

TO: LWVUS
1730 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

FROM: LWV of DECATUR
State: ILLINOIS
File #: IL 128

POSTMARK DEADLINE: January 15, 1986

NATIONAL SECURITY U.S. RELATIONS WITH DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Instructions for Using this Consensus Report Form

If your League participated in a joint consensus meeting with other Leagues, please fill out a separate form for each League. Please fill out the consensus report form in the blanks indicated.

In those areas that indicate a narrative response use a separate page. Do *not* write on this consensus form. By your using a separate sheet, two teams of tabulators can compile the reports. Identify your League on each attachment in the following way:

FROM: LWV of ILLINOIS File # IL 128

SIGNED: _____

Be sure to mark which question or subquestion you are responding to by labeling with the appropriate number (Consensus I, II, III) and Part (A, B, C, D). It would be helpful to use a separate page for each question, but it is not essential.

- How did your board determine member thinking on this consensus report?
- unit meetings
 - general meetings
 - bulletin tear-off
 - questionnaire
 - telephone poll/survey
 - other, please specify Bulletin Inserts

Number of members participating in this member agreement process: 10

REMEMBER, this is a report of your League's consensus, not the concerns and opinions of individual members. It is **NOT** appropriate to ask for or to report numbers or percentages of "votes." "Consensus" means member agreement. "No consensus" means your League was unable to agree; "no response" means your League did not discuss.

Please postmark this completed form by **January 15, 1986** to the above address. Mark envelope "National Security Consensus." The national board is under no obligation to consider replies postmarked after January 15, 1986.

LWV of ILLINOIS
Signed Michael Prozman Vice President-Program (Portfolio)

I. Past, present and possible U.S. international economic and political interests include those on the list below. Select UP TO FIVE interests that should be PARAMOUNT in determining U.S. policies toward developing countries and UP TO FIVE that should be ABSOLUTELY EXCLUDED in determining U.S. policies toward developing countries. (If you list more than five, we will tabulate only the first five listed.) Additional comments elaborating your choices should be attached and identified.

PARAMOUNT		ABSOLUTELY EXCLUDED
_____	stimulating economic growth	_____
_____	promoting stability	_____
_____	promoting peaceful change	_____
_____	fighting communism	X
_____	containing the Soviet Union	_____
_____	limiting U.S. involvement abroad	X
_____	protecting U.S. access to resources and markets	_____
_____	maintaining U.S. preeminence	X
_____	maintaining U.S. leadership	X
X	ensuring self-determination	_____
_____	fostering democratic values	_____
X	protecting human rights	_____
X	promoting sound management of global resources	_____
_____	protecting U.S. business interests	_____
X	reducing the risk of military conflict	_____
_____	supporting allies	_____
X	improving the quality of life	_____
_____	protecting U.S. territory, institutions and people	_____
_____	Other: _____	_____
_____	No consensus	_____
_____	No response	_____

II. The United States has a variety of means to promote its economic and political interests in developing countries. Among them are development aid, the Economic Support Fund, military aid and direct military involvement of U.S. forces. The LWVUS has evaluated development aid in previous studies. For the following questions, please indicate YES, NO, NO CONSENSUS or NO RESPONSE on this form and attach narrative responses on a separate, identified sheet.

A. Is the Economic Support Fund (ESF) an appropriate means to promote the paramount U.S. interests you listed in Question I?

YES NO NO CONSENSUS NO RESPONSE

If YES, for what purposes should ESF be used?

If NO, why not?

B. Is military aid an appropriate means to promote the paramount U.S. interests you listed in Question I?

YES NO NO CONSENSUS NO RESPONSE

If YES, for what purposes should military aid be used?

If NO, why not?

C. Is the direct military involvement of U.S. forces an appropriate means to promote the paramount U.S. interests you listed in Question I?

YES NO NO CONSENSUS NO RESPONSE

If YES, for what purposes should direct military involvement of U.S. forces be used?

If NO, why not?

D. Of the following means to promote U.S. economic and political interests in developing countries, is there one or more that is preferable to the others? Do NOT check all four.

Development Aid Economic Support Fund Military Aid Direct military involvement of U.S. forces

WHY? NO CONSENSUS NO RESPONSE

III. Please respond to Parts A and B of this question on a separate, identified sheet. We ask that your responses to Part B be in *list form*. Comments may follow.

A. What role, if any, should U.S.-Soviet relations play in influencing U.S. policies toward developing countries?

B. What efforts could reduce U.S.-Soviet competition in developing countries?

FROM: LWV of DECATUR

File # IL 128

SIGNED:

Melvin Partzman

V.P. Program

NATIONAL SECURITY
U.S. RELATIONS WITH DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

- II. A. The Economic Support Fund could be used to reduce the risk of military conflict, at times of economic crisis, and to improve the quality of life ~~for~~ ^{with} projects such as dams, wells, roads, etc.
- B.
- C. The use of military forces would not be necessary to promote those interests checked in Part I. ~~Other means of promotion could be used.~~
- D. We felt that an increase in Development Aid was most preferable. Military aid may need to be included at times but should be given in combination with the other types of aid.
- III. A. U.S.-Soviet relations should play a limited role in influencing U.S. policies toward developing countries - as limited as is possible.
- B. Efforts to reduce U.S.-Soviet competition in developing countries should include:
1. Improving understanding between U.S. and U.S.S.R.
 2. Summit meetings.
 3. An agreement by U.S. and U.S.S.R. to support regional organizations.
 4. Concentration on a North-South perspective, rather than an East-West perspective in our relations with the developing countries.

FILE

NATIONAL SECURITY CONSENSUS ON MILITARY POLICY AND DEFENSE SPENDING

Listed below are a number of possible military missions that might be fulfilled by nuclear and/or conventional military forces. Which of these do you consider to be appropriate U.S. military missions and which forces would be appropriate to fulfill these missions?

For each mission listed, check "nuclear role" if you believe that nuclear weapons are appropriate in fulfilling that mission and check "conventional role" if you believe that conventional forces are appropriate. You may check both "nuclear role" and "conventional role" if you wish. Check "should not be a mission" if you believe that the United States should not adopt or retain the mission at all.

	Nuclear Role	Conventional Role	Should Not Be A Mission
A. Defend homeland	yes	yes	
B. Defend allies	no consensus	yes	
1. North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)	yes	yes	
2. Japan	no	yes	
3. Other allies/friends	no	yes	
C. Defend access to vital resources (e.g., oil)	no consensus		
D. Maintain capability to respond to conflicts around the world	no	yes (strong minority)	no
E. Other			

Comments: *allies should be encouraged to provide their own defense. U.S. should have "no first strike" nuclear policy.*

In order to have a nuclear deterrent, the United States has developed a triad of strategic nuclear weapons, composed of *intercontinental bombers, land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and submarine launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs)*. Each leg has differing capabilities and somewhat overlapping purposes. What the United States (and the USSR) does about such weapons affects its deterrence, first-strike and counter-force capabilities.

What should the United States do regarding each leg of its strategic nuclear triad? (Check one box for each leg of the triad.)

	Eliminate	Reduce	Retain As Is	Modernize	No Opinion/ No Agreement
Air leg			X		
Land leg		X			
Sea leg			X		

Comments: *eliminating or modernizing weapons are both unacceptable. Reduce land leg because of its danger to our country. Retain as is and reduce in the future air & sea legs thru negotiations.*

The current U.S. role in NATO is two-fold: to provide a nuclear "shield" over NATO (with nuclear weapons stationed in Europe and with U.S. strategic nuclear weapons) and to deploy conventional weapons and troops to defend Western Europe.

1. Should the United States have the policy of "first use" of nuclear weapons in Europe? Yes ___ No X
2. Should the United States *maintain as is, increase or decrease* its reliance on conventional forces in Europe?
 Maintain As Is X
 Increase ___
 Decrease ___

Comments: *If we would decrease forces in Europe, the countries would be encouraged to provide their own defense.*

IV. The U.S. defense budget can be divided into two broad categories: *investment* (procurement of new nuclear and conventional weapons systems, research and development, and military construction) and *readiness* (operations and maintenance, personnel and retirement pay). In preparing and adopting the defense budget, the President and Congress must make choices between these two categories. (The President's proposed Fiscal Year 1984 defense budget allocates 51 percent of its funds to investment and 49 percent to readiness.)

Within any given level of defense funding, should the United States place more/less emphasis on *investment*, which affects long-term defense capabilities, or *readiness*, which affects near-term combat capabilities?

More Emphasis Less Emphasis Equal Emphasis On Both X

Investment

Readiness

Comments Reduce funding but keep equal emphasis on both.

V. National security has many dimensions and cannot be limited to military policy alone. It can be defined as ensuring domestic tranquility, providing for the common defense and promoting the general welfare. Key elements include the country's ability to implement social and environmental programs and to maintain cooperative relationships with other nations. Other important components are effective political leadership and a strong economy. Therefore, in decisions about the federal budget, political leaders should assess the impact of U.S. military spending on the nation's economy and on the government's ability to meet social and environmental needs.

Do you agree X disagree strong minority

Comments National defense should come before any other considerations.

A. If you agree ----

There is a ratio between spending for national defense and social policies and natural resources that is set by elected officials. The League feels this ratio should

no opinion Have a goal of being equal

no Have defense spending as a priority

no Have social policy and natural resources as priorities

yes Be set each year in national budget debate based on current situations.

B. If budget priorities should be determined by a national budget debate, do you

Agree Disagree that the following circumstances require a change in the ratio?

- yes _____ Declared war
- yes _____ Technology gap due to new advances (i.e. Sputnik)
- yes _____ Economic recession
- yes _____ Major natural or agricultural disasters
- yes _____ Major demographic changes

C. Entry into a country with military aid should be accompanied by economic aid.

Agree _____ Disagree X - it should vary with the circumstances

D. In your view what are the components of national security? Not in order of priority

- (1) Strong defense
- (2) Economic stability
- (3) Capable leaders
- (4) adequate national resources
- (5) tactics + agreements with other nations
- (6) technological resources & development