

## NEW YORK TIMES

## The Brooding Hawks

By Anthony Lewis

SAN FRANCISCO, Feb. 9—There is a peculiar, almost venomous intensity in some of the opposition to Paul Warnke as President Carter's chief arms control negotiator—a feeling beyond the usual policy disagreement in a democracy. It is as if the opponents have made him a symbol of something they dislike so much that they want to destroy him.

The feeling was in the air of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on the Warnke nomination, admirably broadcast in extended summary by Public Television. It was there in the impassioned critical testimony of Representative Samuel Stratton and in the letter from Paul Nitze opposing Mr. Warnke, his former Pentagon colleague. And it had been there in the anonymous anti-Warnke memorandum circulated before the hearing.

The nomination does not seem to be threatened in the Senate. Mr. Carter took the occasion of his first Presidential press conference, on the day the Warnke hearings began, to reaffirm his support of the nominee and to endorse in remarkably strong terms the Warnke view of the advantages of effective arms limitation.

The intensity of feeling of the opposition side is nevertheless important. It signals a policy disagreement so fundamental that any imaginable arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union will face powerful resistance. And it signals the rise of a new militant coalition on national security issues.

The new coalition has many strands. The traditional right is there, along with unreconstructed Vietnam hawks and the labor and industrial and military elements usually favoring higher defense spending.

But there is a new element, an intellectual one. It includes strong supporters of Israel who since the Yom Kippur War have become a significant factor in the growing support for larger U.S. defense budgets. The magazine Commentary is at the heart of this element, along with such Senators as Henry Jackson and Daniel Patrick Moynihan. The New Republic, now a leading pro-Israel voice, made a sustained attack on Paul Warnke before the election.

The military-intellectual complex, it could be called. It is symbolized by the recently formed Committee on the Present Danger, whose members include John Connally, Lane Kirkland of the A.F.L.-C.I.O., Paul Nitze—and Norman Podhoretz, editor of Commentary, and Saul Bellow.

The common thread of this coalition is intense suspicion of Soviet intentions. Concern about a nation as powerful, secretive and authoritarian as the U.S.S.R. is right. Only a fool believes that Soviet leaders are a kindly lot who will make the world a better place if we just trust them. But it is outrageous—and dangerous—to imply anyone favoring arms limitation is such a fool.

The misrepresentation of Mr. Warnke's views is instructive in this regard. Critics cited a past statement by him to the effect that American actions had inspired "the Soviet Union to spend its substance on military manpower and weaponry."

But the mainspring of the super-power arms race is precisely that each side's new weapons systems inspire the other's. Mr. Warnke was looking at the side that we can almost immediately affect: ourselves. The point he was making—has been making for years—is that we Americans, believing ourselves rational, should try the first steps to stop the spiral of increased arms spending.

Mr. Warnke articulated exceptionally well, under the pressures of the Senate hearing, the reasons for thinking that effective arms limitation would make this country more secure, not less. He gave the example of the U.S. decision years ago to develop and deploy missiles with multiple, independently-targeted heads: MIRV's. When the Soviets inevitably followed suit, we ended up feeling less secure than if we had managed to stop the development on both sides.

Of course it is not so easy to get effective, verifiable agreements. But the alternative is a competition with its own Gresham's Law: making the arms balance progressively more expensive and less stable. Congressman Stratton faulted Mr. Warnke for having opposed such weapons systems as MIRV's and the antiballistic missile—a if new hardware automatically produced more security. History teaches that it does not.

President Carter made very similar points, at his press conference, about the potential gains for true security and arms agreements. He made clear his own commitment to the effort—one much deeper than I had understood. The fact that he has those views is doubtless what so greatly agitates the critics of Paul Warnke.

Mr. Carter now knows the political resistance he faces in the arms field. He will be strengthened by having in his Administration Adm. Stansfield Turner, his C.I.A. choice, a military man of unusual breadth of intellect—and James Schlesinger, one skeptic about Soviet intentions who argues policy without personal assault. He has in Mr. Warnke a man of incisive mind who can stay cool under pressure. And in the end the President may find, as John Kennedy did, that careful steps toward peace generate their own popular support.