

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

SECURING PEACE: HENRY M. JACKSON AND U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN PARTIAL  
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS

BY HENRY ATKINSON

Dr. Robert Collins, Thesis Supervisor

COLUMBIA, MISSOURI  
MAY 2012

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

SECURING PEACE: HENRY M. JACKSON AND U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

presented by Henry Atkinson, a candidate for the degree of master of arts,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

---

Professor Robert Collins

---

Professor Catherine Rymph

---

Professor Ellen Levy

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are several people I would like to thank. Professors Robert Collins, Catherine Rymph, and Ellen Levy served on my thesis committee. Their insight and feedback, not to mention their kindness, were valuable in putting this thesis together. Professor Collins endured the most as my faculty adviser, patiently reading through several drafts of chapters and providing suggestions for changes that were necessary in making the final product successful. I would also like to thank Professor John Bullion and all of the professors whose classes I took during the writing of this thesis. Professor Bullion's insights on American foreign policy were helpful in putting Henry "Scoop" Jackson's career in the larger context of the Cold War. I would also like to thank all of my fellow graduate students for helping me to become a better writer and scholar.

This work would not exist without the help of Nancy Taube, the History Department's administrative assistant. Her helpful reminders about deadlines and the graduate school process were a vital part of keeping me on track. The staff of the Graduate School also deserves my gratitude and thanks.

Thank you to the administration, staff, and the students at Christian Fellowship School. Their support and willingness to hear about the Cold War and Henry "Scoop" Jackson during our

class time was a good way of testing out themes and concepts for my thesis. I hope I repaid their patience with the gift of knowledge.

A special thanks to Peter McCarthy and the staff of the State Historical Society of Missouri. They patiently pulled boxes from several different manuscript collections, particularly the papers of Stuart Symington. Their kindness and professionalism are to be commended. The same goes to Peter Constantine and the staff of the Special Collections staff at the University of Washington. The Henry M. Jackson Papers are a massive collection, and the staff was kind enough to pull dozens of boxes for me upon request. My thanks to all of the hard work they put into making my research visit to Seattle a success.

Finally, I would like to thank my family. My parents, Terry and Nancy Atkinson, have always provided support for my ambitions and dreams. My grandmother, Helen Lee, has spent several weekends allowing me to use her home as a quiet research and writing base. Their love and support has been a necessary part of completing this thesis. My brothers, Christopher, Curtiss, and Wayne Atkinson have provided me with laughs and the ability not to take myself too seriously. My deepest thanks go to my fiancée, Emily Lambert. Her love, patience, and honesty have not only made me a better scholar, but most importantly, a better person.

# SECURING PEACE: HENRY M. JACKSON AND U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

Henry Atkinson

Dr. Robert Collins, Supervisor

## ABSTRACT

This work focuses on the efforts of Senator Henry M. “Scoop” Jackson to stop U.S-Soviet détente. Arms control, human rights, and national security policy are discussed in this work. Détente, or relaxation of tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States, aimed to link reductions in Soviet military action with progress in the area of arms control and cultural exchanges. Jackson opposed U.S-Soviet détente because he thought that it would embolden the Soviets militarily and allow the U.S.S.R to gain an advantage in the nuclear arms race.

Jackson was also concerned with human rights and the character of the Soviet regime. He worked to change Soviet behavior in this area as well. He worked to publicize the cases of Soviet and Eastern European dissidents who struggled for political and religious freedom behind the Iron Curtain. This was in contrast to the Nixon and Ford administrations, who deemphasized human rights in pursuing détente. This study explores the interconnection between these issues and Jackson’s struggle to strengthen American defenses against Soviet expansionism.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
Introduction: The Birth of a Cold Warrior.....	1
Chapter 1. The Beginnings of SALT: Defense and Foreign Policy in the Age of Détente.....	21
Chapter 2. Hard Bargain: Henry “Scoop” Jackson and the Fight to Stop SALT II.....	54
Chapter 3. “A Little Bit of Freedom”: Henry “Scoop” Jackson, Détente, and Human Rights...	83
Conclusion: The Legacy of Henry “Scoop” Jackson.....	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	118

## Introduction: The Birth of a Cold Warrior

Senator Henry “Scoop” Jackson’s career featured many stops: prosecutor, congressman, senator, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and presidential candidate. His support for domestic social welfare programs and environmentalism established him as a liberal, but it is Jackson’s focus on foreign policy and national security that made him an international figure. His fight against U.S.-Soviet détente as it was practiced by the Nixon, Ford, and Carter administrations defined his career, the “Last of the Cold War Liberals” fighting against a relaxation of tensions between the superpowers.

The Nixon and Ford administrations, led by Secretary of State and National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger, believed that such a relaxation would help the United States manage the threat of nuclear war in the world, check Soviet expansionism around the globe, and provide economic benefits for both countries. But it was Vietnam that pushed Nixon and Kissinger to seek “peaceful coexistence” between the United States and the Soviet Union. Soviet aid to North Vietnam continued into the late 1960s and 1970s, prolonging the struggle between the North and the U.S.-backed South Vietnam. Nixon and Kissinger sought to withdraw American forces while preserving the security of South Vietnam. Fostering a better relationship with the Soviet Union, not to mention the historic rapprochement with the People’s Republic of China, might lead to concessions at the bargaining table in Paris.

The Vietnam War eventually concluded with the Paris Peace Accords in 1973, seeming to vindicate the Nixon and Kissinger approach. Soviet General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev and Chinese Communist Party Chairman Mao Zedong pressured the North Vietnamese to accept a deal. Jackson supported the Paris Peace Accords and pursuing a close relationship with the Chinese. He understood that preserving South Vietnam was necessary in preserving American

prestige and for the security of Southeast Asia. He also knew that a relationship with the Chinese would provide economic benefits to the United States and function as a bulwark against Soviet expansionism, carefully exploiting the Sino-Soviet split in international Communism that emerged in the 1960s.

So why would Jackson oppose U.S.-Soviet détente? He did so because he knew that there was more to the U.S.-Soviet relationship besides Vietnam and China. Arms control, human rights, and Soviet expansionism were all concerns that topped the agenda for U.S. and Soviet policymakers. Jackson strongly disagreed with the approach of the Nixon, Ford, and Carter administrations on these issues. A failure to incorporate all weapons systems into arms control agreements allowed the arms race to continue to spiral upward, to the Soviets' advantage no less. Human rights were only a small aside in discussions with the Soviets when they should have been a major talking point in undermining the moral legitimacy of the Soviet Union. The Soviets also appeared to be on the march globally, as the Paris Peace Accords only provided South Vietnam with what Kissinger called "a decent interval" to survive. North Vietnam invaded South Vietnam in 1975, reuniting the country under Communist rule. Laos and Cambodia fell to Communism in the 1970s, although the Soviets and the Chinese would bicker about who would have influence in Southeast Asia. Angola was under attack from Soviet and Cuban troops. Only a coup in Chile prevented socialist President Salvador Allende, a leader friendly to Fidel Castro and the Soviet Union, from continuing to hold power. The Soviets had put down the Prague Spring in 1968, solidifying their control over Eastern Europe. Nixon and Kissinger thought they could check these developments with linkage, the idea that good Soviet behavior abroad would lead to arms control deals and economic agreements.



But Jackson knew that the Soviets had no intention of curbing their aggressive behavior, their arms buildup, or their assault on the human rights of their citizens. He believed that only strength would deter the Soviets and lead to arms reduction agreements. Allowing the Soviets to have the advantage in nuclear and conventional military capability would embolden the Communist superpower to assert its might around the world.

The senator sought to undermine U.S.-Soviet détente in order to prevent the Soviets from continuing to enjoy military superiority and to continue their expansionist actions. It was his fight in the 1970s that prevented the United States from falling further behind the Soviets. His views on the Soviet Union were shared by many conservatives, particularly Ronald Reagan, who would employ many of Jackson's ideas and former staffers. As Senator Howard Baker once said, Jackson "made sure that we did not lose the Cold War in the 1970s so that Ronald Reagan could win it in the 1980s."<sup>1</sup> Perhaps Baker gives too much credit to either Jackson or Reagan, but there is no doubt that both men played a significant role in the collapse of the Soviet Union. But Jackson did not come to these beliefs all at once, nor was he new to the problems of international relations.

It could be argued Jackson's internationalism began with his upbringing. Henry was the youngest of five children born in Everett, Washington, a town thirty miles north of Seattle. His parents Peter and Marine were Norwegian immigrants; the family name was changed from Gresseth to Jackson in the 1890s. The town was filled with working-class immigrants like Jackson's parents. A policeman turned laborer, his father Peter never lost his Norwegian accent.<sup>2</sup> The experience of being a first-generation American shaped Jackson's views on tolerance. There is no way to verify it, but Jackson claimed that his mother's Lutheran faith led to philo-Semitism.

---

<sup>1</sup> John McCain with Mark Salter, *Worth the Fighting For: The Education of an American Maverick and the Heroes Who Inspired Him*, (Random House: New York, 2002), 18.

<sup>2</sup> Peter J. Ognibene, (Stein and Day: Briarcliff Manor, New York, 1975), 31.

Marine Jackson rebuked neighborhood children for shouting “Kike” at a Jewish garbageman.<sup>3</sup> Although Jackson later became a Presbyterian, his mother’s lessons of tolerance remained with him forever. In fact, they would have long-lasting effects.

The Jacksons were originally Republicans.<sup>4</sup> The Great Depression changed their views and shaped Henry’s. Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal was a godsend to the people Marine Jackson fed, not to mention the starving families that ate out of the garbage bins at Henry Jackson’s fraternity.<sup>5</sup> These two things--a working class immigrant upbringing and the Great Depression--shaped Jackson’s worldview.

After a brief stint at Stanford University to pursue a life in the Foreign Service, Jackson returned to the University of Washington, where he studied law. Nicknamed “Scoop” after a cartoon strip when he was a boy, the young Henry Jackson was a good student who lived a clean and boring life.<sup>6</sup> Politics were an obsession of the young Jackson in high school and college, with Henry joining the League for Industrial Democracy, a socialist youth group.<sup>7</sup> Jackson never traveled in Communist circles, but he supported a strong role for government in the lives of the American people. However, his views reflected New Deal liberalism more than the socialism of Norman Thomas. He graduated law school and in 1935, briefly worked for the Federal Emergency Relief Administration while he awaited the results of the bar exam. He passed and settled down as a lawyer in Everett. But young Henry Jackson was ambitious. In 1938, the incumbent prosecuting attorney of Snohomish County was vulnerable to a primary challenge

---

<sup>3</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 13.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 10-11.

<sup>5</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 20.

<sup>6</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 20. Peter J. Ognibene, *Scoop: The Life and Politics of Henry M. Jackson* (Stein and Day: Briarcliff Manor, New York, 1975), 38.

<sup>7</sup> Peter J. Ognibene, *Scoop: The Life and Politics of Henry M. Jackson* (Stein and Day: Briarcliff Manor, New York, 1975), 38.

because of rumors about his alcoholism and corruption.<sup>8</sup> Jackson seized the opportunity to run, and won. Jackson was an aggressive prosecutor and developed a classical prosecutorial worldview, seeing the world in terms of right and wrong. He was aggressive in turning back bribes and cracking down on violent crime.

But county politics was not enough for Jackson. He unsuccessfully sought a federal court position, losing out to a younger, more inexperienced appointee.<sup>9</sup> It appeared that the young prosecutor would remain in Everett for a long time. But in 1940, Washington's Second District Congressman Moe Wallgren retired to run for the U.S. Senate. The race to succeed him brought many comers, but it was Henry "Scoop" Jackson who won the primary and the general election. He campaigned on domestic issues relating to the New Deal, such as old-age pensions, public power, and employment. Jackson argued for the "preparation of an adequate national defense," but was otherwise quiet about the war in Europe during the campaign.<sup>10</sup> Once elected, however, he could not afford to keep quiet about such issues for long.

The Nazis invaded Norway in the spring of 1940, an event Jackson that took Jackson aback. Furthermore, the new congressman sympathized with the plight of Great Britain.<sup>11</sup> But most of his constituents opposed to any U.S. involvement in World War II, even the sending of destroyers to Great Britain through Lend-Lease. Jackson was a strong supporter of President Roosevelt, but he also worried about the sentiments of his constituents. He opposed Lend-Lease when it came up to a vote in January 1941.<sup>12</sup> Jackson's brief isolationism soon became a casualty of world events. Nazi Germany invaded the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941 and the Japanese

---

<sup>8</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 23-27.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 23-27.

<sup>10</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 29.

<sup>11</sup> Jeff Bloodworth, "Senator Henry Jackson, the Solzhenitsyn Affair, and American Liberalism," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 97, no.1.,(Spring 2006): 69 and 70.

<sup>12</sup> Letter to Ivan Boe, February 6 and 25, 1941, folder 54, box 1.Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-002, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 34 and 35.

stepped up their efforts to conquer the Pacific during that same summer. The freshman congressman gradually recognized the threat posed by the Axis Powers. In October 1941, Jackson supported military and economic aid to Great Britain. Two months later, the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and the young congressman became a strong supporter of the war effort.

Jackson briefly joined the Army in September 1943. His experience in the Army taught him the value of preparedness. He was stationed at Fort McClellan, Alabama. Republicans in his district criticized him for abandoning his district, but Jackson was eager to serve.<sup>13</sup> In January 1944, President Roosevelt forced members of Congress to choose between their seats or military life. Congressman Jackson chose Washington D.C. Two months later, many of the men he served with were sent overseas.<sup>14</sup>

Only on one occasion was Jackson's support for war measures misplaced. Jackson wholeheartedly agreed with the internment of Japanese-Americans, fearing their alleged support for their relatives in Japan.<sup>15</sup> He also opposed the establishment of a Japanese-American fighting unit.<sup>16</sup> His animus continued after the war, encouraging the deportation of 5,500 first-generation Japanese-Americans to Japan. Only later, in the 1950s, did he seem to admit that internment had been wrong and supported restitution to the interned.

Jackson's attention was on the defense of the West Coast and on the troubled situation of Nazi-occupied Norway. He spoke to Norwegians via short-wave radio, talking about his district and his own Norwegian roots, noting the struggle its people put up against Nazism:

Can a nation be called 'conquered' when 99 percent of its people  
are bravely resisting the Nazi overlords in spite of their

---

<sup>13</sup> Peter J. Ognibene, *Scoop: The Life and Politics of Henry M. Jackson* (Stein and Day: Briarcliff Manor, New York, 1975), 152.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 152.

<sup>15</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 35 and 36.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 35 and 36.

persecution, firing squads, and concentration camps? Every day we in American hear of acts of courage which prove that Norwegians are fighting on the home front just as effectively as are their forces abroad... I would like to compare these Norwegian airman and sailors to the intrepid Vikings of old-these modern Vikings on land and on sea and in the air. They have come out of the grim vastness of the North, not to conquer and discover new lands, but to seek new vistas of freedom and overcome oppression wherever and whenever it exists. Truly those persons of Norwegian ancestry in our country can be proud of the people in the land of their fathers.<sup>17</sup>

Jackson's pride in his Norwegian ancestry extended to membership in the Sons of Norway, an immigrant pride group similar to the Sons of Italy.<sup>18</sup> He visited Norway after the war. His treatment at the hands of Norwegian doctors while there strengthened his support for national health insurance at home, and the reports Jackson received about Soviet actions in the area sharpened his suspicions of the USSR.<sup>19</sup>

Jackson's visit to Norway in the winter of 1945 was months after another troubling visit in April 1945. Congressman Jackson was a part of a congressional delegation invited by General Eisenhower to see the Nazi concentration camp of Buchenwald. The sight of the emaciated, anemic Jewish survivors disturbed Jackson. He told a constituent that it was "“as rotten a mess as I ever hope to see.”<sup>20</sup>

Jackson met the emerging Cold War with strong support for the foreign policy of Harry Truman. He supported the Greece-Turkey Aid Bill, the Marshall Plan, the creation of Israel, and

---

<sup>17</sup> Peter J. Ognibene, *Scoop: The Life and Politics of Henry M. Jackson* (Stein and Day: Briarcliff Manor, New York, 1975), 54.

<sup>18</sup> Letter to Ivan Boe, April 29, 1948, , folder 54, box 1. Henry M. Jackson Papers, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. Sons of Norway Honor Roll Sheet, folder 64, box 7, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-002, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>19</sup> William Prochnau and Richard W. Larsen, *A Certain Democrat: Senator Henry M. Jackson, A Political Biography* (Prentice-Hall Books: New York, 1972), 27 and 28. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 40.

<sup>20</sup> Letter to Floyd Laird, July 20, 1945, folder 13, box 2. Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-002, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

the new United Nations.<sup>21</sup> Jackson strongly supported the president in his struggle with Henry Wallace over the fate of postwar liberalism, and the choice between the softer line of Wallace with the Soviet Union and the tough-minded containment of Truman. Congressman Jackson backed the right horse with Truman's victory in the 1948 presidential election. He also won a new committee assignment: a seat on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.<sup>22</sup> Although much of the committee's time was focused on the domestic uses of atomic energy, the specter of nuclear war loomed over decisions of the committee. The Soviet Union developed its own atomic bomb and seemed intent on expanding their ideology and national power, wherever possible. Although Jackson opposed U.S. involvement there, he worried about China falling to Mao in 1949, only a year after Czechoslovakia fell under the control of Soviet-backed Communists.<sup>23</sup> The Berlin Airlift saved West Berlin in 1948-1949, but that was a rare setback for the Communist superpower. Jackson supported efforts to build the hydrogen bomb and to create a new organization to protect the U.S. and Europe from Soviet intentions: NATO.<sup>24</sup>

Events worsened in 1950 with the North Korean invasion of South Korea. Jackson abandoned his earlier flirtation with world federalism.<sup>25</sup> He urged a rapid buildup in conventional weaponry and manpower in the U.N. effort to push back the North Koreans.<sup>26</sup> With a major role in Congress as a member of a committee that dealt with national security, Jackson's views began to attract attention.

---

<sup>21</sup> Jeff Bloodworth, "Senator Henry Jackson, the Solzhenitsyn Affair, and American Liberalism," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly* (Spring 2006): 69. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 40-42.

<sup>22</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 53.

<sup>23</sup> Letter to Mr. A. Dieterle, undated, box 2. Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-002, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>24</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 54.

<sup>25</sup> Jeff Bloodworth, "Senator Henry Jackson, the Solzhenitsyn Affair, and American Liberalism," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, (Spring 2006) :70 and 71.

<sup>26</sup> Letter to Mrs. Trygve Aos, August 20, 1950, folder 23. Box 1, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-002, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Jackson pushed for another project during this period: universal disarmament. It was his first effort to push for the reduction of nuclear weapons. He cosponsored a resolution with Senator Brien McMahon (D-CT) and several congressmen to convene discussions where the United States and the Soviet Union would turn their armaments over to the United Nations. The episode showed that Jackson, while a strong supporter of national defense, was not a proponent of an arms race without end. Even at this point, he wanted to reduce the amount of nuclear weaponry.<sup>27</sup>

Jackson, now established as a strong Cold Warrior, looked toward his future. The Democratic Party was in dire straits in 1952 as the Korean War dragged on and inflation remained high. Harry P. Cain was the Republican Senator from Washington State and up for reelection in 1952. Jackson, who had planned to run for the seat as early as 1948, decided to run against Cain.<sup>28</sup> He won the Democratic primary with ease, never diverting his focus from defeating Cain. The junior senator from Washington had made several missteps during his time in office. He went through a highly publicized divorce and several political scientists ranked him as one of the top five worst senators.<sup>29</sup> He was known as a strong ally of Joseph McCarthy who blocked the nomination of Mon Wallgren to the chairmanship of the National Security Resources Board for being soft on communism back in Washington State.<sup>30</sup> He had strongly supported General MacArthur over President Truman, sponsoring resolutions supporting both the withdrawal of forces from the Pacific and war with China, not seeing the inconsistency of these

---

<sup>27</sup> Resolution for Limitation of Armaments, folder 22, box 52. Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-002, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>28</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 64.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 66- 67.

<sup>30</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 66- 67.

proposals.<sup>31</sup> The prominent columnists Stewart and Joseph Alsop blasted him for having “a matchless ignorance of foreign affairs.”<sup>32</sup>”

Jackson contrasted Cain’s conservative record with his own New Deal liberalism, noting his opposition to HUAC and his refusal to join the committee when asked by Speaker Sam Rayburn.<sup>33</sup> He touted his Cold War credentials as an advocate for national defense and a tough line with the Soviets, in an effort to increase his appeal to independents and Republicans. Democratic Senator Warren Magnuson(D-WA), with whom Jackson would have a long and complicated relationship, gave him key logistical support.<sup>34</sup> Jackson defeated Cain, even outpacing Eisenhower’s margin of victory in the state.<sup>35</sup>

The freshman senator was initially quiet, but the cause of disarmament came to the fore again with President Eisenhower’s Atoms for Peace proposal. Jackson renewed his call for universal, though not unilateral, disarmament. He spoke to the Senate on May 1 , 1953:

“ If the road before us continues without turning, the future promises at best a world living in fear of annihilation- a world in which our treasures are drained away in the manufacture of weapons which cannot feed a single hungry person or ease the pain of a single man or woman racked by disease. And that is the best we can hope for if armaments continue piling up on both sides of the Iron Curtain at an accelerating rate. If history is to be our guide, we must assume that eventually such an armaments race will spill over to outright global war. In truth, the future holds only two alternatives: atomic war, a war made hideous beyond imagination by the new destroyers of men and all their works; or atomic peace, a peace made rich beyond imagination by the power of modern science and technology freed for peaceful tasks.”<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 66- 67.

<sup>32</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 66- 67.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 44.

<sup>34</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 68. , Peter J. Ognibene, *Scoop: The Life and Politics of Henry M. Jackson* (Stein and Day: Briarcliff Manor, New York, 1975), 102-103.

<sup>35</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 69.

<sup>36</sup> Quoted in Dorothy Fosdick, ed. *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches 1953-1983*(University of Washington Press: Seattle, 1990), 33 and 34.



Jackson's call for disarmament were overtaken by two events in 1954, the first being the Army-McCarthy hearings. Senator Jackson was a member of McCarthy's Senate Committee on Government Operations. Jackson biographers debate how strong the senator's opposition to McCarthy was. One argues he was quiet and ineffective, while another describes him as necessarily subtle.<sup>37</sup> Jackson certainly indulged in his own anti-communist excesses: he joined a unanimous effort to outlaw the Communist Party and to track down subversive organizations.<sup>38</sup> But this was a rare mistake.

Jackson joined a bloc of senators opposed to McCarthy's excessive, overbearing tactics. The freshman senator joined with fellow Democratic committee members John McClellan and Stuart Symington, another Cold War liberal and freshman Senator from Missouri, in walking out of committee hearings and pushing McCarthy to get rid of staffers who made inflammatory statements about ferreting out Communists from every walk of life.<sup>39</sup> The Army-McCarthy hearings were the Wisconsin senator's downfall, and Jackson was there to give him a push. The two senators tussled over the case of Anna Lee Moss, pushing against McCarthy's suggestion that the civil servant had a secret Communist past. Jackson grilled a another witness named David Schine, who advocated "anticommunist psychological warfare." The Washington senator ridiculed the idea and Schine's plans to use "pinups, bumper stickers, and Elks Clubs" to defeat domestic communism.<sup>40</sup> President Eisenhower called Jackson to praise his performance. As the hearings went on, it was clear that McCarthy's disastrous performance and subsequent censure all but finished his career. But the hearings made Henry "Scoop" Jackson a household name.

---

<sup>37</sup> Peter J. Ognibene, *Scoop: The Life and Politics of Henry M. Jackson* (Stein and Day: Briarcliff Manor, New York, 1975), 97-98. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 74-77.

<sup>38</sup> Letter to Constituent, undated, folder 18, box 105. Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-003, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>39</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 80.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 81.

Jackson received more good news at the end of 1954: another committee assignment. Jackson served on the Committee on Government Operations and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Democrats won back control of the Senate, and Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson gave Senator Jackson a spot on the Armed Service Committee. It would be that committee that Jackson would use to change and shape American foreign policy.<sup>41</sup>

Senator Jackson used his new spot on the Armed Services Committee to rail against what was called “the New Look.” President Eisenhower emphasized nuclear weapons as a deterrent (he called it “massive retaliation”) while reducing the defense budget for conventional arms and manpower. Jackson blasted the shift; he wanted a focus on maintaining American nuclear capability while matching the Soviets in troop levels and conventional weaponry.<sup>42</sup> He was also an early advocate of the Submarine Launched Ballistic Missile and other weapons systems needed to match the Soviets.<sup>43</sup> He wanted to make sure the United States was second to none during the Cold War.

Jackson worried about the Soviet effort to outpace the United States. Events such as the Suez Crisis, the Soviet invasion of Hungary, and the launch of Sputnik seemed to confirm the warnings of congressional Democrats like Jackson. His 1956 visit to the Soviet Union led him to conclude that the Soviet Union moved forward militarily and in the foreign policy arena “by depriving its people of the goods and services Americans take for granted.”<sup>44</sup> He warned audiences against underestimating the Soviet Union, condemning “a national superiority

---

<sup>41</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 83.

<sup>42</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 86-88. Letter to Constituent, undated, box 136, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-003, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 91.

<sup>44</sup> Jeff Bloodworth, “Senator Henry Jackson, the Solzhenitsyn Affair, and American Liberalism,” *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, (Spring 2006): 71.

complex” and “smugness” in the face of Soviet technological advances.<sup>45</sup> Voters seemed to approve: Jackson easily won reelection in the Democratic tidal wave of 1958.

Jackson continued to enhance his national security profile with his chairmanship of the Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Submachinery.<sup>46</sup> This work gave Jackson an inside look at the key players in the national defense debate, how the national defense establishment worked, and what needed to be fixed. He and his colleagues urged the elimination of several interagency committees. *New York Times* columnist James Reston and *Washington Post* reporter David Broder both praised the hearings.<sup>47</sup>

The 1950s saw the tension between Eisenhower’s America and Nikita Khrushchev’s Soviet Union somewhat lessened with summit meetings in 1958 and 1959. But the threat of war still existed going into the 1960 presidential campaign, particularly with the U-2 spy plane incident that infuriated Khrushchev. By then, two men vied to succeed Eisenhower: Vice President Richard Nixon and Senator John F. Kennedy. Jackson strongly backed Kennedy in the Democratic primaries, his friendship with the Kennedys going back to their time as freshman senators.

As the Democrats met in Los Angeles to nominate Senator Kennedy, Henry “Scoop” Jackson received serious attention as a vice-presidential contender. Senior Jackson staffers created a vice-presidential campaign headquarters, lobbied delegates, and distributed “Scoop Jackson for Vice-President” campaign buttons.<sup>48</sup> *Time* magazine listed him as a top contender for the job and won support from California Governor Pat Brown, Congressman Stewart Udall of

---

<sup>45</sup> “Jackson Hits U.S. Smugness” Associated Press, undated, box 136. Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-003, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>46</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 104.

<sup>47</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 104.

<sup>48</sup> Campaign Button, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-016. Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

New Mexico, and Senators Mike Mansfield (D-MT), and Frank Moss(D-UT). Despite concerns about whether the Washington delegation would support Kennedy, the Massachusetts senator continued to drop hints that it would be Jackson. He told Jim Bishop that he needed “someone like Scoop Jackson.<sup>49</sup>” Robert Kennedy lobbied for Jackson, and many Jackson staffers held parties and writing sessions in anticipation of the nomination.<sup>50</sup>

But Joseph Kennedy disagreed. He met with House Speaker Sam Rayburn and concluded that Senate Majority Leader and Kennedy presidential rival Lyndon Johnson would balance the ticket: a Northern Catholic and a Southern Protestant. Despite Robert Kennedy’s hatred for Lyndon Johnson, it was the tall Texan who prevailed. As a parting gift, the Kennedys gave Jackson the position of Democratic National Committee Chair.

Jackson did not run Kennedy’s campaign: that role belonged to Robert Kennedy. Staffers for the presidential campaign were upset with a disappointing turnout in Seattle during a September stop, although Jackson told them not to come during that time of the year.<sup>51</sup> But Jackson toured the country raising money for the party’s coffers and campaigning for the Kennedy-Johnson ticket. He was a leading proponent of the theory that the Eisenhower administration had created a “missile gap” (the gap would later prove to be a nonexistent one). Senators Kennedy and Johnson repeatedly brought up foreign policy issues, taking issue with the Eisenhower administration for neglecting national defense and allowing the country to fall behind the Soviet Union. The tough line, combined with the regional balance of the ticket, proved to be successful as Kennedy defeated Nixon in November.

---

<sup>49</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 120-121.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 120-121.

<sup>51</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 123.

The new president and Senator Jackson had a difficult yet productive relationship. The Kennedy clan was upset because Nixon won Washington. Kennedy dragged his feet in placing key Jackson staffers and friends in administration spots. Paul Nitze, the respected author of NSC-68 and an experienced foreign policy hand, was passed over for the Secretary of Defense spot in favor of Ford Motor Company executive (and Republican) Robert McNamara. Nitze took the position of assistant defense secretary.<sup>52</sup> The president and Senator Jackson worked together and got along personally, but their relationship was somewhat strained. Jackson supported the administration's defense buildup and its responses to the crises in Berlin and the Cuban Missile Crisis (although it is hard to imagine Jackson would have so blithely accepted the Berlin Wall or would have been placed in a position to accept the Turkey-for-Cuba missile swap). He did occasionally venture from the administration line, criticizing the administration of the United Nations. A disagreement over the TFX fighter, made by Boeing, also complicated matters. Jackson worked to investigate the awarding of the TFX contract to a firm in Texas over the Seattle-based Boeing. Critics attacked him as "the Senator from Boeing," but Jackson was just doing the job of representing not just the economic motivations of the multinational corporation, but the workers in his state who relied on production of the fighter. Investigations were held on the matter, and no wrongdoing was found. But Jackson proved that he was willing to fight an administration he largely agreed with.<sup>53</sup>

It was during the Kennedy years that his efforts to aid Soviet Jews began. Jackson cosponsored a resolution with Abraham Ribicoff and other senators that denounced the treatment of Soviet Jews. This occurred at about the time that a grassroots movement to aid Soviet Jewry

---

<sup>52</sup>. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 128-129.

<sup>53</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 142-148.

began to emerge in the United States. The movement to truly understand the human costs of the Holocaust emerged during this period, putting Jackson's visit to Buchenwald in a new light. With Soviet Jews suffering persecution and discrimination in their homeland, American Jewish leaders and U.S. policymakers were dedicated to helping Soviet Jews avoid the fate of those who died at places like Auschwitz, Dachau, and Buchenwald. Jackson was an early supporter of the movement to save Soviet Jewry from persecution and bigotry. His views on this issue would only intensify as the years went on.

Perhaps the greatest row between Jackson and Kennedy involved his reluctant support for the Limited Test Ban Treaty in 1963. This treaty forbade the United States, the Soviet Union, and most nuclear powers from atmospheric testing.<sup>54</sup> Passage was crucial, considering President Kennedy's speech on relaxing U.S.-Soviet relations at American University in June 1963. But Jackson worried about the modernization of the nuclear arsenal, fearing the Soviets would modernize their weaponry while the United States would be shackled by the treaty. However, he had supported the goal of banning atmospheric testing going back to the late 1950's.<sup>55</sup> Underground testing would continue, but Jackson wanted to make sure of this before supporting the treaty.<sup>56</sup> This put the Kennedy administration in a difficult position as they lobbied for the treaty. The newspaper columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak picked up on the disagreement.<sup>57</sup> Jackson insisted on strengthened safeguards to monitor Soviet compliance with the treaty, and reserved judgment until this was assured by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.<sup>58</sup> Ultimately

---

<sup>54</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 148.

<sup>55</sup> Letter to Constituent, August 23, 1958, box 136. Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-003, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>56</sup> Dorothy Fosdick, ed. *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches 1953-1983* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 1990), 121.

<sup>57</sup> Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, "Strains on Scoop Jackson Over Treaty", undated 1963, Box 203, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-003, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>58</sup> Letter to Constituent, August 10, 1963, box 203, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-003, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

the administration agreed to these safeguards, which included continued underground testing, laboratory testing, support facilities and laboratories for nuclear testing, and verification to make sure the Soviet were not cheating.<sup>59</sup> Jackson announced his support for the treaty on September 13, 1963, noting that “efforts to limit the spread of nuclear weapons deserve our serious attention. But I believe the role of the treaty in inhibiting proliferation has been generally overestimated.<sup>60</sup>” Jackson argued that the treaty would not limit or reduce the number of nuclear weapons, it would just prevent atmospheric testing. His support moved several senators to vote for the treaty, putting the vote over the two-thirds necessary for ratification. The Limited Test Ban Treaty passed 80 to 19.<sup>61</sup> Jackson was ready to continue his complicated but friendly relationship with President Kennedy, but fate intervened.

President Kennedy’s assassination elevated Lyndon Johnson to the presidency. The growing problem of Vietnam loomed over the country. Jackson strongly supported Kennedy and Johnson’s efforts to support the South Vietnamese government, though he raised complaints about the “loss” of Laos, a key neighbor that was supposedly neutral under an agreement reached by President Kennedy and Soviet Premier Khrushchev in 1962. But the Communists took over Laos, making matters difficult for the authoritarian, anti-Communist regime of Ngo Dinh Diem.<sup>62</sup> This development, combined with the growing unrest and revolt against Diem’s regime, led President Kennedy to approve a coup in 1963. That was the situation President Johnson inherited on November 22, 1963.

---

<sup>59</sup> Dorothy Fosdick, ed. *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches 1953-1983*(University of Washington Press: Seattle, 1990), 123.

<sup>60</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 124.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 152.

<sup>62</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 156-157.

But both President Johnson and Senator Jackson had to worry about reelection first. The two men were somewhat suspicious of each other after Jackson's support for Kennedy in 1960 and Johnson's role in securing the TFX contract for his home state of Texas.<sup>63</sup> The two men bonded, however, strong in their support for the basic premises of Cold War liberalism. Neither man had any trouble winning reelection in 1964, cruising to easy victories. The senator published a new book, *Fact, Fiction, and National Security*, detailing his views on the Soviet threat.<sup>64</sup> Jackson's life and career were never better. He was a powerful and successful senator, had been married to his wife Helen for three years, and had a one-year old daughter named Anne Marie. A son, Peter, was born in 1966.

Family life and success did not temper Jackson's commitment to the liberalism of the New Deal and Fair Deal. Jackson was a strong supporter of the Civil Rights Act, Voting Rights Act, Medicare, environmental initiatives, and all of the Great Society. That steadfastness carried over into foreign policy, particularly on the issues of Israel and Vietnam. Senator Jackson cosponsored a resolution with Senator John Tower(R-TX) that provided arms to Israel during the Six-Day War. Jackson supported the existence of the Jewish state, but he was also concerned about Soviet involvement in the area. The amendment carried the day as the Johnson administration carefully maneuvered to keep the Soviets from interfering on the Arab side of the conflict. But the Six-Day War in 1967 was only one part of the foreign policy equation. The topic of Vietnam dominated the conversation in the United States.

As the antiwar movement began to emerge in the mid-1960's, Jackson rebuffed efforts to withdraw troops or end the war. He criticized the "peace movement," blasting its rejection of

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., 161.

<sup>64</sup> Henry M. Jackson, *Fact, Fiction, or National Security* (McFadden-Bartell Corp: New York, 1964).



American's cultural and moral foundations.<sup>65</sup> But Jackson wanted the President to avoid "gradual escalation" and to spell out what U.S. forces were supposed to do in South Vietnam.<sup>66</sup> A clear mission and the necessary support were vital to success in Vietnam. Unfortunately, those two things never met up in Vietnam, as the antiwar movement and urban unrest destroyed the Johnson presidency. Jackson, along with Senators Richard Russell, John Stennis, and Margaret Chase Smith, asked President Johnson to veto any troop increases unless accompanied by a sustained and heavy bombing campaign of North Vietnam. Under the pressure of events, Johnson withdrew from the 1968 presidential race.

Jackson refused entreaties from the campaign of Senator Robert Kennedy, sticking with President Johnson's handpicked successor, Vice President Hubert Humphrey.<sup>67</sup> But Cold War liberals like Humphrey and Jackson were not the flavor of the month. Kennedy and Senator Eugene McCarthy electrified the young, antiwar New Left that was turning out in several Democratic primaries. Only the tragic assassination of Senator Kennedy on June 5, 1968 and the control President Johnson maintained over the party machinery won the nomination for Humphrey. But it was not worth having. The chaos, violence, and division in Chicago deeply hurt Humphrey's chances. Even Humphrey's call to stop the bombing of North Vietnam and the Paris Peace Talks were not enough to save the Vice-President's campaign. Richard Nixon, making a phoenix-like rise from the political ashes, won the presidential election of 1968. Jackson would have to work with a Republican President and congressional colleagues who increasingly moving away from the key principles of Cold War liberalism. He readied himself for the work necessary to take on the Soviets, prevent defeat in Vietnam, and strengthen American defense.

---

<sup>65</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 174.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 170.

<sup>67</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 192.

But President-elect Nixon had a different proposition for Senator Jackson. How would the senator like to come and work in the Administration? Nixon offered Jackson the position of Secretary of Defense. Given Jackson's experience and passion for shaping national security policy, it would be a difficult offer to refuse.

## Chapter 1

### The Beginnings of SALT: Defense and Foreign Policy in the Age of Detente

Henry Jackson examined his options in December of 1968. He could accept President Nixon's offer to become the next Secretary of Defense, or he could return to the Senate.<sup>68</sup> Would he accept the offer from the man he had worked to defeat in 1960 and 1968? Prominent conservatives and a smattering of Cold War liberals rushed to his aid, endorsing his nomination.<sup>69</sup> He weighed the options by talking to friends and staffers, before finally declining the offer. Scoop Jackson would remain in the Senate.

Jackson was not timid in resuming his role as a staunch advocate for national defense in the Senate. He sought to solve the prominent foreign policy issues of the day, especially the U.S.-Soviet relationship. The war in Vietnam consumed outgoing President Lyndon Johnson, overwhelming his other foreign policy goals. The president had hoped to improve U.S.-Soviet relations during his time in office, meeting with Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin at Glassboro, New Jersey in 1967. The two swapped stories and enjoyed their time together at the Glassboro Summit, but could not make progress on arms control agreements. The main obstacle to progress on arms control was the ongoing war in Indochina. Kosygin did not believe that Johnson would make a deal with the Vietnam War raging, much to the frustration of President Johnson. The president desperately sought Soviet help in achieving peace in Vietnam, but was unable to obtain any significant assurances from Premier Kosygin. Johnson would spend the rest of his presidency seeking better relations with the Soviet Union and an end to the war in Vietnam.

Such was the situation President Nixon inherited and Senator Jackson worked to correct. Senator Jackson generally supported both the Johnson and Nixon administration's efforts to end

---

<sup>68</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 198.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 197-198.

the war in Vietnam, while opposing unilateral withdrawal and cutting off funding. He would continue to do so until 1972, when the war was winding down because of the withdrawal of U.S. ground forces. Jackson sought to bolster the President on other key national defense issues. Alongside Armed Services Committee Chairman John Stennis (D-MS), Jackson fought hard against any large overall reduction in defense spending.

Jackson also sought to strengthen the Nixon administration's resolve on the matter of anti-ballistic missiles (ABM). The Johnson administration had wanted to negotiate with the Soviets on the matter, but in the meantime had started efforts to construct anti-ballistic missile sites under a program named Safeguard. The Johnson administration decided to move forward gently, preferring to rely on the safety of mutually assured destruction. But given the failure of the Glassboro Summit and the Soviets' work on an ABM system around Moscow, the United States could not afford to have its nuclear arsenal rendered useless. Nixon and Kissinger worried about losing this advantage and pressed on with the Safeguard ABM program, despite the opposition of prominent senators like Senate Foreign Relations Chairman William Fulbright and Senator Stuart Symington, the first-ever Secretary of the Air Force during the Truman administration.<sup>70</sup>

The senior senator from Missouri's shift was indicative of the foreign policy shift within the Democratic Party. Once a strong proponent of weapons systems and a prominent critic of the supposed "missile gap" between the Soviet Union and the United States in the late 1950s, Symington gradually moved away from the defense-hawk aspect of his Cold War liberalism.<sup>71</sup> Secrecy in U.S. policy and the deteriorating conditions on the ground in Vietnam in the mid-1960s forced Symington to re-examine his support for the Vietnam War and for the defense

---

<sup>70</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson :A Life in Politics*, 184-186

<sup>71</sup> Robert David Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2006), 144-146.

establishment.<sup>72</sup> As the war intensified and the Johnson administration refused to share information with him, he began to call for withdrawal from Vietnam.<sup>73</sup> Symington moved into a camp that questioned the basic premises of the Cold War and high defense spending, joining Fulbright and other anti-war liberals. He knew that the Soviets had achieved strategic parity with the United States in nuclear weapons.<sup>74</sup> He argued that fear of a Soviet attack on U.S. nuclear weapons was overstated and that the Safeguard was no more necessary to fend off a Soviet attack than a Chinese one, which had been the original reason for building the ABM in Symington's mind.<sup>75</sup> He argued that an ABM system would not work and would only serve to undermine arms control negotiations.<sup>76</sup>

Symington was not alone. Senate Democrats, who controlled the chamber, gradually moved toward an anti-war, pro-defense cutting position in the late 1960s. The Safeguard ABM and appropriations for the Vietnam War were new flashpoints in a battle over foreign policy between the Congress and the executive branch.<sup>77</sup> One scholar notes that "only 12 roll call votes were taken between the end of the Korean War and increased American involvement in the Vietnam War in 1965." Three of these were to reduce defense spending.<sup>78</sup> Hundreds of roll call votes on defense were taken in the late 1960s and 1970s. The turning points were Vietnam and the Israeli-Arab Six-Day War of 1967.<sup>79</sup> These conflicts forced the whole Senate to consider

---

<sup>72</sup> Robert David Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2006), 144-146.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 144-146.

<sup>74</sup> Statement by Senator Stuart Symington to the Senate Armed Services Committee, March 20, 1969, folder 2034, 4-6, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri. Notes from Senator Stuart Symington, undated, folder 2034, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>75</sup> James C. Olson, *Stuart Symington: A Life* (University of Missouri Press: Columbia, 2003), 421-422.

<sup>76</sup> Notes from Senator Stuart Symington, undated, folder 2034, 1, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>77</sup> Julian Zelizer, "Domestic Politics and Détente," *Journal of Diplomatic History* 31, no. 4, (September 2009): 656-658.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 656-658.

<sup>79</sup> Robert David Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War*, (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2006), 146-147.

foreign policy matters. For the most part, this consideration led to anti-war sentiment and reductions in defense spending.

Neither Jackson's nor the Nixon administration looked at military preparedness issues in isolation. The idea of détente gradually emerged within the administration.<sup>80</sup> Balance-of-power politics were a staple of Henry Kissinger's career. A Harvard professor specializing in international relations, Kissinger rose to prominence with his work *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* in 1957, which led to a position in the Kennedy administration and as a foreign policy adviser to New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller. Jumping onto the Nixon campaign in the summer of 1968, Kissinger had a clearly defined view of what détente with the Soviet Union meant. The Communist giant was a permanent fixture in foreign relations, just as had been the powers of 19<sup>th</sup> century Europe he had written about. It was best to remain strong, but to bargain with the Soviets whenever possible.

Nixon came to share this view. Known for his confrontations with Alger Hiss as a congressman and Nikita Khrushchev during his time as Vice-President, President Nixon's reputation as a Cold Warrior was sterling. It was difficult to question the toughness of a man who stood against the Soviets and criticized the Kennedy and Johnson administrations for strengthening economic relations with the Soviet Union.<sup>81</sup> But Nixon shared Kissinger's view of the Soviet Union in the world. The president and his national security adviser worried about the "strategic presence" of the United States.<sup>82</sup> Nixon wanted to "recognize that the Soviet Union"

---

<sup>80</sup>Robert Schulzinger, *Henry Kissinger: Doctor of Diplomacy* (Columbia University Press: New York, 1989), 50-53. See also George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776* (Oxford University Press: Oxford and New York, 2007), 769-771.

<sup>81</sup> Quoted in *AFL-CIO Free Trade Union News*, December 6, 1973, Box 90, folder 191, Richard Ichord Papers, C1269, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>82</sup> Keith Nelson, *The Making of Détente* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 17, 27 and 81.

had “interests” just as the United States had interests.<sup>83</sup> Interestingly, Senator J. William Fulbright, a critic of American foreign policy during the late 1960s and 1970s, made the same argument. In 1966, he argued that “Russia can now properly be regarded as a conservative power in foreign relations, whose stake in in the status quo is a far more important determinant of her international behavior than her philosophical commitment to world revolution.”<sup>84</sup>

The difference between Fulbright and Nixon’s foreign policy views came on the question of Vietnam and the defense establishment. While Fulbright wanted a quick withdrawal from the war and to reduce defense spending, the Nixon administration wanted to withdraw U.S. troops from Vietnam gradually and strengthen American defenses. This would require the help of the Soviets, who could help the United States with the Paris Peace Talks between the U.S. and North Vietnam. The Soviets could provide another boost to world peace by reducing the size of their defense apparatus and nuclear stockpile. Given the limits on American foreign policy put in place by the war in Vietnam and increasing congressional action, the President and his National Security Advisor sought to work out the best deal possible on limiting nuclear arms and holding the line on ABM systems.

Nixon and Kissinger did not believe the Soviets would take these actions lightly, highlighting the need for a tough American negotiating position. In his memoirs, Kissinger argues that he did not “believe SALT was a cure-all” and that President Nixon wanted a Moscow summit, but was worried about such a meeting receiving too much hype.<sup>85</sup> The two men preferred secrecy, hiding communications between Kissinger and Soviet Ambassador Anatoly

---

<sup>83</sup> Letter from President Richard Nixon to Secretary of State William Rogers, February 4, 1969. *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 12, Soviet Union: January 1969-October 1970*, 26.

<sup>84</sup> Quoted in Eugene Brown, *J. William Fulbright: Advice and Dissent* (University of Iowa Press: Iowa City, Iowa, 1985), 84.

<sup>85</sup> Henry A. Kissinger, *White House Years* (Little, Brown, and Company: Boston, 1979), 530-532.

Dobrynin from Secretary of State William Rogers.<sup>86</sup> It was during these exchanges that Kissinger proposed holding a summit in January of 1970.<sup>87</sup> The secrecy caused confusion in the Soviet regime and within the Nixon administration, complicating relations between the two countries when it was intended to improve them. Nixon and Kissinger knew that negotiating would need to come from a position of strength; resting on a concept Nixon called linkage. The term was not used publicly, but instead was a private idea of Nixon and Kissinger's.<sup>88</sup> Soviet behavior abroad would be linked to progress at the negotiating table. It is true that scholars fault Kissinger for not clearly defining negative Soviet behavior (for example, funding Soviet client regimes) but the idea of linkage was clear in the minds its chief American proponents.<sup>89</sup> If the Soviets would put the brakes on their expansionist behavior, Nixon and Kissinger would reward Soviet leadership at the bargaining table.

But to strengthen their position, they needed to press forward with bolstering the defense of the United States. The Safeguard ABM system, together with Minutemen missiles, the Trident submarine armed with nuclear weapons, and funding for other weapons systems were all part of the Nixon administration's overall defense posture.<sup>90</sup> The Nixon White House turned to an old friend for support of their efforts: Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson.

Jackson's task was to guide the Safeguard ABM program through the Senate in 1969 and 1970, while limiting simultaneously limiting efforts to cut overall defense spending. Jackson's efforts encountered a roadblock when a Foreign Relations subcommittee overseeing

---

<sup>86</sup> Robert Dallek, *Nixon and Kissinger: Partners in Power* (HarperCollins Publishers: New York, 2007), 136-139 and John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History* (The Penguin Press: New York, 2003), 199-200.

<sup>87</sup> Henry A. Kissinger, *White House Years*, 532.

<sup>88</sup> Jerome Suri, *Henry Kissinger and the American Century*, (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass, 2007), 204.

<sup>89</sup> Robert Schulzinger, *Henry Kissinger: Doctor of Diplomacy*, 56-57

<sup>90</sup> Robert David Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War*, 152-154. The ABM system was previously named Sentinel during the Johnson administration. See Robert Dallek, *Nixon and Kissinger: Partners in Power* (HarperCollins Publishers: New York, 2007), 136-139.



disarmament, led by Senator Albert Gore, Sr., took up Safeguard.<sup>91</sup> The members of the Gore subcommittee, including Senators Symington and Fulbright, strongly opposed the deployment of the ABM.<sup>92</sup> The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee noted in an April 1969 speech that

...violence has become our nation's leading industry...millions of Americans have acquired a vested interest in the experience of weapons which provide their livelihoods and indirectly therefore a foreign policy that has plunged the United States into a spiraling arms race with the Soviet Union.<sup>93</sup>

, Symington and Fulbright grilled Defense Secretary Melvin Laird in this critical vein during committee hearings. They argued that the ABM threatened the stabilizing aspects of the doctrine of mutually assured destruction, which posited that both countries would be afraid to launch nuclear weapons for fear of thermonuclear war.<sup>94</sup> Laird countered that the Soviet's own SS-9 ABM missile defense could destroy the deterrent capability of the nuclear arsenal of the United States.<sup>95</sup> Nuclear weapons were ineffective as a deterrent if they were so easy to destroy, argued Symington. Laird refused to respond further, citing classified material and security concerns. The American ABM program was in serious jeopardy without the help of Jackson, Stennis, and their allies. Nixon intensified efforts to secure the ABM's passage, privately threatening to defund National Education Television for an anti-ABM program they ran. To counter anti-ABM efforts, he urged former OSS agent William Casey to set up a pro-ABM

---

<sup>91</sup> Robert David Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War*, 152-154.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 152-154.

<sup>93</sup> William C. Berman, *William Fulbright and the Vietnam War* (Kent University Press: Kent, Ohio, 1988), 108-109.

<sup>94</sup> James C. Olson, *Stuart Symington: A Life*, 421

<sup>95</sup> "Memorandum from the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) to President Nixon," *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 12, Soviet Union: January 1969-October 1970*, Department of State, 100-101, footnote 3.

group.<sup>96</sup> In the minds of top administration officials, the fate of the Nixon administration's defense policy would hinge on securing ABM's passage.

In the end, the ABM program fell within the oversight of the Armed Services Committee. There Stennis condemned efforts to reduce the deployment of the Safeguard. With Stennis as its chairman and Jackson as a senior member of the committee, the ABM was voted out of the full Armed Services Committee, approved the ABM over the opposition of Symington and several other Democrats. Getting the ABM out of committee was easy. Guiding the system through a successful floor vote was the true test of whether Jackson and Nixon's efforts on ABM would pay off.

Jackson and Symington spoke to a closed-door session of the Senate and the result was unpleasant for everyone involved. Despite their friendship, the two men exchanged extremely tough words, conflicting facts, and dueling charts.<sup>97</sup> The charts were outsized, with Department of Defense officials refusing to declassify Symington's large chart.<sup>98</sup> Jackson outdid the senior senator from Missouri with a presentation partially crafted by two young aides named Richard Perle and Paul Wolfowitz.<sup>99</sup> For his part, Symington argued that the system was a technological bust and costly to boot. Jackson argued the system was necessary to protect the American homeland and to show strength to the "hard-boiled" Soviets.<sup>100</sup> Many senators praised both men's efforts, with anti-ABM Senator Walter Mondale later noting how Jackson's arguments presaged Ronald Reagan's efforts with the Strategic Defense Initiative in the 1980s.<sup>101</sup> Though the presentations were effective, the debate over them was barely civil. Senators in the session

---

<sup>96</sup> Randall Bennett Woods, *J. William Fulbright, Vietnam, and the Search for a Cold War Foreign Policy* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1998), 198-199.

<sup>97</sup> Robert David Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War*, 154-158.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, 154-158.

<sup>99</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 211

<sup>100</sup> Robert David Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War*, 154-156.

<sup>101</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 211-212.

traded barbs and insults, with one senator deriding pro-ABM senators as “stooges of the military” and another comparing Senator John Sherman Cooper(R-KY) to Neville Chamberlain.<sup>102</sup>

The effort to weaken the ABM was proposed by Senators Cooper and Philip Hart (D-MI). Their proposal would have reduced the size of the ABM system from twelve missile sites to two. This was the original Johnson administration plan, which made it difficult to argue Cooper and Hart were advocating a radical position.<sup>103</sup> Furthermore, the senators argued that a larger system would undermine SALT negotiations by provoking the Soviets.<sup>104</sup> As Jackson’s biographer has argued, the senator completely rejected that view. The Soviets respected strength, and going forward with the ABM would bolster the negotiating efforts.

With the Cooper-Hart minimalist proposal now up for consideration, both sides went to work. Symington, Fulbright, Stennis, Jackson, and pro-ABM Senator John Tower all figured prominently in the battle over the ABM. In the end, pro-ABM forces won. Jackson’s dear friend, New Mexico Senator Clinton Anderson, cast the deciding vote against Cooper-Hart and for the ABM system to go forward as planned. The first vote in 1969 to kill the Cooper-Hart Amendment ended 51-49.<sup>105</sup>

Stennis, working with Jackson, reached a compromise that would restrict the Safeguard ABM system to cover land-based missiles, preventing ABMs from being deployed on submarines.<sup>106</sup> Nixon supported this compromise and conferred with Senators Jackson and Tower about whipping the vote. Jackson was unsure about the health of his friend Clinton Anderson, a

---

<sup>102</sup> Robert David Johnson, *Congress and the Cold War*, 154-156.

<sup>103</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 210.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, 210.

<sup>105</sup> Randall Bennett Woods, *J. William Fulbright, Vietnam, and the Search for a Cold War Foreign Policy* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1998), 198-199.

<sup>106</sup> , Senator John Stennis Press Release, July 30, 1970, folder 1686, 1-4. Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

crucial swing vote.<sup>107</sup> Jackson advised the President on how to win Anderson's vote and when to apply the pressure. He also put in a good reminder to his friend from New Mexico right before the vote. The second vote authorizing the program to go forward occurred in July 1970, with a fifty-fifty tie broken by a supportive Vice President Spiro Agnew.<sup>108</sup>

The ABM debate gave Jackson the opportunity to hire a new staffer: Richard Perle. One cannot write about Jackson's career without looking at the important people who comprised his staff. Perle, a University of South California doctoral student, joined Jackson's stable of foreign policy specialists. A tough protégé of the RAND Corporation think-tank expert Albert Wohlstetter, Perle shared Jackson's zeal for arms reduction and taking a tough line with the Soviet Union.<sup>109</sup> He joined Dorothy Fosdick, a longtime Jackson staffer going back to the 1950s and former State Department official who had served as a speechwriter for Adlai Stevenson.<sup>110</sup> Fosdick and Perle would lead an impressive foreign policy staff for Jackson: Elliot Abrams, Douglas Feith, Frank Gaffney, Jim Woolsey, and Michael Ledeen all served on Jackson's staff at one time or another during the 1970s.<sup>111</sup> These men would play a significant role in the Reagan and Bush 43 administrations, with Woolsey serving as the Clinton administration's first CIA director.

The young staffers, along with Jackson and the Nixon administration, believed that negotiations with the Soviets would require a strong national defense, lest the negotiating position of the United States be imperiled. It would be difficult to secure an arms control

---

<sup>107</sup> "Memorandum for the Record Washington, July 24, 1970. Subject: Report for the President's file on his meeting with Senators Jackson and Tower on Thursday, July 23 at 4:00 p.m.," *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 34, SALT 1969-1972*, Department of State, 322-324.

<sup>108</sup> Robert Dallek, *Nixon and Kissinger: Partners in Power*, 139.

<sup>109</sup> Alan Weisman, *Prince of Darkness: Richard Perle-The Kingdom, the Power, and the End of Empire in America* (Union Square Press: New York, 2006), 30-33.

<sup>110</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 211.

<sup>111</sup> Alan Weisman, *Prince of Darkness: Richard Perle-The Kingdom, the Power, and the End of Empire in America*, 32-33.

agreement if the Soviets felt they had the advantage. The two sides could not effectively reduce conventional armaments if the United States was behind. Jackson used parliamentary maneuvering to maneuver the Safeguard and other missile systems through the Senate.<sup>112</sup> Nixon was so enamored of Jackson that he made sure to show up to a VFW Convention where Jackson was being honored. The president even ordered the Republican National Committee, led by Senator John Tower, not to fund Jackson's Republican opponent.

But there were early signs that the alliance between the Nixon administration and Senator Jackson would not last. The President and Kissinger assured each other that they would not betray Jackson on the Safeguard ABM at the negotiating table.<sup>113</sup>

Kissinger:...Scoop Jackson called this afternoon, and he said if we screw him on this Washington defense after all the pleading he's done for us on—

Nixon: We're not going to do that.

Kissinger: —on Safeguard, he'll never forgive us.

Nixon: Well, you told him we weren't?

Kissinger: I told him we weren't.<sup>114</sup>

The senator strongly supported Safeguard, but also disagreed with some key goals of the Nixon administration. The president and Dr. Kissinger wanted to limit the amount of nuclear weapons; Jackson thought that this was a timid goal. He believed in mutually verifiable reductions in nuclear weapons. He wanted the reductions to apply to ICBMs (Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles), SLBM (Submarine Launched Ballistic Missiles), ABMs, and a newer technology called MIRVs (Multiple Reentry Vehicles). The latter innovation allowed ballistic missiles to carry multiple nuclear weapons on one device. Jackson worried that negotiators would allow the Soviets to maintain an advantage in MIRV technology, thereby gaining an actual advantage in the amount of nuclear weapons.

---

<sup>112</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 184-186.

<sup>113</sup> "Conversation among President Nixon, the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger), and the Assistant to the President (Haldeman), Washington, March 11, 1971." *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 34, SALT 1969-1972*, Department of State, 423-425.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, 423-425.

Peace activists ridiculed Jackson's views. What did it matter if the Soviet Union had an advantage in nuclear weapons or conventional armaments? Militarism was wrong, and both Jackson and Nixon facilitated its growth.<sup>115</sup> They believed that both countries should stop building weapons and limit the amount of nuclear weapons in the world.

Interestingly, Nixon did not disagree with the anti-war movement's ideas for nuclear weapons. He wanted the U.S. to have the advantage, but limiting the arms race had its benefits. It would prevent the Soviets from increasing their lead and could prove helpful in fostering trade relations, an issue popular with business and farmers. Nixon supported the idea of Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), which continued under his watch in 1969 and 1970.

Jackson thought reductions (rather than limits or ceilings) were the better course, but he continued to support the broad structure of Nixon's foreign policy toward the Soviet Union. It is important to remember that Jackson never supported détente or the assumptions about Soviet behavior that Nixon and Kissinger shared. But he was a man who considered himself a strong supporter of national defense, regardless of political party.

The anti-war mood of the Senate and the Democratic Party emboldened anti-war activists.<sup>116</sup> They sought to defeat supporters of the Vietnam War and a large defense establishment. One prominent target was Senator Jackson. Prominent Vietnam critics like the reporter turned gossip columnist Kitty Kelley, Allard Lowenstein, John Kenneth Galbraith, and Senator Eugene McCarthy supported Carl Maxey, Jackson's anti-war opponent in the 1970 Democratic primary.<sup>117</sup> After the Minnesota senator derided the idea of falling behind the Soviets during his campaign stop in Washington State, Jackson quipped, "I opposed both McCarthys--

---

<sup>115</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 216.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, 221.

<sup>117</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 221.

Eugene and Joe.<sup>118</sup>” Anti-war activists pelted Jackson with marshmallows during a speech on a Minnesota campus, while students at the University of Washington booed and jeered him during the first Earth Day in 1970.<sup>119</sup> Given Jackson’s sterling record on environmental issues, this was a clear rejection of Jackson’s views on Vietnam and national defense. Nevertheless, Jackson went on to easily win re-election in the primary and the general election.<sup>120</sup>

Perhaps voters in the state of Washington were concerned about the state of American national security in 1970. Many issues relating to U.S.-Soviet relations besides Vietnam came up in the early 1970’s. The Soviet Union, emboldened by the U.S. dilemma in Vietnam, increased its efforts to expand the reach of Communism. Asia was only one part of the equation, with countries in Africa and Latin America also prime targets. Kosygin may have been the de facto ruler in the post-Khrushchev era, but it was General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev who had the real authority by 1971. The walrus-faced apparatchik presided over the period in Soviet history dubbed “stagnation.” The economic, cultural, and political facets of Soviet life drifted along, with seemingly no improvement in sight. The Soviet leadership increasingly grew older and distant from its people. But there was no stagnation on the foreign front. The Brezhnev Doctrine posited that once a country became Communist, it would remain so forever. Given the Brezhnev/Kosygin regime’s response to the Prague Spring in 1968, this doctrine seemed to be an ironclad rule for the Soviet Union in the 1970s.

Europe was another Cold War flashpoint during the 1970s. Berlin remained divided, as did West and East Germany. West German Chancellor Willy Brandt excited Germans and scared U.S. officials with his *Ostpolitik*, or policy of reaching out to East Germany and Communist nations. These arrangements required nothing of the East German government or its Communist

---

<sup>118</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 219.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, 217.

<sup>120</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 222.

allies--a free gift of trade and cultural exchanges, not to mention de facto acceptance of the permanent division of Berlin and Germany.<sup>121</sup> The NATO alliance grew increasingly divided, with France having opted out of its security arrangements in 1966. Britain was undergoing sclerotic economic growth, and NATO countries did little better in the difficult economic environment of the 1970s. Defense budgets fared poorly during this period in Western Europe, a terrible time to reduce expenditures with the Soviet Union seeking to expand its empire.

Nixon and Kissinger viewed these developments with concern, as did many in the United States Senate. The Mansfield Amendment, proposed by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D-MT), was an effort in the late 1960s and early 1970s to reduce U.S. troop levels in Europe. This was at a time when there were hundreds of thousands of Soviet troops were stationed in Eastern Europe.<sup>122</sup> The Nixon administration knew that containing the Brezhnev Doctrine required a strong U.S. presence in Europe.<sup>123</sup> Mansfield was supported in his efforts by Fulbright, Symington, and other antiwar liberals in the Senate. A compromise measure offered by Senator Charles Mathias(R-MD) called for the Nixon administration to consult with Congress on reducing troops in Europe.<sup>124</sup> Jackson and Stennis stood firmly against both efforts, continuing to argue that the United States needed a strong presence in Europe to deter a Soviet attack.

---

<sup>121</sup> Raymond Garthoff, *Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan* (Brookings Institution: Washington D.C., 1994) 209-212.

<sup>122</sup> Jerome Suri, *Henry Kissinger and the American Century*, (Belknap/Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Mass., September 2009), 224.

<sup>123</sup> Angela Romano, "Détente, Entente, or Linkage? The Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in U.S. Relations with the Soviet Union," *Journal of Diplomatic History*, 33, no. 4 (September 2009): 706-708.

<sup>124</sup> Henry A. Kissinger, *White House Years*, 940-942



The Senate defeated the Mansfield Amendment in 1971 by a vote of 36 to 63.<sup>125</sup> Jackson's speech was crucial in determining the outcome. He argued that retreat during a time of Soviet expansionism would send a message of weakness to the Soviets and also force the United States to rely on nuclear weapons more as a deterrent.<sup>126</sup> He pointed out fears in Europe about a resurgent West Germany. Reducing American troop levels would force West Germany to add to its NATO contributions, allowing the Soviets to evoke the memory of Nazi conquest.<sup>127</sup> He invoked pro-NATO comments by former President Truman, former President Johnson, and former Secretaries of State Dean Acheson and Dean Rusk, pointing out that the United States stationed forces in Europe not out of charity but because Americans realized that security of the European continent was interlinked with the security of the United States.<sup>128</sup>

Still, forging a stronger relationship with the Soviet Union was the order of the day. Negotiators continued to labor over a SALT agreement that limited MIRVs and an ABM treaty designed to limit or eliminate anti-ballistic missiles. Gradual and sometimes frustratingly slow progress was made in 1971 toward an agreement in both areas. Kosygin told Senator Frank Church that eliminating nuclear weapons would be impossible, but that he supported arms reduction, "limited or complete."<sup>129</sup> The administration worried about limiting ABM, particularly given their alliance with Senator Jackson.<sup>130</sup> Jackson continued accrue power in the Senate, chairing a Senate subcommittee examining the SALT talks and arms control. Kissinger led

---

<sup>125</sup> Quoted in Dorothy Fosdick, ed. *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches 1953-1983*(University of Washington Press: Seattle, 1990), 111.

<sup>126</sup> Quoted in Dorothy Fosdick, ed. *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches 1953-1983*(University of Washington Press: Seattle, 1990), 114.

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid.*, 114.

<sup>128</sup> 1 Quoted in Dorothy Fosdick, ed. *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches 1953-1983*(University of Washington Press: Seattle, 1990), 114.

<sup>129</sup> "Interview with Kosygin, Report to the Committee on Foreign Relations by Senator Frank Church, Member of the Delegation of the United States to the Sixth Dartmouth Conference, Kiev, U.S.S.R.," Government Printing Office, October 1971. Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>130</sup> Conversation Between President Nixon and the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger), Washington, March 12, 1971. *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 12, Soviet Union: October 1970-October 1971*, Department of State, 399-402.

Jackson to believe they would hold firm on the Safeguard ABM system, possibly limiting the number of sites to four. The National Security Adviser urged Jackson to talk tough about the Administration in order to enhance the bargaining position of the United States.<sup>131</sup> Dobrynin and Kissinger continued to talk, discussing Vietnam, the Middle East, and arms control. They discussed limiting the number of ABM sites and limits on the number of ICBMs and SLBMs.<sup>132</sup>

Jackson worked to strengthen the administration's resolve by speaking out on what a SALT agreement should look like. He went to the Senate floor to propose an interim agreement with four parts:

1. The United States would immediately halt the deployment of Minuteman III missiles with their MIRV warheads.
2. The Soviet Union would immediately halt the deployment of new ICBM launchers and missiles including these now under construction.
3. The countries would retain the freedom to assure the survivability of their strategic land-based forces as long as they did not add to their offensive potential.
4. Neither side would deploy a population defending ABM.<sup>133</sup>

Jackson argued that this proposal allowed both sides a limited ABM to protect the nuclear deterrent forces of both countries. It also stopped the arms race, laying the foundation for arms reductions by stopping construction of new offensive weapons. Jackson argued that:

“We have said in the past, that if the Soviet Union will stop building up its strategic offensive potential arms we will agree to limit our defenses. Unfortunately, the Soviets have chosen to press for an agreement that would limit defenses only... This position, of course, is unacceptable. Far from slowing the arms race, it would provide an incentive to the Soviets to press ahead with the

---

<sup>131</sup> Telephone Conversation Between a Transcript of a Telephone Conversation Between the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) and Senator Henry M. Jackson, Washington, May 20, 1971, 7:40 p.m. *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 13, Soviet Union: October 1970-October 1971*, Department of State, 674-675.

<sup>132</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Washington, November 18, 1971, 8:30 p.m., Participants: Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin and Henry A. Kissinger, *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 14, October 1971-May 1972* Department of State. 66-70.

<sup>133</sup>“SALT: A New Initiative,” Speech on the Senate Floor, March 29, 1971, Box 236, folder 60. Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession 3560-004, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

deployment of more offensive weapons in the full knowledge that we, for our part, have nothing in prospect with which to counter their increasing strength.<sup>134</sup>

Jackson continued his efforts during a speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. He argued that the principle of deterrence was necessary to maintain peace in the world, and that a weak deterrent invited Soviet aggression and adventurism. He warned that the United States was “slipping” into this dangerous territory, falling behind the Soviets in nuclear arms and conventional weaponry. He warned that the Soviet Union would use this advantage to secure a better position at the negotiating table and to secure its interests abroad. He blasted the Nixon administration, arguing that:

The Administration has made the claim that we are leaving the “era of confrontation” and entering the “era of negotiation.” I see scant evidence to support such a sunny forecast concerning our relations with Moscow. The massive Soviet weapons build-up does not suggest to (*sic*) that with greater strength they will be more wary of confrontation. It does suggest to me that they will be better equipped to pursue the tactics they have employed since World War II—confrontation and negotiation together as partners advancing their interests. Indeed, to the Kremlin, confrontation tactics are “bargaining” as much as formal talk can be, and the Soviets are experts at deeds and displays to influence the outcome of a negotiation.<sup>135</sup>

But the administration continued in its efforts to secure a deal with the Soviets. Despite Soviet support for India during the tumultuous India-Pakistan conflict and tensions over reaching a peace agreement to end the Vietnam War, Nixon and Brezhnev agreed to meet in 1972.<sup>136</sup> The two sides plus West and East Germany agreed to the continued division of Berlin with the

---

<sup>134</sup> “SALT: A New Initiative,” Speech on the Senate Floor, March 29, 1971, Box 236, folder 59, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession 3560-004, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>135</sup> “The Strategic Balance and the Future of Freedom,” Speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, April 15, 1971, Box 236, folder 60, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession 3560-004, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>136</sup> Memorandum of Conversation, Washington, November 18, 1971, 8:30 p.m., *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 14, October 1971-May 1972*, Department of State, (Washington D.C., 2012), 66-70. Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and his Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) Washington,” December 8, 1971, 8:05 p.m., *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 14, October 1971-May 1972*, Department of State., 66-70.

Quadpartite Agreement on September 3, 1971.<sup>137</sup> West German recognition of Poland and the Soviet Union occurred in April 1972.<sup>138</sup> By early 1972, Nixon and Kissinger agreed to limit the number of ICBMs, SLBMs, and MIRVs the two countries would have. In addition, the ABM aspect of the SALT I treaty confined anti-ballistic missile technology to two missile sites and continued laboratory work, but nothing further.<sup>139</sup> Kissinger secretly journeyed to Moscow to finalize the outline of the agreement with Brezhnev, Dobrynin, and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko in late April of 1972, shortly before the President traveled to the Soviet Union for the summit.<sup>140</sup>

The Moscow Summit, couple with Nixon's rapprochement with China, constituted a significant high point for Nixon and his foreign policy. The war in Vietnam, despite the continued bombing of North Vietnam, was winding down. The combination gave the president several major foreign policy accomplishments in an election year. There was more progress to be made in the arms control arena and in discussions over forces stationed in Europe, but the two countries made great progress on several highly significant issues. The Soviet Union and the United States signed SALT I on May 26, 1972, pending Senate and Politburo approval. No one doubted the approval of the latter, but the Senate was still a question mark for the administration.

---

<sup>137</sup> Memorandum From Helmut Sonnenfeldt of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger) Washington, undated. *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 14, October 1971-May 1972*, Department of State, 173-174.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid.,173-174. Memorandum of Conversation, Moscow, May 22, 1972, 6:15–8:10 p.m., *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 14, October 1971-May 1972*, Department of State, 982 and 988.

<sup>139</sup> Raymond Garthoff, *Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan*, 125-127.

<sup>140</sup> "Memorandum of Conversation, Moscow, April 22, 1972, 11 a.m.–4:05 p.m.," *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 14, October 1971-May 1972*, (Washington D.C.:Department of State, 2012), 989-995.

Senator Jackson was a source of deep concern as the administration mustered support for Senate approval of SALT. “The Last of the Cold War Liberals” would not go away quietly.<sup>141</sup> He said in a written statement:

We would all like to see stabilizing agreements to curb the arms race. But far from curbing the arms race, the present agreements are likely to lead to an accelerated technological arms race with great uncertainties profound instabilities, and considerable costs.<sup>142</sup>

SALT I limited the Safeguard ABM, rendering Jackson’s lobbying meaningless. Abolishing the ABM for both sides was one thing—Jackson himself had proposed such a measure if the Soviets were willing to do the same.<sup>143</sup> But to limit deployment when the Soviets could cheat infuriated Jackson. The senator was livid with Nixon and Kissinger for undercutting his work on the Safeguard ABM and initially vowed to oppose the administration’s efforts to pass the SALT treaty, before softening his position to become a supportive critic of SALT.<sup>144</sup>

Jackson was a much-discussed contender for the Democratic nomination in 1972. Although the records show he finished second to George McGovern in the number of delegates, Jackson had a difficult time running in 1972. His style was decidedly not that of a politician in the television age--baggy clothes, a jowly face, and an ability to drone on that did not fare well with voters.<sup>145</sup> But his views on the Cold War and defense spending were perhaps his greatest

---

<sup>141</sup> Paul Wieck, “The Last of the Cold War Liberals-Another President Jackson?,” *The New Republic*, September 18, 1971, 17. William W. Prochnau and Richard W. Larsen, *A Certain Democrat: Senator Henry M. Jackson: A Political Biography*, 1.

<sup>142</sup> “Statement of Senator Henry M. Jackson on the Signing of the SALT Agreements” May 26, 1972, Box 236, folder 19. Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession 3560-004, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>143</sup> “Conversation Among President Nixon, the President’s Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger), and the Assistant to the President (Haldeman),” *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 34, SALT 1969-1972*, (Washington D.C.: Department of State, 2012), 452-456.

<sup>144</sup> “Transcript of Telephone Conversation Between President Nixon and his Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger), May 19, 1972,” *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 14, October 1971-May 1972*, (Washington D.C.: Department of State, 2012), 957-958, 962,

<sup>145</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 226-232.

handicap. Jackson was able to hold off antiwar activists back home because independents and Republicans familiar with the Jackson brand could cross over and support the senator in the state primaries.<sup>146</sup> But in the Democratic Party of 1972, antiwar activists, minorities upset with Jackson's anti-busing views, and young people held greater sway under new rules put in place by Senator George McGovern and Congressman Douglas Fraser (D-MN). These groups were in no mood to nominate a man who was to the right of Richard Nixon on the Soviet Union and defense spending. Jackson had problems winning over traditionally supportive constituencies. Although a favorite of labor, he lost out to Senator Hubert Humphrey in securing their backing.<sup>147</sup> He decided to skip New Hampshire, a mistake given the attention paid to the second-place finisher, Senator McGovern.<sup>148</sup>

He turned to Florida, home to a large Jewish constituency and a rural vote that might look favorably on Jackson's national security and agriculture record. He finished third in the state behind George Wallace and McGovern, despite endorsements from Southern politicians including Senator Stennis, North Carolina Senator Sam Ervin, and House Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur Mills (D-AR). Even praise from Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter was not enough to boost Jackson. Scurrilous attacks, supposedly coming from presidential campaign of Senator Edmund Muskie, claimed he had fathered an illegitimate child in high school and was arrested for gay sex. Investigations later revealed that Donald Segretti, a Nixon campaign official, had written the accusations on Muskie's stationary. He was sentenced to six months in jail for his caper.<sup>149</sup> Investigations during the Watergate scandal revealed that a top Jackson aide,

---

<sup>146</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 226-232.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*, 226-232

<sup>148</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 234-235.

<sup>149</sup> *Ibid.*, 226-232.

Sterling Munro, was on the enemies list of his “old friend” Richard Nixon.<sup>150</sup> Jackson’s frustration with the Nixon administration only grew.

After losing every state but his native Washington to McGovern and the other Democratic contenders, Jackson stayed in the race long after most of the candidates dropped out. He made national security a prime facet of his push toward the Democratic National Convention, blasting “the New Left Establishment” that supported McGovern.<sup>151</sup> Jackson highlighted McGovern’s support for the 1948 presidential candidacy of Henry Wallace over Harry Truman, his revisionist view of the Cold War, and the massive defense cuts the South Dakota senator advocated. The senator felt that McGovern would be a complete disaster not only for the Democratic Party’s chances of taking back the White House, but for the very security of the United States and the world. He held back the New Left radicals who had attempted to oust him from office in 1970. Why should he fail now? He vowed to stop McGovern’s nomination at any cost.

Jackson’s critique of McGovern allowed him to forge an “Anybody But McGovern” coalition that would support the Washington senator or Senator Humphrey at the convention in July 1972.<sup>152</sup> What Senator Jackson and the anti-McGovern delegates failed to appreciate significantly were the McGovern-Fraser rules that were in place after 1968. The new rules and procedures favored minorities, youth, and anti-war activists--the groups supporting McGovern.<sup>153</sup> McGovern supporters won all of the major convention votes, which led Muskie and Humphrey to end their campaigns. They even dumped the Illinois delegation of Mayor Daley in favor of a group led by the Reverend Jesse Jackson, a telling move that reflected the

---

<sup>150</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 234-235.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.*, 234-235.

<sup>152</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 238-239.

<sup>153</sup> *Ibid.*, 234-235.

political forces that would shape the Democratic Party at the end of the twentieth century. In the end, McGovern and Jackson were the only candidates left standing. Labor leaders and Governor Jimmy Carter supported “Scoop” Jackson, but it was too little, too late.<sup>154</sup> McGovern won the nomination and gave his acceptance speech at 2 a.m. in the morning.

Jackson returned to the Senate and did some campaigning for Democratic Senate candidates on the side. His White House hopes were dashed for the moment, but the senator had more pressing concerns. The SALT I treaty was coming up for a vote. He had promised his support, but at what cost? Jackson and his staffers got together to strategize and plan. The senator, once a strong supporter of the Nixon administration’s foreign policy, now became a sharp critic.<sup>155</sup> Years later, Henry Kissinger would argue that support for détente began to waver in 1973 when issues surrounding the Yom Kippur War, Soviet dissidents, and Soviet Jewish emigration emerged. This view is wrong.<sup>156</sup> Jackson never supported the administration’s version of détente, but his opposition was about to become much more vocal in the summer of 1972. The Jackson Amendment to SALT I would be the senator’s first blow against the Nixon administration’s efforts to achieve U.S-Soviet detente.

At first, Jackson wanted to kill the ABM treaty and the SALT I agreement. He told a Florida supporter that “the Moscow arms agreements raise serious questions that go to the heart of the security of the United States and the stability of the strategic balance.<sup>157</sup>” But there were not enough votes to deny ratification of the agreement and the treaty in the Senate. Most senators were reluctant to oppose arms control and gestures toward peace in an election year.<sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>154</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 238.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid. 242-243.

<sup>156</sup> Henry A. Kissinger, *White House Years*, 1255.

<sup>157</sup> Letter to Constituent, August 1, 1972, Box 236, folder 41, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession No. 3560-004, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>158</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 253-256.



Jackson looked for a way to hold the Nixon administration accountable. The strategic disparity in ICBMs (Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles) would be frozen, while the U.S. advantage in MIRVs (Multiple Reentry Vehicles) could be surpassed by the Soviets.<sup>159</sup> A continued advantage would not endanger the United States, but it allowed the Soviets to threaten Europe and Japan. Most scholars have ridiculed Jackson's view of SALT, but John Lewis Gaddis has admitted that the Soviets had such an advantage in SALT I.<sup>160</sup> U.S. security was linked to the security of those nations, according to Jackson. There had to be some way to remedy this flaw in the SALT I agreement.

Jackson staffers Dorothy Fosdick and Richard Perle went to work. Looking for a way to establish a standard that would guide future arms control negotiations, they came up with the Jackson Amendment. This proposal would demand complete parity on MIRVs and ICBMs in future arms control treaties between the Soviet Union and United States. Jackson made passage of the amendment a condition of his support for the SALT I and ABM treaties. Senator James Buckley (Conservative-NY), proposed a similar amendment allowing the United States to leave the ABM treaty after five years if no permanent agreement was reached. The Buckley amendment successfully passed the Senate.<sup>161</sup>

The Nixon administration was unhappy with both proposals, especially Jackson's. Nixon and Kissinger felt that the Jackson amendment tied their hands in future agreements and complicated efforts to reach further deals with the Soviets.<sup>162</sup> But they realized that Jackson was a key ally in the Senate. Jackson told Nixon and Kissinger that he might withdraw support for

---

<sup>159</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 253-256.

<sup>160</sup> John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History* (The Penguin Press: New York, 2003), 199-200. For the conventional view of Jackson's opposition to SALT I, see Jussi Hanhimaki, *The Flawed Architect: Henry Kissinger and American Foreign Policy*, (Oxford University Press: Oxford and New York, 2004), 280-282.

<sup>161</sup> Text of ABM Amendment proposed Senator James L. Buckley, folder 6277, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>162</sup> Jussi Hanhimaki, *The Flawed Architect: Henry Kissinger and American Foreign Policy*, (Oxford University Press: New York, 2004), 220-222.

SALT I and the Trident nuclear submarine. Fearing that Jackson would follow through with his threat, the Nixon administration went along with the Jackson Amendment. Nixon worked with Stennis to minimize the effects of the Jackson Amendment on SALT, with both men disparaging Jackson's efforts to hold the administration accountable.<sup>163</sup> Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin strongly objected to the Jackson Amendment, suggesting it to a form of punishment.<sup>164</sup>

Ambassador Gerald Smith, the lead negotiator in the SALT negotiations, voiced objections to the administration's acquiescence to Jackson.<sup>165</sup> Smith told Kissinger deputy General Alexander Haig about his frustration with the passage of the Jackson Amendment.<sup>166</sup> The general explained to Smith why Nixon and Kissinger's went along with the Jackson Amendment, but Smith argued that Jackson would have supported the submarine program even if he opposed SALT. Smith grew increasingly frustrated with U.S. domestic criticism of SALT I and later accused Jackson of destroying the careers of prominent State and Defense Department officials who were involved in the SALT negotiations.<sup>167</sup> That is a strong accusation, but Jackson did prevent the promotions of several people involved in the SALT negotiations, such as Raymond Garthoff and General Royal B. Allison.<sup>168</sup> Jackson's influence allowed him to have a say in who served as arms control negotiators, such as Jackson ally General Edward Rowley.<sup>169</sup>

---

<sup>163</sup> "Conversation Among President Nixon, Senator John Stennis, the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Kissinger), the Assistant to the President (Haldeman), and the President's Deputy Assistant for Legislative Affairs, (Korologos)" *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 36*, (Washington D.C.: Department of State, 2012), 952-954.

<sup>164</sup> "Memorandum of Conversation: Washington, August 4, 1972. Participants: Russian Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin, Dr. Henry A. Kissinger" *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 36*, (Washington D.C.: Department of State, 2012), page 976-977.

<sup>165</sup> Gerald Smith, *Doubletalk: The Story of the First Strategic Arms Limitation Talks Agreement* (Doubleday and Company: New York, 1980), 442-443.

<sup>166</sup> *Ibid.*, 149.

<sup>167</sup> Gerald Smith, *Doubletalk: The Story of the First Strategic Arms Limitation Talks Agreement* (Doubleday and Company: New York, 1980), 149.

<sup>168</sup> Gerald Smith, *Doubletalk: The Story of the First Strategic Arms Limitation Talks Agreement* (Doubleday and Company: New York, 1980), 149.

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, 149.

The Jackson Amendment came after hearings on the SALT I and ABM treaties in the Senate Armed Services Committee, where Jackson grilled Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other prominent defense officials about the implications of the SALT agreement. After the hearings, Jackson proposed his Amendment on the Senate floor on August 11, 1972.<sup>170</sup> He made the case for the Jackson Amendment by stating:

...I began my remarks by observing that international agreements always invoke unwritten hopes and expectations and reservations. Sometimes it helps to set them down. In the present case I hope, and I am sure my colleagues share this hope, that a follow-on agreement will limit the threat to the survivalability of our strategic deterrent forces. It is, in my view; well to underline this hope by language that lets the Soviet know that a failure to achieve this result would jeopardize our supreme national interests. My amendment does that.

I fully expect that our negotiators at SALT II will insist upon equality just as the Soviets insisted upon equality in the ABM treaty. The issue of whether the present agreement adds up to equality is beside the point; and there will be difference of opinion on that. But what I am certain we can agree on is the necessity that we *not* (emphasis original) accept in SALT II levels of intercontinental strategic weapons that are inferior to the levels of intercontinental forces permitted by the Soviet Union. My amendment does that.<sup>171</sup>

Senators William Fulbright and other congressional liberals fought the amendment. Senators Muskie, Symington, and Charles Mathias(R-MD) sought to weaken the amendment, watering down the equality language to make the Jackson Amendment conform to the administration's original position.<sup>172</sup> Fulbright, Muskie, and Symington argued against Jackson Amendment, arguing that SALT I would achieve equality in arms levels "in a larger sense and

---

<sup>170</sup> Quoted in Dorothy Fosdick, ed. *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches 1953-1983* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 1990), 154-155.

<sup>171</sup> *Ibid.*, 154-155.

<sup>172</sup> "Memo on Amendments to SALT I," undated, Box 293, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia Missouri.

not system by system.”<sup>173</sup> Jackson fought his critics with tough, personal barbs. After an exchange with Fulbright concluded, Jackson said, “Senator, I think we’re for equality in *all* matters,” referring to Fulbright’s segregationist views.<sup>174</sup> After a more than a month of debate, the Amendment passed the Senate 56 to 35. The ABM Treaty was ratified in August and the SALT I Treaty was ratified in late September. The United States and the Soviet Union hosted official signing ceremonies commemorating the ratification in October of 1972, one month before the presidential election.

The Nixon administration, seeking to maintain flexibility for future negotiations, worked to minimize the Jackson amendment. White House Press Secretary Ron Ziegler pointed out at a press conference that the Jackson Amendment would be “taken into account seriously in the U.S. preparation of the SALT II phase, but it does not become a part of the Interim Agreement which was signed by the President.”<sup>175</sup> The administration would go along with the Jackson amendment, but they didn’t have to like it. Symington was unimpressed as well, lashing out at Kissinger during a briefing.

Senator Symington: “You realize you put us all on the spot, hedging on the SALT deal. First you sign the agreement, then Laird says he won’t go along unless all of these big things he wants are funded, then Scoop says the deal is no damn good. But I remember that you in Moscow cited our bombers and our FBA, our forward based aircraft. But Jackson then said it stinks and the Administration then supports Jackson.”<sup>176</sup>

---

<sup>173</sup> Memorandum on Amendments to SALT I, undated, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia Missouri.

<sup>174</sup> Alan Weisman, *Prince of Darkness: Richard Perle-The Kingdom, the Power, and the End of Empire in America* (Union Square Press: New York, 2006), 32-33.

<sup>175</sup> Transcript of Press Conference at the White House with Ron Ziegler, 3-4, October 2, 1972, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>176</sup> Memorandum of Conversation Washington, October 4, 1972. Participants Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee (Senators Fulbright, Javits, Symington, Scott, Mansfield, Aiken, Sparkman, Spong, Percy, Muskie, and Cooper), Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, Tom Korologos, White House Staff, David Abshire, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Peter Rodman, NSC Staff, *Foreign Relations of the United States, Volume 36*, (Washington D.C.: Department of State, 2012), 983.

But Jackson now had a way to hold the administration accountable in future agreements. Violating the Jackson amendment would bring no legal penalties, but it would give the administration a political headache should it secure an agreement that did not guarantee arms equality in every type of system. Jackson made this clear when speaking to NATO parliamentarians in Bonn, Germany:

Congress specifically maintained that the view that the treaty to be negotiated on offensive arms in SALT II should be based on a numerical balance between the United States and the Soviet Union in intercontinental strategic systems, exclusive of U.S. forces in Europe...The Congress' call for equality to SALT II—an equality based on numbers and throw weight of intercontinental systems—is best understood as a prescription for scaling down the level of armaments on both sides. We should enter SALT II seeking equality with proposals to reduce strategic forces.<sup>177</sup>

U.S.-Soviet détente continued to move along in 1973, with President Nixon ready to make great strides in improving U.S.-Soviet relations. The greatest threat to détente in the spring and summer of 1973 was not Senator Jackson; it was Watergate. The scandal continued to expand and ensnare top officials and aides to the President. Brezhnev and Nixon met for a summit in Washington in June of 1973, discussing SALT, troops in Europe, the Middle East, Vietnam and Cambodia after the successful Paris Peace Accords, and Soviet actions around the world.<sup>178</sup>

Brezhnev met with President Nixon throughout his stay in Washington. He took time out from his sessions with Nixon to meet with members of Congress at a luncheon at Blair House. 25 members of Congress were invited, including Senators Fulbright, Symington, Mansfield,

---

<sup>177</sup> “A Credible Deterrence in a SALT II Environment,” North Atlantic Assembly Military Affairs Committee, Bonn Germany, November 1972, Box 236, folder 58. Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession 3560-004, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>178</sup> Jussi Hanhimaki, *The Flawed Architect: Henry Kissinger and American Foreign Policy*, 280-282.

Hubert Humphrey, Edmund Muskie, Howard Baker, and Senate Minority Leader Hugh Scott. Even Jackson's fellow Washingtonian, Senator Warren Magnuson, was included in the dinner with Brezhnev. But Henry Jackson was nowhere to be found, presumably because of his "strident" views.

The Soviets and Americans agreed to various energy, cultural, and social exchanges that were signed later in Brezhnev's visit. The Soviet General Secretary stonewalled on issues such as human rights and troops in Europe. Brezhnev pressed for trade, touting his country's strength in timber. But perhaps the greatest point he made was the very denial of the Brezhnev Doctrine. He told the delegation that "we can't understand how people get the idea that the superpowers want to control others. A good atmosphere does have an influence on others, but this is not collusion of superpowers."<sup>179</sup> The Soviet leader spoke as if the Soviets played no role in dominating Eastern Europe, yet no senators directly challenged his claim about non-interference in the affairs of other nations. The only major development to come out of Brezhnev's visit was the exchange agreements, including one pertaining to nuclear energy.<sup>180</sup>

With détente intact, Nixon looked to strengthen his foreign policy team. Henry Kissinger was confirmed as Secretary of State in September of 1973. He did not escape Senate confirmation unscathed. The National Security Adviser faced tough questions about wiretapping, his role in Watergate, Vietnam and Southeast Asia, CIA involvement in the overthrow of the Allende government in Chile, the Middle East, and the Soviet Union.<sup>181</sup> Senators Claiborne Pell (D-RI) and Hugh Scott(R-PA) asked Kissinger about forces in Europe, to which Kissinger

---

<sup>179</sup> Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, "Notes on Luncheon at Blair House with Leonid I. Brezhnev," June 19, 1973, 4. See also 1-3 and 5 for more information about Soviet-American relations..

<sup>180</sup> Letter from Carl Marcy to Senate Foreign Relations Committee, June 30, 1973, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>181</sup> Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "Nomination of Henry A. Kissinger, Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate, 93<sup>rd</sup> Congress, First Session," 45-47.

replied that continued numbers would be needed to deter a Soviet attack. He told the senator that serious cuts would alter the balance in favor of the Soviets.<sup>182</sup> He allowed for the possibility of some support personnel to be redeployed. Senators also asked him about progress with SALT II. He promised a strong effort to reduce the reliance of both countries on weapons systems.<sup>183</sup> Kissinger conceded that equality in every missile program, as Jackson strongly argued for, was unattainable and not a goal of the Nixon administration.<sup>184</sup> He said that the main issue was superiority overall, which he claimed the United States had. Failure to limit the arms race, however, would result in overall Soviet superiority. Reaching an agreement on SALT II was of the utmost importance to the Nixon administration.<sup>185</sup> After the hearings, Kissinger's nomination was easily voted out of the Foreign Relations Committee and sailed through the Senate.

Kissinger's grilling from senators was only the beginning. The toll of Watergate and events in the Middle East soon strained the relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States. Nixon did not enjoy the exalted position of foreign policy guru he once held. The Watergate hearings and the tapes of his Oval Office conversations revealed Nixon to be an angry, profane, and bitter man. For his part, Secretary Kissinger had to balance the problems of scandal and Cold War tensions as he sought to carry out his duties.

The new Secretary of State faced the problem of tensions between Israel and her Arab neighbors. These trends began to reemerge in October of 1973. What would later be known as the Yom Kippur War had a negative impact on détente. The United States was deathly afraid of the Soviets interfering on behalf of their Arab allies. The challenges of Middle Eastern conflict

---

<sup>182</sup> Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "Nomination of Henry A. Kissinger, Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate, 93<sup>rd</sup> Congress, First Session," 82-84.

<sup>183</sup> Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "Nomination of Henry A. Kissinger, Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate, 93<sup>rd</sup> Congress, First Session," 103-104.

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid.*, 120-122.

<sup>185</sup> Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "Nomination of Henry A. Kissinger, Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate, 93<sup>rd</sup> Congress, First Session," 120-122.

were difficult enough, but the President suffered from severe mood swings due to Watergate. The President even drank on the job, forcing Kissinger to have Deputy National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft refuse a call from British Prime Minister Ted Heath.<sup>186</sup>

This is the atmosphere in which Secretary Kissinger strove to keep Israel secure while preventing the Soviets from interfering in the region. But he did not want the Israelis to gain territory from the war, lest détente and the Mideast peace process be derailed. He ordered officials not to resupply Israeli armaments for seven days after the Egyptian/Syrian attack.<sup>187</sup> Jackson, stunned that the United States would stand by as its ally was under siege, pressed the administration to move and kept in constant touch with top Israeli and NATO officials. On October 13, President Nixon ordered an airlift to resupply the Israelis. The conflict lasted twelve more days. Jackson cosponsored a resolution that backed the Administration's resupply efforts. Jackson, Perle, and Fosdick kept the pressure on Kissinger. A cease-fire was agreed to on October 22, but the Soviets contemplated intervening in the war to save the Egyptians and Syrians, who were pushed back into their respective borders. On October 25, Nixon ordered U.S. nuclear forces to be on alert. This deterred the Soviets and kept the Israelis from gaining more territory. Most scholars have praised Kissinger's efforts in the fall of 1976. Even Paul Wolfowitz admitted that the 1978 Camp David Accords "vindicated" Kissinger's management of the crisis. But Jackson was disgusted. He condemned the administration's policies on détente, arguing that the initial delay emboldened the Soviets, allowing them to contemplate intervention in the conflict.<sup>188</sup> The antipathy between "Scoop" Jackson and the Nixon administration worsened.

---

<sup>186</sup> Jussi Hanhimaki, *The Flawed Architect: Henry Kissinger and American Foreign Policy*, 280-282.

<sup>187</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 274-275.

<sup>188</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 275-276.



Jackson had at least one ally in the Executive Branch: James Schlesinger, Nixon's new Secretary of Defense in 1973.<sup>189</sup> The two men were friendly to each other and had common interests. Both distrusted the Soviet leadership and wanted the defense cuts of the 1970s to stop. The defense secretary briefed Jackson during the Yom Kippur War of 1973. Schlesinger was one voice Jackson could count on to tell the President the truth about the Soviets.

Jackson sought to bolster Schlesinger's position by taking the initiative on technology transfer and arms control. He proposed an amendment that gave the Secretary of Defense "veto power" over technology transfers.<sup>190</sup> Jackson knew that giving the Soviets circuitry, computer technology and jets, would strengthen the Soviet's economic and military position in the world.<sup>191</sup> Although weakened by Senator Alan Cranston (D-CA), the amendment served a critical purpose. It slowed the ability of the administration to transfer sensitive technology to the economically backward Soviet Union.

But arms control was Jackson's central focus. On January 29, 1974, he proposed legislation that reduced nuclear arsenals to 1,760 missiles for each side. The Nixon administration flatly rejected the idea, but Jackson clearly established a bar for negotiators in future arms talks.<sup>192</sup> Jackson later argued for the proposal by calling its potential passage as a "conceptual breakthrough."<sup>193</sup> That is almost exactly the wording James Schlesinger used when arguing for a similar proposal during the Moscow summit in the summer of 1974.

Nixon's presidency was on its deathbed by 1974, as revelations from the Watergate hearings increasingly damaged the President. Kissinger was not immune from its effects as

---

<sup>189</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 276 and 287.

<sup>190</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 276 and 287.

<sup>191</sup> Quoted in Dorothy Fosdick, ed. *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches 1953-1983* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 1990), 215-222.

<sup>192</sup> *Ibid.*, 278.

<sup>193</sup> Quoted in Dorothy Fosdick, ed. *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches 1953-1983* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 1990), 162.

several senators asked about his role in wiretapping. The Secretary of State offered to resign, but several senators, including Jackson, urged Kissinger to stay on at a crucial time in the country's history.<sup>194</sup>

Jackson's defense of Kissinger did not extend to détente. At a speech to the Awards Dinner of the Overseas Press Club, Jackson blasted the administration's record on the U.S.-Soviet relationship. He made clear that he did not oppose any form of détente, but how the Nixon administration's handling of negotiations with the Soviets. He discussed his proposed mutual and verifiable reductions in the U.S. and Soviet nuclear arsenal, criticizing Nixon and Kissinger for allowing the Soviets to solidify the advantage gained in SALT I:

The response of the Administration to this situation has been disappointing in the extreme. For rather than concentrating on the designs and presentation of an arms control proposal that could form the basis for a long-term stabilization of the strategic balance, the Administration has concentrated on quick-fix, short term proposals that can be readied in time for the forthcoming June summit meeting in Moscow...Kept on such a course, the SALT II is doomed to fail in the supreme mission of reducing the risk of mutual destruction. Indeed, instead of putting a damper on the arms race, such a failure would add fuel to the fire.<sup>195</sup>

President Nixon and Secretary Kissinger visited Brezhnev in Moscow on June 27, 1974 in order to talk about SALT II and other issues plaguing U.S.-Soviet relations. But Nixon's influence was significantly reduced by Watergate. To complicate matters, Paul Nitze, the father of NSC-68, resigned from the SALT negotiating team shortly before the summit. Nitze felt that the effects of Watergate damaged the administration's ability to negotiate. He also worried that the administration was allowing the Soviets to gain the upper hand in the arms race.<sup>196</sup>

---

<sup>194</sup> Henry A. Kissinger, *Years of Upheaval* (Little, Brown, and Company: Boston, 1982), 1112.

<sup>195</sup> "Détente and SALT," Speech to the Annual Awards Dinner, Overseas Press Club, April 20, 1974, Box 234, folder 24, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession 3560-005, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>196</sup> Henry A. Kissinger, *Years of Upheaval* (Little, Brown, and Company: Boston, 1982), 1152-1153.

As expected, little was accomplished during Nixon's meeting with Brezhnev in Moscow. Discussions about SALT, troops in Europe, and human rights went nowhere. Kissinger continued to feud with Schlesinger at the meetings. Their disagreements would continue, dividing the administration and weakening détente in the mid-1970's. The Secretary of State wanted to take a position on ICBMs and MIRVs similar to Jackson, but President Nixon and Secretary Kissinger were insulted. No significant process was made; though one of the two ABM sites from the SALT I treaty was scrapped.<sup>197</sup> Nixon and Kissinger came home empty handed on July 3. Just over one month later, Richard Nixon resigned from the presidency. The new President, Gerald Ford, faced the challenge of continuing the Nixon policy of détente. Senator Jackson, on the other hand, continued his struggle to stop it.

---

<sup>197</sup> Henry A. Kissinger, *Years of Upheaval* (Little, Brown, and Company: Boston, 1982), 1155-1165.

## Chapter 2

### Hard Bargain: Henry “Scoop” Jackson and the Fight to Stop SALT II

President Gerald Ford was a mild-mannered Michigander. Serving as the House Minority Leader, he contemplated retirement before Nixon chose him to replace the scandal-plagued Spiro Agnew as Vice-President in the winter of 1973. Now he would become the only person ever to serve as President of the United States without being elected president or vice-president. Jackson knew and respected Ford. The senator’s relationship with Secretary of State Henry Kissinger was another matter.

Kissinger grew tired of Jackson. He “jokingly” asked Soviet General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev to allow Jackson’s permanent emigration to the Soviet Union during a Moscow meeting in October of 1974.<sup>198</sup> He frequently cited Jackson as an obstacle to progress on human rights and arms control, even though Brezhnev and Kissinger agreed to an outline of a preliminary agreement on further arms limitation.<sup>199</sup>

U.S.-Soviet détente progressed slowly in 1974 and 1975. Ford met with Brezhnev in November of 1974 in Vladivostok. The two men discussed the major issues now well established in U.S.-Soviet relations: troops in Europe, human rights, and SALT. Discussions about the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe were finalized. The Committee on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), a body that included the United States, Canada, most European nations, and the Soviet Union, would meet in 1975 to discuss arms control, force levels in Europe, and human rights. The two men formalized an agreement that would limit total nuclear arms to 2, 400 per side.<sup>200</sup> The new president, in need of a foreign policy

---

<sup>198</sup> Quoted in William Burr, *The Kissinger Transcripts* (The New Press: New York, 1999), 335-338.

<sup>199</sup> *Ibid.*, 335-338.

<sup>200</sup> Quoted in William Burr, *The Kissinger Transcripts* (The New Press: New York, 1999), 335-338.

accomplishment after his controversial pardon of Richard Nixon, came home with a victory in arms control.

But Senator Henry “Scoop” Jackson found the Vladivostok agreement unimpressive.<sup>201</sup> He strongly condemned the high levels of arms the Soviets were allowed to keep. He blasted low-interest loans to the Soviets, arguing that they would subsidize the Soviet arms buildup made permanent by the agreement.<sup>202</sup> He told a Missouri audience that the arms limit was like setting a limit as “high as Mount Everest,” telling them that the agreement would actually make the country spend more on defense in order to stay ahead of the Soviets.<sup>203</sup> Jackson criticized the exclusion of the Soviet’s Backfire Bomber from the agreement, arguing that it was yet another way for the Soviet Union to deliver nuclear weapons.<sup>204</sup> He told *U.S. News and World Report*:

In the SALT I nuclear arms accord, the Soviets got a 3-to-2 advantage in numbers of sea-based and land-based strategic missiles, and an even greater advantage in throw weight of those missiles. In SALT II, I thought, was to carry out the mandate of Congress to achieve parity in American and Russian strategic weapons by mutual reductions down to a lower common ceiling. But, in fact, the Vladivostok agreement provides not only that there can’t be any mutual reductions until the 1980s, but that the force levels on both levels will go higher than they are today. Ford says his program caps the arms race-but the cap is on Mt. Everest.<sup>205</sup>

Jackson’s opposition to the Vladivostok agreement marked the beginning of the end for U.S-Soviet détente in the Ford years. The pressure on the administration was about to get worse. Secretary Schlesinger, Governor Ronald Reagan, and other prominent conservatives joined

---

<sup>201</sup> Quoted in *Dialogue with Litton*, “Interview with Senator Henry M. “Scoop” Jackson,” December 12, 1974. Jerry L. Litton Papers, C3730, Audiovisual Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>202</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 288-289.

<sup>203</sup> Quoted in *Dialogue with Litton*, “Interview with Senator Henry M. “Scoop” Jackson,” December 12, 1974, Jerry L. Litton Papers, C3730, Audiovisual Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>204</sup> Quoted in *Dialogue with Litton*, “Interview with Senator Henry M. “Scoop” Jackson,” December 12, 1974. Jerry L. Litton Papers, C3730, Audiovisual Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri

<sup>205</sup> “Détente: Loaded in Russia’s Favor?” *U.S. News and World Report*, November 30, 1975. Box 323, folder 18. Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-006, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Jackson in criticizing the Vladivostok agreement. William F. Buckley Jr.'s *National Review* criticized the proposal, and Phyllis Schlafly co-authored an entire book dedicated to refuting Kissinger's approach to arms control and détente.<sup>206</sup> Even Stuart Symington, a strong supporter of détente and the Vladivostok agreement, started to sound like Senator Jackson. The senior senator from Missouri condemned the administration for saying "it would build up" to the levels in the agreement. In a handwritten letter to a staffer, Symington called it "a major admission" and later argued that the administration should refuse to build up to the Vladivostok levels.<sup>207</sup>

Many constituents of Senator Symington's in 1975 and 1976 certainly opposed it. One man from Sweet Springs, Missouri withdrew his support of the senator because Symington had allowed "the world to be swallowed up by Communism," while another Missourian denounced Soviet intensions.<sup>208</sup> The mood in the country was turning against détente.

In defending détente, Kissinger later pointed out that the strategic balance between the United States and the Soviet Union was better under Nixon and Ford than it was under Presidents Reagan and George H.W. Bush.<sup>209</sup> He left out two things: the MIRVs that were banned (temporarily) in the 1990s that allowed multiple nuclear weapons on one missile and liberalization of the Soviet regime after 1985. Mikhail Gorbachev, the father of *glasnost* and perestroika, was in charge of the nuclear weapons during the late 1980s and early 1990s, not doctrinaire Communists like Brezhnev and Kosygin. To the end, Kissinger refused to understand the problems Americans had with détente.

---

<sup>206</sup> Phyllis Schlafly and Admiral Chester Ward (ret.), *Kissinger on the Couch* (Arlington House Publishers: New Rochelle, NY, 1975), s 11-15 and 648. See also Donald T. Critchlow, *Phyllis Schlafly and Grassroots Conservatism: A Woman's Crusade* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).

<sup>207</sup> Letter written by Stuart Symington, undated, folder 6252, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri. Draft of Press Release, folder 6252, February 11, 1975. Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>208</sup> Draft of Press Release, folder 6252, February 11, 1975. Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri

<sup>209</sup> Henry A. Kissinger, *Years of Renewal* (Simon and Schuster: New York, 1999), 121-129.

Like Kissinger, President Ford did not understand how damaging the issue of détente could be. Ford made matters worse by refusing to meet with Soviet dissident and author Alexander Solzhenitsyn, yet making time to meet with the Soviets in Helsinki. On August 1, 1975, the Helsinki Final Act was agreed to, solidifying Soviet control over Eastern Europe and establishing closer cultural, economic, and social arrangements between the United States, Canada, Europe, and the Soviet Union. Kissinger was left to defend détente through speeches throughout the country and press conferences, arguing that any violations of SALT I the Soviets may have committed were “technical” and were dealt with privately.<sup>210</sup> In Milwaukee, he praised Solzhenitsyn, but warned that meeting with the Soviet dissident would disrupt détente.<sup>211</sup> The reaction to the Vladivostok agreement, Ford’s Solzhenitsyn snub, and the Helsinki Accords was tough. Jackson and Governor Ronald Reagan, both considering presidential candidacies, blasted Ford’s decision to meet in Helsinki and the subsequent agreements.<sup>212</sup> Diplomat and author Raymond Garthoff refers to this period as “détente shelved.”<sup>213</sup> There were no major agreements in 1976 and no meetings with the Soviets between May 1976 and the presidential election.<sup>214</sup>

Détente and human rights would play a major role in the 1976 presidential election. President Ford was an underdog. The Democrats appeared to be heavy favorites in November. Who would lead the charge? Many Americans thought it would be Senator Henry “Scoop” Jackson. His fight against détente, combined with his fight for tighter price controls on energy, thrust Jackson into the national limelight. He was named one of the top ten most admired people

---

<sup>210</sup> “Press Conference with Secretary of State Henry Kissinger,” December 9, 1975, Box 293, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri.

<sup>211</sup> Jussi Hanhimaki, *The Flawed Architect: Henry Kissinger and American Foreign Policy*, (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 436.

<sup>212</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson*, 294-295.

<sup>213</sup> Raymond Garthoff, *Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan* (Brookings Institution: Washington D.C., 1994), 600-605.

<sup>214</sup> *Ibid.*, 600-605.

in the country for 1973 and 1974.<sup>215</sup> Magazines and newspapers such as *New York Magazine*, *National Review*, *The New Republic*, *The Nation*, *The Washington Post* and *The Saturday Evening Post* ran pieces on Senator Jackson.<sup>216</sup> *The Nation* condemned Jackson for “publicity stunts” when he was trying to investigate crime and energy.<sup>217</sup> The left-wing publication blasted Jackson, criticized him as someone who loved nuclear weapons, accused him of playing racial politics, condemned him as “a bully” with a vicious temper, questioning his World War II service record, and blasting him as cold-hearted for pouring whiskey after hearing about Dale Bumpers’ victory over Senator Fulbright in 1974.<sup>218</sup> *The Saturday Evening Post* was kinder, describing him as “bold” and talking about Jackson’s “forward” political views.<sup>219</sup>

The senator began to fundraise and organize for a presidential run. Having played a major role in securing the selection of his friend Robert Strauss as Democratic National Committee chairman, the senator campaigned for the next four years. Jackson’s biographer notes that the senator “traveled to over twenty-seven states while leading the Senate with an astounding 99 percent attendance record” in 1974.<sup>220</sup> He campaigned for antiwar liberals across the country. He even made an appearance with former McGovern campaign manager Gary Hart (D-CO), who successfully ran for the Senate.<sup>221</sup>

Jackson’s most disturbing shifts occurred in defense policy, though he never supported détente or draconian cuts to the defense budget. But he did vote to cut off funding for South Vietnam in 1975, voted against funding anti-Communist rebels in Angola, supported a delay in

---

<sup>215</sup> Raymond Garthoff, *Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan* (Brookings Institution: Washington D.C., 1994), 302.

<sup>216</sup> Richard Reeves, “The Inevitability of Scoop Jackson” *New York Magazine*, December 17, 1973, 54.

<sup>217</sup> Robert Sherrill, “Senator Jackson Enters Right,” *The Nation*, February 1, 1975, 107-111.

<sup>218</sup> Robert Sherrill, “Senator Jackson Enters Right,” *The Nation*, February 1, 1975, 107-111.

<sup>219</sup> Gwen Dobson, “The Big Scoop Around Washington,” *The Saturday Evening Post*, August/September 1974, 42-45, 132.

<sup>220</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 302-303

<sup>221</sup> *Ibid.*, 302-303.



the construction of the B-1 bomber, and suggested a 5 to 7 percent reduction in the defense budget.<sup>222</sup> The vote to deny funding to anti-Communist forces in Angola was particularly disturbing. The Soviets took American refusal to intervene in Angola as a sign of weakness, with Ford and Kissinger arguing that Soviet-Cuban involvement was a sign of bad faith.<sup>223</sup> Regardless, Jackson's negative vote was necessary to rebut the charges that he was "the Senator from Boeing," not to mention accusations that he interfered in the Senate investigation of the CIA, particularly the right-wing coup in Chile. Jackson denied the charges, but it complicated the effort to soften his image.<sup>224</sup> A Cold War liberal like Jackson had to compromise with the left-liberal wing of his party if he wanted their support for the presidency.

Jackson announced his candidacy in February of 1975. The mood of the country seemed ready for a change. Even the President's party questioned his rationale for a full term, with Ronald Reagan announcing his candidacy in November of 1975. The economy grew at a sluggish clip, energy prices were high, and the President was scrambling. Ford did something drastic- he fired several cabinet members.

"The Halloween Massacre" was a clear break with the past. The President wanted to maintain support for détente while blunting the grassroots opposition to his foreign policy with the Soviet Union. Ford, tired of Schlesinger's vocal opposition to détente, fired him in November of 1975. Donald Rumsfeld moved from his position as White House Chief of Staff to succeed Schlesinger.<sup>225</sup> A young aide named Dick Cheney succeeded Rumsfeld as Chief of Staff. George Bush was recalled from China to take the place of CIA Director William Colby. But perhaps the

---

<sup>222</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 302-303.

<sup>223</sup> George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: American Foreign Relations Since 1776* (Oxford University Press: New York, 2008), 825. Herring argues that Angola was strategically meaningless, but important in revealing the disagreements between the Soviet Union and the United States over the definition of détente.

<sup>224</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson*, 302-303.

<sup>225</sup> Jussi Hanhimaki, *The Flawed Architect: Henry Kissinger and American Foreign Policy*, 427.

biggest news was the removal of Henry Kissinger from his role as National Security Adviser. He would remain Secretary of State, but General Brent Scowcroft would lead the National Security Council staff. “Super-K,” as *TIME* once dubbed him, was apparently human after all.

This development should have bolstered Jackson’s chances. The country clearly needed leadership, especially in foreign policy. Why not turn to an experienced hand to run against President Ford? But Henry “Scoop” Jackson was not able to capture the Democratic presidential nomination in 1976. It was not due to a strong group of contenders running for the nomination. As Jackson’s biographer notes, the Democratic field was wide but shallow. Ted Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, and Walter Mondale announced that they would not join the race.<sup>226</sup> Texas Senator Lloyd Bentsen was too conservative and friendly to oil interests to capture populist liberals.<sup>227</sup> Former Senator Fred Harris of Oklahoma “lacked money and name recognition.”<sup>228</sup> Indiana Senator Birch Bayh delayed his entry into the race due to his wife’s breast cancer. North Carolina Governor Terry Sanford, Pennsylvania Governor Milton Shapp, and Sargent Shriver, the father of the Peace Corps, failed to catch fire. Why, then, did Democrats reject Jackson?

The answers were Jimmy Carter, Mo Udall, and George Wallace. Had the race only featured the liberal Udall and the formerly segregationist Wallace, Jackson might have won. The wings of the Democratic Party would have split, leaving an opening for a Cold War liberal like Jackson. But the race did not unfold that way. Instead, a smiling peanut farmer would steal Jackson’s thunder.

A key difference between Carter and Jackson was their appearance on television. Jimmy Carter’s smile was famous and his demeanor was polite and relaxed. Even Jackson admirers suggested that the senator’s plodding speeches and long-winded town hall responses were not

---

<sup>226</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 302-303.

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*, 302-303.

<sup>228</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 302-303.

inspiring.<sup>229</sup> He could come across as gruff, although he was never mean. Richard Pipes, the noted Harvard professor and historian, explained that Jackson “didn’t relish crowds...he really didn’t relish the political process.”<sup>230</sup> His sexual mores were of the 1940’s, not the swinging Seventies. This complicated his efforts to reach young liberal voters who were children of the Sexual Revolution.<sup>231</sup>

His understanding of contemporary pop culture and society was little better. According to his son Peter, he didn’t even know who the Beatles were! Robert Redford literally walked into his office and he might as well have been a young Senate staffer.<sup>232</sup> He openly said that “gays were sick” before staffers had to correct him.<sup>233</sup> He abhorred what was later known as multiculturalism, insisting that English alone be the language of Puerto Rico.<sup>234</sup> These views should be understood in the context of Jackson’s upbringing in a Lutheran home at the beginning of the twentieth century and not as bigotry, ignorance, or malice.

One group that did understand Jackson’s point of view was the Coalition for a Democratic Majority. Formed by Jackson staffer Ben Wattenberg in the wake of the McGovern defeat, the organization was dedicated to the proposition that Cold War liberalism was worth saving. Luminaries such as Congressmen Richard Bolling and Tom Foley, *Commentary* editor Norman Podhoretz, and his wife Midge Decter joined the group.<sup>235</sup> But this group, comprised of many people who would become known as “neoconservatives,” was a minority in the party.

Labor, once a Jackson stronghold, was fractured. Some labor unions did not care about the Cold War and thought Jackson, despite his support for collective bargaining, public

---

<sup>229</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 323. 309.

<sup>230</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 311

<sup>231</sup> *Ibid.*, 311.

<sup>232</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 312.

<sup>233</sup> *Ibid.*, 312.

<sup>234</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*,

<sup>235</sup> *Ibid.*, 312.

education, and national health insurance, was a moderate-to- conservative not worth backing. Jackson could not even count on old friends like AFL-CIO head George Meany, who was angry with the senator for visiting Communist China and for his support of the 1974 trade bill.<sup>236</sup> The old labor leader sat on his hands, waiting for Humphrey to change his mind. If Jackson could not get labor to help him, who would?

Not many people would help a man they could not see. The senator waited until New Year's Day 1976 to start campaigning full-time. Jackson believed focusing on Senate business was good for the country and his party. Furthermore, it would bolster his image as a statesman.<sup>237</sup> Repeated pleas for him to start campaigning earlier fell flat. The senator would campaign when he felt like it.

This was a strategic blunder. Jimmy Carter practically lived in Iowa, New Hampshire, and the early primary and caucus states. He went from being “Jimmy Who?” to the second place finisher in the Iowa caucus, finishing behind “Uncommitted.” His strong anti-outsider theme began to resonate with voters. Jackson failed to take Carter seriously despite pleas from DNC Chairman Bob Strauss and other senior strategists.<sup>238</sup> Jackson skipped Iowa and New Hampshire in February. Perhaps one could understand skipping a caucus state filled with ardent liberal Iowa Democrats, but skipping New Hampshire was a major mistake. He feared competing in a state where admiring conservatives might support him. Such support would only help his opponents, according to Jackson.<sup>239</sup> The senator never considered that these conservative supporters might vote in the Republican primary for Ronald Reagan, who was strongly contesting the state in his

---

<sup>236</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 315.

<sup>237</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 316.

<sup>238</sup> *Ibid.*, 318.

<sup>239</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 323.

fight with President Ford. Jackson made no effort there and Carter, emboldened by his second-place Iowa showing, won New Hampshire.

Jackson rebounded in Massachusetts. The state had a strong Jewish population and working class union voters who were sympathetic to Jackson's Cold War liberalism.<sup>240</sup> George Wallace, seizing the opportunity offered by the mandatory busing issue, was a top contender in Massachusetts. But it was Carter who had the most to lose. He wanted "to deliver a knockout blow to the other liberals and to Jackson."<sup>241</sup> The senator's past support from labor, opposition to busing, and support for Israel made him the favorite to win Massachusetts. Unlike Wallace, Jackson's only racial problem was that of a freshman congressman who supported the internment of Japanese-Americans during World War II. He strongly supported every civil rights bill that came to a vote during his time in the House and Senate, which gave his anti-busing stance more credence.

Jackson also had key endorsements and a good rapport with voters in Massachusetts. Former U.N. Ambassador and New York senatorial candidate Daniel Patrick Moynihan traveled to Massachusetts to campaign for Jackson. Several Harvard professors, such as Pipes, supported him, as did many local labor leaders and elected officials.<sup>242</sup> Jackson, sensing victory, attacked Carter for flip-flopping on large defense cuts. The senator went after Carter's evolving views on abortion and taxes, portraying him as a tax-increaser.<sup>243</sup> The attacks stuck and Jackson won Massachusetts. Carter's campaign was vulnerable.

The campaign moved to Florida, a state with a large Jewish and Cuban vote, not to mention a strong group of working-class voters in places like the Panhandle. He won the

---

<sup>240</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 323.

<sup>241</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 323.

<sup>242</sup> *Ibid.*, 324.

<sup>243</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 324-326.

endorsement of Governor Reuben Askew, a foe of Carter's.<sup>244</sup> The advantage seemed to be Jackson's. But Carter fought back by accusing Jackson of racism over the busing issue and questioning his honesty.<sup>245</sup> The senator counter-attacked, repeating his attacks on Carter's call for defense cuts and his shifting positions. But it was not enough. Carter won, with Wallace finishing second and Jackson third. Carter finished Wallace off with victories in Illinois and North Carolina.

Jackson skipped both states, fearing a tangle with Mayor Daley's powerful machine in Chicago. His avoidance of North Carolina was bizarre, given that Senator Sam Ervin, known for presiding over the Watergate hearings, had endorsed him. Jackson blamed his opposition to right-to-work for the move. But given Ervin's endorsement and connections in the state Democratic Party, the move made little sense.<sup>246</sup>

Jackson made another blunder by raising the stakes in New York, the state with the largest Jewish population in the country. To complicate his New York efforts, Hubert Humphrey continued to toy with entering the race. This led Jackson's numbers to go down, receiving only a plurality of the votes in New York. A win was a win, but with Carter's victory in Wisconsin, time was running out to stop Carter.

The final test for Jackson was in late April. Pennsylvania was home to a lot of union, working-class voters later called Reagan Democrats. Jackson had several union endorsements and the support of Philadelphia Mayor Frank Rizzo, who was unpopular in western Pennsylvania.<sup>247</sup> The senator was running low on money, having spent much of it in

---

<sup>244</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 324-326.

<sup>245</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson*, 327.

<sup>246</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 327-328.

<sup>247</sup> *Ibid.*, 327-328.

Massachusetts, Florida, and New York. He refused to take out a loan or borrow money.<sup>248</sup> Jimmy Carter had no such reservations, drawing from his personal assets.

But Jackson was forced to take his eye off of the ball. Henry Kissinger had once been an advisor to Vice-President Nelson Rockefeller, who told reporters that there might be a Communist presence on Jackson's staff. The senator suspected Kissinger was behind the slander and was outraged at the attack on Dorothy Fosdick and Richard Perle. He demanded an apology from Rockefeller. The vice-president did so in front of the entire United States Senate, thereby ending the episode.<sup>249</sup>

The attention Jackson devoted to the Communist staff flap took away precious campaign time in Pennsylvania. The senator finished a distant second, twelve points behind Carter. On May 1, 1976, Jackson ended his campaign for the presidency.<sup>250</sup> Privately, he refused to consider accepting the vice-presidency, saying that "I would not run with that blankety-blank under any circumstances." The personal animosity between the two men would color their relationship during the Carter Presidency.

The senator was not happy with antiwar liberal senators either. Senator Mike Gravel (D-AK) promised to support the ABM in 1970 before backtracking, earning him a strong tongue-lashing from Jackson. The two men did not see eye-to-eye after that, and Jackson was livid that Senator Gravel was trying to bargain with Jackson to get a spot on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. After Gravel read 150 pages of a bill, thereby tying up Senate business, Jackson thundered on the Senate floor, "I will not be blackmailed! You have no honor, you have no decency, you are a disgrace to the Senate!" Senator Robert Byrd, the Senate Majority Leader,

---

<sup>248</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 331.

<sup>249</sup> Alan Weisman, *Prince of Darkness: Richard Perle-The Kingdom, the Power, and the End of Empire in America*, 42.

<sup>250</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 336.

asked Jackson to withdraw his comments. He did so. But the outbursts revealed the stress he was under and the disappointment he had after losing the Democratic presidential nomination.<sup>251</sup>

Jackson had to put away his anger and frustration because he still had to run for re-election to the Senate. He also worked with Carter to bury the hatchet and forge a strong working relationship, with Jackson even becoming the first candidate to release his delegates to Carter. Both were successful in their bids, a part of the strong Democratic trend in 1976. The next four years were very interesting as the two rivals would work closely on energy, economic issues, and U.S.-Soviet détente.

Two major developments occurred before Carter's inauguration in 1977: the formation of Team B in the Central Intelligence Agency and the creation of the Committee on the Present Danger(CPD). Most scholars view the creation of the groups with skepticism. But Team B was formed to re-examine the Soviet military threat. Though their report overemphasized the strength of Soviet capabilities, it was important in stressing the importance of dealing with the threat from the Soviet Union. The same can be said for the CPD. It was a bipartisan group dedicated to educating Americans about the threat posed by the Soviet Union. Paul Nitze, Richard Pipes, Richard Allen (who would serve as Ronald Reagan's first National Security Adviser), and former Johnson State Department official Eugene Rostow all belonged to the group. It was an impressive list of names. Their influence over public attitudes toward the Soviet Union would be significant. But Carter initially ignored them both.

Carter did not ignore détente. He attacked its management on the campaign trail, emphasizing human rights, an outgrowth of his evangelical Christianity.<sup>252</sup> It appeared the two had more in common than was originally thought. But the Carter administration suffered from an

---

<sup>251</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 338.

<sup>252</sup> Burton I. and Scott Kaufman, *The Presidency of James Earl Carter* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2006), 44-45.



internal inconsistency when it came to foreign policy. It struggled to balance human rights with détente. This tension was reflected in the makeup of the senior foreign policy players. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, was a former Johnson administration official. He advocated negotiations and increased cooperation with the Soviets. National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski supported negotiations, but wanted confrontation when necessary. Defense Secretary Harold Brown was somewhere in the middle, providing a balance to Vance's and Brzezinski's views.<sup>253</sup> Carter usually sided with Brzezinski and Brown if it came down to it, but the President preferred to forge a compromise between the views of all three men.<sup>254</sup>

But Carter's relationship was complicated with Congress. He had problems with traditional allies, not to mention Jackson. He rejected fifty-one out of fifty three names on a list of foreign policy nominees submitted by the Coalition for a Democratic Majority.<sup>255</sup> He struggled to work with Speaker Tip O'Neill, Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd, Senator Ted Kennedy, and Jackson.<sup>256</sup> Some senators found Carter's staff arrogant and aloof.<sup>257</sup> Even sympathetic senators such as Daniel Inouye found it difficult to work with the White House.<sup>258</sup> Jackson was flummoxed at receiving only one invitation to a private or state dinner during the Carter administration.<sup>259</sup> Trifling perhaps, but such niceties are expected in a formal town like Washington. Carter, the consummate Washington outsider so used to dominating the Georgia legislature, failed to grasp the importance of minor gestures and good interstaff relations.

A better working relationship would have helped Paul Warnke, the president's choice to lead the SALT II talks and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in early 1977. Warnke

---

<sup>253</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 352-353.

<sup>254</sup> Burton I. and Scott Kaufman, *The Presidency of James Earl Carter*, 44-45.

<sup>255</sup> Ibid. 44-45. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 352-353.

<sup>256</sup> Burton I. and Scott Kaufman, *The Presidency of James Earl Carter* 22-23. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 341.

<sup>257</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 342.

<sup>258</sup> Ibid., 342.

<sup>259</sup> Burton I. and Scott Kaufman, *The Presidency of James Earl Carter*, 48.

served in the Johnson administration and as an adviser to George McGovern's 1972 presidential campaign.<sup>260</sup> A longtime critic of American military power and the arms race, Warnke's paper trail provided material that infuriated Jackson and the CPD.<sup>261</sup> Warnke had criticized the necessity of the Trident submarine, the B-1 bomber, and the need for the United States to compete in the arms race against the Soviet Union. He said that the United States should provide "a worthier model," showing restraint in the face of an increasing Soviet arms buildup.<sup>262</sup> Warnke later said that he believed that the United States should be second to none in nuclear weapons and that the United States should have a strong national defense.<sup>263</sup> But Warnke's defense did not impress Jackson and the CPD. Paul Nitze blasted Warnke's abilities as a negotiator. Jackson grilled Warnke during his confirmation hearings, asking him if he had opposed the B-1, the Trident submarine and missile, MIRV deployments, unilateral reduction of nuclear weapons in Europe, withdrawal of 30,000 troops from Europe, and support for defense cuts in the mid-1970s. Warnke admitted to once supporting these positions. Jackson rebuked Warnke at his confirmation hearing, saying that the Carter appointee had "shattered my confidence that I know where he stands, that I know what he believes."<sup>264</sup> Despite the opposition of Jackson and the CPD, Paul Warnke was confirmed by a vote of 70 to 29 as ACDA head and 58 to 40 as chief SALT negotiator.<sup>265</sup> The battle lines were drawn in the struggle over who would decide arms control policy: Henry "Scoop" Jackson and the anti-SALT II forces in the Senate, or President Carter and his allies.<sup>266</sup>

---

<sup>260</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 358.

<sup>261</sup> Dan Caldwell, *The Dynamics of Domestic Politics and Arms Control*, (University of South Carolina Press: Columbia, South Carolina, 1991), 20.

<sup>262</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*,

<sup>263</sup> Thomas Eagleton Press Release on the Nomination of Paul C. Warnke, March 7, 1977, , 1-4. folder 4502, Thomas Eagleton Collection, C674, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>264</sup> Dan Caldwell, *The Dynamics of Domestic Politics and Arms Control*, 20.

<sup>265</sup> *Ibid*, 20.

<sup>266</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 358.

This is not to say Jackson was opposed to arms control or automatically opposed Carter's proposals on arms control. The senator voted for SALT I and earlier efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. The initial administration proposal to the Soviets was similar to Jackson's idea of mutually verifiable reductions and the administration worked with Jackson on SALT II initially. But the Soviets were not amused. They disliked the initial proposal for SALT II, which looked a lot like Senator Jackson's mutually verifiable reductions. The Soviets refused to negotiate as long as the reductions proposal was on the table. Instead of calling the Soviets' bluff, the administration caved, deciding to use an arms limitation plan crafted by Secretary of State Cyrus Vance.<sup>267</sup>

Jackson and the CPD were livid.<sup>268</sup> Nitze, Eugene Rostow, Georgetown University professor Jeane Kirkpatrick, retired Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, and Joseph Fowler met with the President. He listened to their proposals on arms reduction, but did nothing.<sup>269</sup> Vance's arms limitation proposal continued on. Interestingly, Vance had to work around the Jackson Amendment of 1972 that insisted upon equality in the nuclear forces of the two superpowers, discussing arms limitation in "aggregates" when the matter was brought up by Senator Joseph Clark (D-PA).<sup>270</sup> This was a dodge to preserve wiggle room at the negotiating table. Vance's goal was to get an agreement, period. As Vance told the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, "The choice is between an agreement-a good agreement-within our grasp, or no agreement at all. It is against this standard that we have to measure what we have achieved, not against some ideal

---

<sup>267</sup> Dan Caldwell, *The Dynamics of Domestic Politics and Arms Control*, 48 and 49.

<sup>268</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 365.

<sup>269</sup> *Ibid.*, 365

<sup>270</sup> Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, "Briefings on SALT Negotiations, Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations," 95<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, Briefings by Cyrus Vance, Secretary of State and Ambassador Paul C. Warnke, Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, on the SALT Negotiations, November 3 and 29, 1977, 22.

agreement.<sup>271</sup> This meant moving forward without Senator Jackson's help. The senator felt that there were worse than failing to achieve an arms limitation agreement.

The president could have continued to court Jackson. Vance later admitted that Jackson was both a great ally and "a tremendous foe," but claimed that the president told him that Jackson would oppose SALT II no matter what was in it. Carter argued that he did try to court Jackson, but he could never meet his demands of mutually verifiable reductions, so he acceded to the fact that Jackson would oppose SALT II no matter what.<sup>272</sup> The Carter administration's stubborn refusal to aggressively court Jackson, in a marked contrast to the early efforts of the Nixon administration, would cause them headaches down the road.

The Soviets did not like to work with Carter either, at least initially, and were unimpressed with Carter's support for Soviet dissidents Andrei Sakharov and Natan Sharansky. They detested President Carter's support for Charter 77, a document written by Vaclav Havel and other Czechoslovakian dissidents.<sup>273</sup> They were unimpressed with his efforts to fund the Khmer Rouge's efforts to drive out the Soviet-backed Vietnamese presence, or his criticism of the Soviet Union's efforts to prop up Ethiopia in its war with Somalia.<sup>274</sup> The president also softened his critique of the human rights policies of the Soviet Union while putting forward an arms agreement that enforced limits on nuclear weapons as opposed to reductions.

Carter sent further signals of weakness by attempting to withdraw U.S. troops from South Korea. He also "delayed the development and deployment of the Trident submarine, cruise missiles, and the MX missile; shut down the Minuteman ICBM production sites, canceled the

---

<sup>271</sup> Dan Caldwell, *The Dynamics of Domestic Politics and Arms Control*, 3.

<sup>272</sup> Cyrus Vance, *Hard Choices: Critical Years in American Foreign Policy* (Simon and Schuster: New York, 1983), 51 and 100. Also see Jimmy Carter, *Keeping Faith: Memoirs of A President* (Bantam Books: New York, 1982) 225. Dan Caldwell, *The Dynamics of Domestic Politics and Arms Control*, 42.

<sup>273</sup> Dan Caldwell, *The Dynamics of Domestic Politics and Arms Control*, 48.

<sup>274</sup> Dan Caldwell, *The Dynamics of Domestic Politics and Arms Control*, 110-112. George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: American Foreign Relations Since 1776*, 836.

enhanced radiation weapon(or neutron bomb)..., and scrapped the B-1 bomber.”<sup>275</sup> Contrary to the assertions of some scholars who minimize the Soviets’ military capabilities in the 1970s, the USSR continued to work on various types of nuclear and conventional weaponry.<sup>276</sup> Accepting a position of equality was unacceptable when the Soviets sought to increase their military capability and expand their empire.

Jackson also grew concerned with aspects of the Camp David Accords because he worried about Soviet involvement in the Middle East.<sup>277</sup> Jackson’s strong support for Israel, opposition to a Palestinian state, and support for Soviet Jewish immigration to the United States and Israel all stemmed from his concerns with Soviet expansionism. He criticized Soviet funding of terrorist groups like the Palestinian Liberation Organization, the Baader-Meinhof gang in West Germany, and the Red Brigades in Italy.<sup>278</sup> For their part, Israelis recognized they had a champion, mobbing him on a visit to Israel to meet with future Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and Avital Sharansky, wife of Natan Sharansky.<sup>279</sup>

Jackson continued to fight against the administration’s foreign policy, refusing to go to the Soviet Union unless he could meet with Sakharov. He criticized the administration’s proposals for SALT II in 1978 and early 1979:

Administration policies reflect anything but hard bargaining. Negotiations between Washington and Moscow have been marked by a one-way flow of concessions(from East to West) and an alarming tendency to appease the Russians by accepting their terms on such crucial matters as a new strategic arms (SALT) treaty and arms control in Europe.”<sup>280</sup>

---

<sup>275</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 354.

<sup>276</sup> *Ibid.*, 354. George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: American Foreign Relations Since 1776*, 846.

<sup>277</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 376-377.

<sup>278</sup> *Ibid.*, 376-377.

<sup>279</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 377.

<sup>280</sup> “Statement on Détente and East-West Relations, Senate Floor,” July 10, 1978, folder 7, box 220, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-005, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Feeling the pressure, Warnke resigned in October 1978.<sup>281</sup> Jackson, smelling victory, stepped up his efforts. He demanded action to help the Somalis, once allies of the Soviets but now beleaguered foes.<sup>282</sup> In fact, Jackson wanted Carter to link progress on SALT II to action in Somalia.<sup>283</sup> But the Carter administration rebuffed Jackson's proposal. The administration worked furiously to come up with an agreement with the Soviets. They finally agreed to a proposal that was to be finalized at the Vienna summit during the summer. The two sides announced the agreement on May 9, 1979.

Both sides girded for battle. The administration was able to guide the Panama Canal Treaties through the Senate in 1978, so they had experience with tough foreign policy fights. But the President was deeply troubled about what the American people would think about SALT. NBC and the Harris Poll showed support as high as seventy or seventy-five percent in the spring of 1979, but the Roper Poll and the American Opinion and Public Research Poll both showed support in the mid-forties.<sup>284</sup> A poll commissioned by the CPD showed that half of Americans either opposed the SALT treaty (just over eight percent) or wanted more protection for the United States before supporting it (almost forty-two percent).<sup>285</sup> As Dan Caldwell has showed, Americans chose military strength as their top non-economic concern, far over peace, in polling data from 1974 to 1981.<sup>286</sup> Yet Pat Caddell, senior strategist and pollster for President Carter, urged the president to emphasize peace, which the Carter administration did throughout 1979 and 1980. Caddell's polling showed even worse ratings for Americans' view of the President's foreign policy. Thirty-seven percent of respondents in 1978 supported SALT II, with nineteen

---

<sup>281</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 376-377.

<sup>282</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 373.

<sup>283</sup> *Ibid.*, 373.

<sup>284</sup> Dan Caldwell, *The Dynamics of Domestic Politics and Arms Control*, 84.

<sup>285</sup> "Public Attitudes toward SALT II: The Results of a Nationwide Scientific Poll of American Opinion," 3-7, folder 4503, Committee on the Present Danger, Thomas Eagleton Collection, C674, State Historical Society of Missouri,

<sup>286</sup> Dan Caldwell, *The Dynamics of Domestic Politics and Arms Control*, 87.

percent opposed and the rest were unaware of the treaty or didn't know. Fifty-five percent of Americans thought that America's position was "fair" or "poor," compared to forty-four percent who said "excellent" or "good." Thirteen percent of respondents said that America's position in the world was becoming "stronger," while sixty-two percent said "weaker."<sup>287</sup> The American people would need some convincing if they were going to support SALT II. The president knew he would have to sell SALT II to the American people and their senators.

Carter, having given up on Jackson, focused on Senator Stennis, who promised the President that he would try as much as he could to keep the issue out of the Subcommittee on Arms Control that Jackson chaired. Carter zeroed in on Democratic Senator Sam Nunn, who was a political associate from Georgia, and Senate Minority Leader Howard Baker. He worked to shore up old allies who were unsure about supporting SALT II, such as Senators McGovern and William Proxmire (D-WI).<sup>288</sup> Jackson, for his part, worked to cobble together a bipartisan coalition against SALT II. Tower, Baker, Nunn, and Senator John Danforth (R-MO) all asked the Committee on the Present Danger for briefings on SALT II. Former California Governor Ronald Reagan, the front-runner for the 1980 Republican presidential nomination, consulted with Jackson and used information from Eugene Rostow and the senator on SALT II in his radio broadcasts throughout the late 1970s.<sup>289</sup> Reagan said in one broadcast that, "And as for verifiability of whether they (the Soviets) are keeping their part of the treaty-it just doesn't exist.

---

<sup>287</sup> Burton I. and Scott Kaufman, *The Presidency of James Earl Carter*, 185.

<sup>288</sup> Burton I. and Scott Kaufman, *The Presidency of James Earl Carter*, 187.

<sup>289</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 383. Kiron Skinner, Annelise Anderson, and Martin Anderson, *Reagan in His Own Hand: The Writings of Ronald Reagan that Reveal His Revolutionary Vision for America* (Free Press: New York, 2001), 77-91.

SALT II allows the Soviet Union military advantages which are denied the United States. SALT II will not increase the chance for world peace.<sup>290</sup>”

Carter went to Vienna in mid-June to sign the treaty with Brezhnev. The two men hugged each other, an image that Carter’s opponents would use against him with glee. They agreed to exclude the Soviet Backfire bomber from the agreement. The agreement cemented the U.S. advantage in SLBMs armed with MIRVs (496 to 144) and heavy bombers (573 to 156), but allowed the Soviets the advantage in ICBMs ( 1,398 to 1,054), SLBMs overall (950 to 656) and ICBMs armed with MIRVs (608 to 550). How Carter thought he could get such a treaty through the United States Senate, particularly at a time when he was beleaguered by poor economic numbers and high energy prices, is mindboggling.<sup>291</sup> His approval ratings (twenty-nine percent approval and fifty-six percent disapproval) barely moved after the Vienna summit. During this time, Carter delivered his “Crisis of Confidence” speech. In it, he noted the political, moral, and spiritual paralysis of the country. The “malaise” speech(as it was called after pollster Pat Caddell used the term at a press briefing), only hurt Carter’s standing with Americans.<sup>292</sup>

Carter realized that he needed congressional support for SALT II, which was under negotiation between the two countries. So the President, with congressional approval, began to embark on a program of increased defense spending.<sup>293</sup> The B-2 Stealth Bomber was one of several projects that began under the Carter administration. But Carter only asked for increased defense spending to keep critics like Jackson at bay.

---

<sup>290</sup> Quoted in Kiron Skinner, Annelise Anderson, and Martin Anderson, *Reagan in His Own Hand: The Writings of Ronald Reagan that Reveal His Revolutionary Vision for America*, 91. This was originally written in short-hand. I have spelled out the abbreviated words for clarification.

<sup>291</sup> Text from Statement of Data on the Numbers of Strategic Offensive Arms as of the Signature of the Treaty. Department of State, June 18, 1979., Roger P. Labrie, *SALT Handbook* (American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research: Washington D.C.,1979), 656-657.

<sup>292</sup> Dan Caldwell, *The Dynamics of Domestic Politics and Arms Control*, 89.

<sup>293</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 354-355.



To make matters worse for President Carter, Senate Foreign Relations Chairman Frank Church, an anti-Vietnam War dove that faced a tough re-election fight in 1980, discovered a long-embedded brigade of Soviet troops in Cuba. Carter and Vance worked to drive the brigade out by increasing the U.S. presence in the Mediterranean, but this did little to assuage Church or other members of Congress.<sup>294</sup> These senators were preparing to vote on SALT II, and Soviet troops 90 miles away from Miami did nothing to ease their doubts about the treaty. The debate over SALT II increasingly turned against the Carter administration.

Jackson pounced on SALT II as soon as it was signed. In a speech to a Coalition for a Democratic Majority gathering, he criticized SALT II for not making America safe and blasted the Carter administration's record on U.S-Soviet relations:

The danger is real that seven years of détente are becoming a decade of appeasement. What so easily transforms a policy of détente and accommodation into one of retreat and appeasement is the failure to insist that restraint must be reciprocal, that forbearance be mutual. Diplomatic accommodation becomes appeasement when we make concessions out of a fear that the Soviets will cause trouble around the world unless we yield to their desires... The fateful question for us is whether the United States can conduct an effective foreign policy—one which will assure our national security and the safety of other free nations—from a position of strategic weakness. Can we bargain confidentially and stubbornly, can we stand up to Soviet blackmail, can we hold our ground in crisis situations---from a position of relative military weakness?<sup>295</sup>

He later blasted the Backfire exclusion, the moratorium on the deployment of the MX missile included in the treaty, and the advantage in SS-18 heavy missiles.<sup>296</sup> His first chance to grill top administration officials was during hearings of the Senate Armed Services Committee in

---

<sup>294</sup> George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: American Foreign Relations Since 1776*, 852.

<sup>295</sup> "The Signs of the Times, Address by Senator Henry M. Jackson," June 12, 1979, Box 20, folder 12. Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-006, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>296</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 386.

late July.<sup>297</sup> Chairman Stennis began with a statement of nonpartisanship and rules for the hearings, true to his role and to his loyalty to the administration. Senator Tower, the ranking Republican on the committee, spoke next. He criticized the Carter administration's record on national defense and its support for détente, while also questioning the advantage the Soviets had in ICBMs and other key weapons systems.<sup>298</sup> Senator Goldwater concurred, but Secretary of Defense Harold Brown, the first witness, defended SALT II using the standard of "essential equivalence" in comparing U.S. and Soviet stockpiles under the treaty. He spoke about Soviet defense spending increases and the need to boost American levels to roughly equivalent levels.<sup>299</sup> He asserted that it "enhances our military security."<sup>300</sup>

After questions from Senator Tower, it was Senator Jackson's turn. He told Secretary Brown that he did not agree with the administration's assertion that it was complying with the Jackson Amendment of 1972. The United States and the Soviet Union were not equal in nuclear weapons. The senator catalogued the advances the Soviets made in military technology in the 1970s and the delays the United States endured during the Carter years.<sup>301</sup> Brown admitted that "the Soviets have moved ahead of where they were more rapidly than we have moved ahead."<sup>302</sup> After questioning from several senators, Jackson asked about a comment President Carter made

---

<sup>297</sup> Senate Committee on Armed Services, "Military Implications of the Treaty of Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto(SALT II), Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee," 96th Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, July 23, 24, 25, 26. 1.

<sup>298</sup> Ibid., 2-9.

<sup>299</sup> Senate Committee on Armed Services, "Military Implications of the Treaty of Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto(SALT II), Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee," 96th Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, July 23, 24, 25, 26, 12-15.

<sup>300</sup> Ibid.

<sup>301</sup> Senate Committee on Armed Services, "Military Implications of the Treaty of Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto(SALT II), Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee," 96th Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, July 23, 24, 25, 26, 31.

<sup>302</sup> Ibid., 32

about not building up nuclear forces if SALT II was rejected. Brown hedged, saying the president would not build up, but that “he would respond to Soviet actions.”<sup>303</sup>

The next witnesses were the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The chairman of the JCS, General David Jones, did most of the talking. The results were interesting, given that the JCS expressed disappointment in several of the treaty’s provisions, including the inability to move forward with the M-X missile and the B-1 bomber.<sup>304</sup> They also supported the administration’s claim of “essential equivalence,” though they (Jones and Admiral Thomas Hayward) admitted that the U.S. would fall behind in nuclear weaponry within three or four years.<sup>305</sup>

Jackson argued with the Joint Chiefs, pointing out that the United States would have to build more weapons systems with SALT II than without it.<sup>306</sup> Jones later argued that the equality proposed in the Jackson Amendment could not be achieved, again arguing for “essential equivalence.”<sup>307</sup> Senator Nunn then asked the general if the defense budget would increase by 3 percent, which was agreed to by all NATO members. The general speculated that the number would be under 2 percent, after almost no growth in the defense budget during 1977 and 1978.<sup>308</sup> In response, General Jones compared the Soviet buildup to that of Nazi Germany, an interesting comparison since Jackson had been saying that for years.<sup>309</sup> The defenders of SALT II, such as

---

<sup>303</sup> Senate Committee on Armed Services, “Military Implications of the Treaty of Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto(SALT II), Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee,” 96th Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, July 23, 24, 25, 26, 98.

<sup>304</sup> *Ibid.*, 171-172.

<sup>305</sup> Senate Committee on Armed Services, “Military Implications of the Treaty of Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto(SALT II), Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee,” 96th Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, July 23, 24, 25, 26, 174-175.

<sup>306</sup> *Ibid.*, 304-306.

<sup>307</sup> Senate Committee on Armed Services, “Military Implications of the Treaty of Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto(SALT II), Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee,” 96th Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, July 23, 24, 25, 26, 284.

<sup>308</sup> *Ibid.*, 191-192.

<sup>309</sup> Senate Committee on Armed Services, “Military Implications of the Treaty of Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto(SALT II), Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee,” 96th Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, July 23, 24, 25, 26, 276.

Senator John Culver (D-IA) and Gary Hart went after Jackson's numbers and arguments, saying that the defense budget would be bigger without SALT II than with it.<sup>310</sup>

The JCS left and made way for General Alexander Haig, the former Nixon chief of staff and Kissinger deputy who was now NATO Supreme Allied Commander. Haig was careful not to tip his hand, carefully answering questions. Jackson argued that SALT II was worse off now than it was five years ago because of the deteriorating international situation, something General Haig concurred with.<sup>311</sup> Haig spoke about European concerns with concessions at Vienna, such as the cancellation of the neutron bomb. He defended the loyalty of the European countries to Western security. The hearings then concluded.

Jackson and the anti-SALT forces put major figures on the record. SALT had flaws that could not be covered up. The United States was prepared to fall behind the Soviets in the arms race and in conventional weaponry. Surely the United States would not agree to a treaty that made this deficit worse?

The two sides dueled throughout the summer and fall of 1979. Dueling groups lobbied for and against SALT II. Americans for SALT was an ad-hoc group supported by labor, religious leaders, and former politicians.<sup>312</sup> CPD took the main role in the effort to kill SALT II. Americans for SALT and the CPD put out a flurry of press releases and lobbied senators, while the Carter administration and the anti-SALT senators continued to argue about the merits of SALT II.

---

<sup>310</sup> Senate Committee on Armed Services, "Military Implications of the Treaty of Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto (SALT II), Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee," 96th Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, July 23, 24, 25, 26, 274-276, 325-329.

<sup>311</sup> *Ibid.*, 411-414.

<sup>312</sup> Americans for SALT and "The Committee on the Present Danger Pamphlets, September 1979, folders 4508-4510, Thomas Eagleton Collection, C674, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

The next opportunity to seriously debate SALT II was during Senate Armed Services Hearings held in mid-October. The committee's first witness was Paul Nitze. He faced tough questioning from Senator Carl Levin (D-MI), but was otherwise greeted warmly by the committee. Jackson asked Nitze about ICBM disadvantages, strategic forces, and concessions made by negotiators. Nitze answered the questions in complete agreement with Jackson, noting the treaty's flaws.<sup>313</sup> After Nitze, retired General Edward Rowny, an old Jackson friend and former military observer to the SALT II negotiations, testified. He worked with Jackson aides Dorothy Fosdick, Richard Perle, and Frank Gaffney before his testimony.<sup>314</sup> He criticized SALT II's failure to comply with the 1972 Jackson Amendment and condemned the treaty as "detrimental to our national security."<sup>315</sup> He criticized the Soviet arms buildup and generally agreed with the anti-SALT forces in the major criticisms of the treaty.<sup>316</sup>

Rowny was followed by former CIA Director William Colby, who supported passage of SALT II. Jackson grilled Colby about Soviet violations of SALT I, while Colby attempted to downplay the matter.<sup>317</sup> The two faced off with dueling numbers about missile systems and verification, with Jackson reminding Colby of the equality amendment the senator proposed in 1972.<sup>318</sup> Even Colby admitted that the Soviets had exceeded the limits of SALT I.<sup>319</sup>

---

<sup>313</sup> Senate Committee on Armed Services, "Military Implications of the Treaty of Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto (SALT II), Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee," 96th Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, October 9,10, 11, and 16,1979, 945-952.

<sup>314</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 387.

<sup>315</sup> Senate Committee on Armed Services, "Military Implications of the Treaty of Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto (SALT II), Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee," 96th Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, October 9,10, 11, and 16, 978 and 984.

<sup>316</sup> *Ibid.*, 990-992.

<sup>317</sup> Senate Committee on Armed Services, "Military Implications of the Treaty of Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto(SALT II), Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee," 96th Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, October 9,10, 11, and 16, 1003-1004.

<sup>318</sup> *Ibid.*, 1004-1006.

<sup>319</sup> Senate Committee on Armed Services, "Military Implications of the Treaty of Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto(SALT II), Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee," 96th Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, October 9,10, 11, and 16, 1010-1011.

After several witnesses passed through the hearings, it was Paul Warnke and Richard Pipes' turn. The former ACDA head toed the administration line, supporting SALT II and the deployment of the M-X missile which would help even out the imbalances in SALT II.<sup>320</sup> Richard Pipes also spoke. The Harvard professor and CPD official criticized détente, talked about his time with Team B at the CIA, and discussed how passage of SALT II would embolden Soviet expansionism.<sup>321</sup> Perhaps his most interesting testimony involved his views of Soviet society, describing the Soviets as unaffected by U.S. policy and inherently expansionist, as opposed to the supporters of SALT II, who in Pipes telling, blurred the main differences between the United States and the Soviet Union.<sup>322</sup> The committee concluded its business.

The anti-SALT and pro-SALT groups continued to throw out various accusations, trading charges and counter-charges. For his part, Senator Jackson intensified the pressure in late October, speaking to a group of NATO parliamentarians:

Many of us believe that no SALT II treaty would be preferable to an unsafe one and that the current treaty will not be safe unless its most serious deficiencies are corrected.

In short, a major undertaking is under way in the Senate to help fashion a balanced SALT II treaty that provides the bargaining position of the NATO alliance for genuine, mutual arms reduction.<sup>323</sup>

One week later, a group of Iranian students took 58 diplomats hostage in Tehran.

While the president dealt with the Iranian hostage crisis, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved SALT II by a vote of 9 to 6. The next key vote was that of the Senate Armed Services

---

<sup>320</sup> Senate Committee on Armed Services, "Military Implications of the Treaty of Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto(SALT II), Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee," 96th Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, October 9,10, 11, and 16, 1268-1269.

<sup>321</sup> Ibid., 1313-1315.

<sup>322</sup> Senate Committee on Armed Services, "Military Implications of the Treaty of Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms and Protocol Thereto (SALT II), Hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee," 96th Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session, October 9,10, 11, and 16, 1325-1327.

<sup>323</sup>Quoted in Dorothy Fosdick, ed. *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches 1953-1983*(University of Washington Press: Seattle, 1990), 168-171.

Committee. Senator Nunn pledged to abstain if the administration promised to support a 5 percent increase in the defense budget, which President Carter agreed to.<sup>324</sup> Six other Democrats on the Armed Services Committee joined Nunn in his neutrality. On December 20, the Senate Armed Services Committee rejected SALT by a vote of 10 to 0.

The battle moved forward to the floor of the Senate, where Jackson would need only 23 more senators to join him in preventing the two-thirds vote necessary for ratification. Given the strong Republican opposition to the treaty, Jackson appeared to have the votes necessary to kill SALT II in 1980. But on December 27, 1979, the Soviets invaded Afghanistan. President Carter, stunned by the Soviets' brazen aggression, asked Senate Majority Leader Robert Byrd to delay action on SALT II until further notice. The president asked for a larger defense budget for fiscal year 1981, boycotted the 1980 Moscow Olympics, and slapped sanctions on various Soviet goods. Carter finally took a hardline towards the Soviet Union, pledging to prevent Soviet interference in the Middle East with the Carter Doctrine. More and more, Carter was sounding like Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson.

Carter would face the twin problems of Afghanistan and Iran in his last year as president, not to mention a grueling re-election campaign. Jackson flirted with endorsing Carter's rival for the nomination, Senator Ted Kennedy, but they were far apart on the national security issues Jackson cared so much about.<sup>325</sup> Republican presidential nominee Ronald Reagan, who strongly agreed with many of Jackson's views, sent mutual friends to ask the senator if he would consider crossing party lines to endorse the former California governor. They even dangled a potential cabinet post in Jackson's face to seal the deal. Jackson loved Reagan's national security proposals, but he could not get past the conservative economic and social agenda that Reagan

---

<sup>324</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 388-389.

<sup>325</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 394.

argued for.<sup>326</sup> The principle New Dealer could not turn his back on the Democratic Party.

Jackson reluctantly backed Carter in October of 1980. Reagan won in a landslide in November, carrying 44 states. Jackson was interested in serving in Reagan's cabinet, but Reagan concluded that he needed a pro-defense Democrat like Jackson in the Senate.<sup>327</sup> The old Cold War liberal, true to his word, pledged to support the new President in any way that he could.

---

<sup>326</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 400-405.

<sup>327</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 406-407.



### Chapter 3

“A Little Bit of Freedom”: Henry “Scoop” Jackson, Détente, and Human Rights

Ronald Reagan and Henry “Scoop” Jackson agreed on one thing: détente as it was practiced in the 1970s was a bad deal for the United States. But there was great hope in the early 1970’s for détente between the United States and the Soviet Union.<sup>328</sup> Americans, especially policymakers in Washington, welcomed the promise of relaxed tensions between the two countries. Senator Jackson, speaking for the dwindling number of Cold Warriors, warned Americans about the growing threat of Soviet nuclear and military capabilities. But Jackson was a rare voice of dissent. If President Nixon and Soviet General Secretary Brezhnev were to be believed, both countries wanted progress on arms control and worked together to end conflicts around the world. The future looked bright for U.S.-Soviet relations.

The Soviet Union’s human rights record comprised a minor part of the Nixon administration’s détente agenda. President Nixon and National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger deemphasized the issues of political and religious freedom in the Soviet Union. The exceptions were the two occasions Kissinger spoke with Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin about allowing Soviet Jews to emigrate.<sup>329</sup> Initially, the number of Jews allowed out of the Soviet Union increased. But the Nixon administration did not put sustained pressure on the Brezhnev regime to improve its treatment of Jewish citizens. The August 1972 exit tax levied on Soviet emigrants, particularly Jews, was the long-term consequence of Nixon and Kissinger’s ambivalence.

---

<sup>328</sup> Harris Surveys, Sep, 1970 and Dec. 1974. The Roper Center for Public Opinion Research, University of Connecticut. [http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data\\_access/ipoll/ipoll.htm](http://www.ropercenter.uconn.edu/data_access/ipoll/ipoll.htm) (accessed Feb-8-2012 from the iPOLL Databank).

<sup>329</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990* (Washington D.C., Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1998), 44-45, 90.

The tax pushed the issue of Soviet Jewry to the forefront of the American debate over U.S.-Soviet relations. The ensuing controversy over the tax and Jewish emigration frustrated both sides. In Washington, administration officials feared the progress in U.S.-Soviet relations would be lost. A month before the exit tax took effect, an irritated President Nixon criticized the public outcry over the Soviet government's human rights record: "We would not welcome the intervention of other countries into our affairs...and we cannot expect them to be cooperative when we seek to interfere in theirs."<sup>330</sup> The president was minimizing the burgeoning American grassroots movement to protect Soviet Jewry.

The president also apparently forgot about the history of American concern for the plight of Russian Jewry.<sup>331</sup> In 1903, the United States used the curtailment of trade to register disapproval with czarist Russia's anti-Jewish pogroms. The condition of Jews did not improve under Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev. The specter of the Holocaust in the 1940s awakened the American Jewish community to the problems of their Soviet brothers and sisters. Prominent American Jewish leaders timidly and half-heartedly lobbied the Roosevelt administration and international officials during the Holocaust, fearing that to do more would feed into anti-Semitic stereotypes of selfishness and dual loyalties.<sup>332</sup> The relative inaction of American Jewish leaders frustrated Jewish grassroots activists who wanted their leaders to fight for the interests of Jews around the world. Responding to these concerns, prominent Jewish leaders improved organizational efforts after World War II. Non-governmental organizations like the World Jewish Congress, International Council of Jewish Women, and B'nai B'rith lobbied on behalf of

---

<sup>330</sup> Quoted in Joshua Rubenstein and Alexander Gribanov, eds., "Introduction: Andrei Sakharov, the KGB, and the Legacy of Dissent," *The KGB File of Andrei Sakharov*, (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005), 31.

<sup>331</sup> Keith Nelson, *The Making of Détente* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, ) 3.

<sup>332</sup> Michael Galchinsky, *Jews and Human Rights: Dancing at Three Weddings* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishing, 2008), 2 and 40.

worldwide Jewry. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, these organizations took their case to the United Nations.

But Soviet Jewry only made up one part of the agenda for most American Jewish leaders. Many American Jews grew frustrated with the lack of concern with the condition of Soviet Jewry. In the early 1960s, these grassroots activists began to create organizations specifically focused on the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union. Many American Jewish organizations, such as the Jewish Community Relations Council, the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry (AJCSJ) which became the National Conference of Soviet Jewry (NCSJ), the Union of Councils on Soviet Jewry (UCSJ), Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry, and somewhat more indirectly, the extremist Jewish Defense League--were created to assist Soviet Jews during the 1960's.<sup>333</sup>

More loosely organized community groups in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and San Francisco also directly or indirectly took up the cause of Soviet Jewry. Cleveland served as a strong hub of activism on behalf of Soviet Jewry and was the home of Congressman Charlie Vanik. (The congressman would go on to become the House sponsor of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, an important effort to improve the plight of Soviet Jews.) Such activism in Cleveland and across the country showed that the movement to free Soviet Jews had a grassroots perspective.<sup>334</sup>

Prominent figures and major developments highlighted the cause of Soviet Jewry in the 1960s. In 1963 and 1971, Jackson cosponsored a resolution with several senators

---

<sup>333</sup> Fred A. Lazin, *The Struggle for Soviet Jewry in American Politics: Israel versus the American Jewish Establishment*. (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2005), 243.

<sup>334</sup> Ibid, 25, 31, 33, and 169. St. Louis Women's Plea for Soviet Jewry, care of Jewish Community Relations Council, mailgram to Stuart Symington, December 10, 1974, folder 6276, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri. "Speech by Senator Thomas Eagleton to Combined Jewish Philanthropies of Greater Boston," March 16, 1973, folder 4435, box 674, Thomas Eagleton Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri. Anne Hessing Cahn, *Killing Détente: The Right Attacks the CIA*, 41.

condemning the Soviet treatment of Jews.<sup>335</sup> The work of Elie Wiesel on behalf of Soviet Jews and the continued memory of the American Jewish establishment's muted response to the Holocaust stirred American Jews to help their Soviet brethren.<sup>336</sup> The AJCSJ sponsored a vigil in Washington D.C. for Soviet Jewry in August 1965 that won the endorsement of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and United Auto Workers president Walter Reuther. Meanwhile, the Johnson administration supported aiding Soviet Jews, as did both political parties.<sup>337</sup> The success of Israel over Egypt and its Arab allies in the 1967 Six-Day War served as another catalyst for increased support for Soviet Jews.<sup>338</sup>

The growing numbers of Jewish emigrants were dubbed "refuseniks," a partial translation of the Russian *otkaznik*, meaning refusal. They originally earned the moniker from the Soviet refusal to issue exit visas to emigrants, especially Jews.<sup>339</sup> The term later covered the "refuseniks" fight for their right to leave the Soviet Union for Israel, the United States, or other Western countries.

The Soviet Union first issued exit visas in 1968. The number of exit visas languished at a mere thousand in 1970 before quickly rising in 1971-1972.<sup>340</sup> Tens of thousands of emigrants left the Soviet Union during this uptick in exit visas. This improvement stopped with the imposition

---

<sup>335</sup> S.J. Resolution 204, 1963-1964, Box 204, folder 36, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-003, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. Soviet Refugee Relief Act, 1971-1972, Box 220, folder 12, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-003, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>336</sup> Andrew Harrison, *Passover Revisited: Philadelphia's Aid to Soviet Jews 1962-1998*, 13. Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 38-39, Natan Sharansky with Ron Dermer, *The Case for Democracy: The Power of Freedom to Overcome Tyranny and Terror*, (New York, Public Affairs, 2006), 109-110.

<sup>337</sup> Andrew Harrison, *Passover Revisited: Philadelphia's Aid to Soviet Jews 1962-1998*, 27.

<sup>338</sup> Andrew Harrison, *Passover Revisited: Philadelphia's Aid to Soviet Jews 1962-1998*, 17, Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 32.

<sup>339</sup> Merriam Webster Dictionary Online. "Refusenik." [www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/refusenik](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/refusenik), (accessed April 14, 2012). Ty Burr, "Giving Voice to Struggle of Russian Jews," *Boston Globe*, May 30, 2008. [www.boston.com/2008-05-30/ae/2927562\\_1\\_refusenik-laura-bialis-soviet-jews](http://www.boston.com/2008-05-30/ae/2927562_1_refusenik-laura-bialis-soviet-jews) (accessed April 14, 2012).

<sup>340</sup> Noam Kochavi, "Idealpolitik in Disguise: Israel, Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, and the Nixon Administration, 1969-1974," *The International History Review*, 29, no. 3 (Sep., 2007), 569.

of the exit tax in August 1972.<sup>341</sup> Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, reflecting the text of the Soviet decree, claimed the Soviet Union sought a “refund for the free education the emigrants received.”<sup>342</sup> Concerns about the Soviet Union losing educated citizens during slow economic times appears to have been the major reason for the tax, although some experts claim the tax was a play for Arab support in the Middle East.<sup>343</sup> U.S. lawmakers, opinion makers, and organizational leaders did not care about Soviet rationales for the tax. They wanted it abolished.

The debate over Soviet Jewry took place at the same time two prominent dissidents emerged in the Soviet Union. Andrei Sakharov and Alexander Solzhenitsyn boldly argued for political liberalization in the Soviet Union. Both men opposed U.S.-Soviet détente, arguing that “peaceful coexistence” rewarded the Soviet government for its poor human rights. Sakharov was a prominent Soviet physicist involved with the creation of the Soviet hydrogen bomb. He subsequently rejected the morality of nuclear testing. Continued study and political involvement pushed Sakharov toward support for political liberalization.<sup>344</sup> His essay advocating convergence between the capitalist and socialist systems was published in the West in 1968, and in the early 1970s Sakharov endorsed Western-style democracy and market economies.<sup>345</sup> He began meeting with and organizing dissidents in the Soviet Union, writing about issues in the United States and the Soviet Union, and talking with Western reporters about human rights for Jews and non-Jews in the Soviet Union. .<sup>346</sup> The future recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize endorsed improved relations between the two countries, but worried détente would be used by the Soviets to

---

<sup>341</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 29, 44, 88-90.

<sup>342</sup> Edward Drachman, *Challenging the Kremlin: the Soviet Jewish Movement for Freedom, 1967-1990*(New York: Paragon House, 1991), 418.

<sup>343</sup> Noam Kochavi, *Nixon and Israel: Forging a Conservative Partnership* (State University of New York: Albany, 2009), 35.

<sup>344</sup> *Ibid.*, 9, 14, and 19.

<sup>345</sup> Noam Kochavi, *Nixon and Israel: Forging a Conservative Partnership* (State University of New York: Albany, 2009), 2.

<sup>346</sup> *Ibid.*, 23 and 112.

consolidate totalitarian Communism instead of moving towards the gradual introduction of democratic reforms.<sup>347</sup> By 1973, the KGB planned ways to discredit, harass, and intimidate Sakharov and Alexander Solzhenitsyn.<sup>348</sup>

Solzhenitsyn was used to what Sakharov was going through. Stalin had imprisoned the former Red Army soldier in the gulag for eight years.<sup>349</sup> Benefiting from the Khrushchev-era thaw of the late 1950's and early 1960's, he emerged as a prominent writer. Solzhenitsyn published *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* in 1962 and wrote several essays that appeared throughout the 1960s. His critical view of Soviet policies and the problem of censorship led to his expulsion from the Soviet Writers' Union in 1969.<sup>350</sup> Solzhenitsyn won the 1970 Nobel Prize for Literature.<sup>351</sup> He continued to write secretly until he was arrested by the KGB in 1973. The KGB released *The Gulag Archipelago* after his arrest, thinking that the book would undermine his appeal to Russians by showing him to be disloyal to the Soviet state.

But Solzhenitsyn had planned ahead. He reached an agreement with his Geneva-based lawyer to release the book in the West if the KGB ever released the text in the Soviet Union. The author passed word along to his lawyer to activate this agreement.<sup>352</sup> In 1974, Soviet authorities again arrested Solzhenitsyn, this time expelling him from the USSR. He settled in Switzerland before moving to Vermont in 1976.<sup>353</sup>

---

<sup>347</sup> Joshua Rubenstein and Alexander Gribanov, eds., "Introduction: Andrei Sakharov, the KGB, and the Legacy of Dissent," *The KGB File of Andrei Sakharov*, 14.

<sup>348</sup> *Ibid.*, 160-164.

<sup>349</sup> Edward E. Ericson and Daniel J. Mahoney, *The Solzhenitsyn Reader: Essential Readings 1947-2005*, (Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2006), xix-xxi.

<sup>350</sup> *Ibid.*, xxii.

<sup>351</sup> Edward E. Ericson and Daniel J. Mahoney, *The Solzhenitsyn Reader: Essential Readings 1947-2005*, xxii.

<sup>352</sup> *Ibid.*, xxiii.

<sup>353</sup> Edward E. Ericson and Daniel J. Mahoney, *The Solzhenitsyn Reader: Essential Readings 1947-2005*, xiii and xxv.

Solzhenitsyn received a hero's welcome from Western intellectuals, but his Russian nationalism and Christian themes soon began to irk prominent thinkers.<sup>354</sup> *The Gulag Archipelago* transcended the concerns of contemporary critics. His work exposed the brutal nature of the forced-labor gulag system, the deaths and displacement caused by Soviet policies, and the totalitarian nature of Communism in a comprehensive manner.<sup>355</sup> But Solzhenitsyn did not always see eye-to-eye with fellow dissidents.

He expressed concerns about the Western focus on Soviet Jewry, fearing it would undermine the broader struggle against the Soviet government. But most observers focused on Solzhenitsyn's writings, which played a crucial role in exposing the gruesome nature of the Soviet regime and influencing Western opinion about the Soviet Union.<sup>356</sup> Soviet dissidents like Solzhenitsyn and Andrei Sakharov changed the discussion, heightening concerns about human rights and the wisdom of détente. They paved the way for a man inside the American government to assume the banner of the dissidents and Soviet Jewry: Senator Henry M. "Scoop" Jackson.

Jackson took the approach of the "generalist" when looking at Soviet Jewry and foreign policy issues. In other words, Jackson saw various foreign policy issues as interconnected. "Jackson distrusted specialists who viewed problems with a very narrow perspective," noted aide James G. Roche, who would later serve in the Reagan administration.<sup>357</sup> Human rights, arms control, and support for Israel were not separate issues on his agenda. They

---

<sup>354</sup> Edward E. Ericson and Daniel J. Mahoney, *The Solzhenitsyn Reader: Essential Readings 1947-2005*, xxiv.

<sup>355</sup> Natan Sharansky with Ron Dermer, *The Case for Democracy, The Case for Democracy: The Power of Freedom to Overcome Tyranny and Terror*, (PublicAffairs: New York, 2006), 115-116.

<sup>356</sup> Eric Ericson and Daniel J. Mahoney, eds. *The Essential Solzhenitsyn Reader: Essential Readings 1947-2005*, xxxix.

<sup>357</sup> *Ibid.*, 64.

were bound together by Jackson's opposition to U.S.-Soviet détente and concern about the growing Soviet threat to U.S. national security.

The fear of American decline in the 1970s played a role in defining Jackson's foreign policy worldview. Americans endured assassinations, demonstrations, rising inflation high unemployment, expansion of the drug culture, and rising crime. These developments occurred at the same time the United States withdrew from Vietnam and reduced military expenditures.<sup>358</sup> Energy shortages brought on by the OPEC oil embargo and worsened by government regulation and price controls slowed any hope for long-term recovery.<sup>359</sup> The fear of American decline crept into national discussions.

Détente with an increasingly expansionist and militarily vibrant Soviet Union reinforced the declinist narrative. The Soviet Union continued to fund client regimes around the world, reminding Jackson of Nazi Germany's domination of Europe and North Africa. Senator Jackson compared America's Cold War struggle of the 1970's to the Battle of Britain in the 1940's.<sup>360</sup> The British did not engage in "peaceful coexistence" with the Nazi regime bombing London, so why should the United States do so with the Soviet Union? If the Soviets posed that kind of threat, Jackson needed a policy weapon to confront the Soviets. Churchill used the Royal Air Force, but Jackson thankfully did not have to deal with the Soviets bombing Washington D.C. The senator created his own tool, the eponymous Jackson-Vanik Amendment, to undermine U.S.-Soviet détente.<sup>361</sup>

---

<sup>358</sup> Edward Berkowitz, *Something Happened: A Political and Cultural Overview of the Seventies*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), 52-53.

<sup>359</sup> *Ibid.*, 52-53.

<sup>360</sup> Quoted in *Dialogue with Litton*, "Interview with Senator Henry M. "Scoop" Jackson," December 12, 1974. Jerry L. Litton Papers, C3730, Audiovisual Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>361</sup> Anne Hessing Cahn, *Killing Détente: The Right Attacks the CIA*. (University Park, PA, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998,) 39.



If Jackson and his supporters thought that Nazi Germany of 1940 was similar to the Soviet Union of 1972, then the comparison between the Holocaust and the Soviet persecution of Jews was clear.<sup>362</sup> Suggesting that Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union were totalitarian doppelgangers was a reoccurring theme throughout Jackson's struggle against détente, serving as a method to focus public attention on the Soviet Union and the plight of Soviet Jewry. Jackson implicitly made this connection between Nazi and Soviet rhetoric when discussing the Soviet leadership. He blasted Brezhnev for possibly talking about the issue of Soviet Jewry as a matter of "internal affairs." Jackson responded to Brezhnev by quoting Alexander Solzhenitsyn: "There are no internal affairs left in our crowded Earth."<sup>363</sup>

Jackson used provocative language in describing Soviet policy toward the Jews. Senator Jackson never liked the idea of being "mushy," especially when dealing with the Soviet Union.<sup>364</sup> He clearly sought to undermine the moral and political legitimacy of the Soviet regime itself:

... I must express my fear that the current ransom program, wicked in itself, carries with it the potential to exacerbate anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union to an extent and a depth that we hoped had perished for all time with the collapse of the Third Reich. For in the effort to justify this barbaric trade in human beings the Soviets have appealed to the basest instincts. The reports reaching us affirming the popularity of the ransom policy are the most painful of all. They portend the unleashing of bitter forces that even a totalitarian regime as adept as regimenting its people as the Soviet state cannot control. Nor is it certain that control is what the leaders in the Kremlin desire.<sup>365</sup>

Jackson's distrust of the Soviet leadership was evident. He connected the treatment of the Soviet Jews with Soviet policy behavior overall. The Soviets seemed unconcerned about

---

<sup>362</sup> 3 Anne Hessing Cahn, *Killing Détente: The Right Attacks the CIA*. (University Park, PA, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998,) 39.

<sup>363</sup> Quoted in Dorothy Fosdick, ed., *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs*, 183.

<sup>364</sup> Quoted in Dialogue with Litton interview with Senator Henry M. "Scoop" Jackson, December 12, 1974. Jerry L. Litton (1937-1976), Papers, 1960-1976,(C3730), Audiovisual Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri. See also Richard Reeves, "The Inevitability of Scoop Jackson" *New York Magazine*, December 17, 1973, 54.

<sup>365</sup> Dorothy Fosdick, ed., *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches 1953-1983*, 182.

unleashing ethnic tension if it served their purposes. If the Soviets treated their people in such a way, how could the United States trust such a regime?

Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford despised the idea of internal linkage that Jackson argued for. They attempted to tie U.S-Soviet détente to the idea of external linkage. The administration decided that external actions such as Soviet funding for guerilla wars and terrorism in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia would determine the progress of détente. Henry Kissinger, who served as U.S. National Security Adviser (1969-1975) and Secretary of State (1973-1977), sought to encourage the Soviets to stop funding groups or nations hostile to the United States. He described linkage as connecting good Soviet behavior, plus assistance in ending the Vietnam War, to benefits such as arms control agreements and improved economic ties.<sup>366</sup> Jackson did not mind the idea of external linkage. In fact, he wanted to take the idea one step further. Why not link internal affairs, such as allowing Jews to leave the Soviet Union, to trade? The idea of internal linkage would magnify the policy of external linkage.

However, the proposal to link trade relations and Soviet Jewish emigration did not start with Jackson. Louis Rosenblum, head of the UCSJ, suggested connecting the two in 1969 and the idea was studied by a Jewish policy group in 1971.<sup>367</sup> Jackson aide Richard Perle and sympathetic Capitol Hill staffers put the emigration-trade linkage amendment together. Perle urged Jackson to meet with the National Council of Soviet Jewry on September 26, 1972 to

---

<sup>366</sup> Dorothy Fosdick, ed., *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches 1953-1983*, 7, 27 and 81.

<sup>367</sup> Anne Hessing Cahn, *Killing Détente: The Right Attacks the CIA*. (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998,) 39.

strongly push the organization to get behind the amendment, which they unanimously supported.<sup>368</sup>

The realization of the idea came when Jackson announced the creation of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment to the East-West Trade Relations of 1971 on September 27, 1972.

Congressman Charlie Vanik introduced his version almost a month later on October 18, followed by Jackson's actual introduction of the amendment on October 27. According to the language of the amendment,

...no nonmarket economy country shall be eligible for most-favored-nation treatment or to participate in any program of the Government of the United States which extends credits or credit guarantees or investment guarantees, if the President determines the country is denying its citizens the right to leave, placing a tax on visas or documents, or placing "more than nominal tax, levy, fine, fee, or other charge" on a citizen for wanting to leave.<sup>369</sup>

Before the President could grant Most Favored Nation (MFN) status to the Soviet Union or any country, he had to submit a report confirming that the country met the legal standards of the amendment.<sup>370</sup> In this first speech about Jackson-Vanik Amendment, Senator Jackson elaborated on the amendment's application to other religious groups in the Soviet Union, citing Lithuanian Catholics as one example.<sup>371</sup> Jackson's strong support for secular Soviet dissidents and persecuted Christians behind the Iron Curtain showed that Jackson was not focusing on one religion or ethnicity. He wanted to make clear that the amendment was not just for one group or even one country, but that it applied to emigrants of various religious and ethnic backgrounds.

---

<sup>368</sup> Gal Beckerman, *When They Come For Us, We'll Be Gone: The Struggle to Save Soviet Jewry*, (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt: New York, 2010), 276-281.

<sup>369</sup> Henry Jackson "Dear Colleague" letter to Stuart Symington and all U.S. Senators, September 27, 1972, folder 6276, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>370</sup> Ibid.

<sup>371</sup> Dorothy Fosdick, ed. *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches 1953-1983*, 180, Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 95-96.

The Nixon administration, skeptical of the amendment, lobbied the Soviets to lower the education tax, which they did in January 1973.<sup>372</sup> Secretary of the Treasury George Shultz negotiated an agreement that specified that President Nixon would support Most Favored Nation trading status for the USSR in exchange for Soviet payment of outstanding Lend-Lease loans from World War II. Shultz followed up the efforts of late 1972 with a trip to Moscow in March 1973. He pressed the Soviets to drop the education tax entirely if the United States extended a \$101 million loan. The Soviets followed through by ending the exit tax, but this was days after Jackson reintroduced the amendment in the new Congress.

The language of the amendment made clear that Jackson did not see the problem of the education tax as the only problem facing Soviet Jews seeking to leave the Soviet Union. Jews and other emigrants were still being denied exit visas.<sup>373</sup> Jackson continued with his amendment even after Soviet's elimination of the exit tax, arguing that "the so-called education tax was only one part of an elaborate system of threats, obstacles, reprisals, and intimidations designed to prevent Soviet citizens from exercising their right to free emigration."<sup>374</sup> Even with the education tax having been eliminated by the Soviets, the amendment still received broad support.

Most major groups working on behalf of Soviet Jews in the United States, such as the USCJ, the NCSJ, and the SSSJ, actively supported Jackson-Vanik.<sup>375</sup> Support for the amendment in the Jewish community was hardly unanimous. Jacob Stein, chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations (also known as the

---

<sup>372</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 98.

<sup>373</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 98

<sup>374</sup> Ibid.

<sup>375</sup> Andrew Harrison, *Passover Revisited: Philadelphia's Aid to Soviet Jews 1962-1998*. , *Passover Revisited: Philadelphia's Aid to Soviet Jews 1962-1998*. : *Philadelphia's Aid to Soviet Jews 1962-1998*. Danvers, Mass.: Rosemont Publishing and Printing Corp. 2001. 169-170.

President's Conference) and Max Fisher, president of the Council of Jewish Federations, both supported Nixon's position of quiet diplomacy and opposition to Jackson-Vanik.<sup>376</sup> But such was the minority position in the Jewish community. Most of Stein's organization wanted to force him to support Jackson-Vanik, as did senior officials within NCSJ.<sup>377</sup>

Jewish activists earned the support of an important ally in their fight: organized labor. George Meany and Lane Kirkland were the president and secretary-treasurer, respectively, of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO). Both men were fervent anti-Communists. Meany aggressively supported the amendment in media interviews, even lobbying Congress to support Jackson-Vanik.<sup>378</sup> He complained about the distorted nature of détente and the "slave labor" used to create Soviet goods. Meany worked with AFL-CIO member organizations such as the Communications Workers of America to provide information on the Soviet education tax to senators and congressmen.<sup>379</sup>

Why would labor take an interest in the issue of Soviet Jewry? The AFL-CIO opposed the trade bill that Jackson-Vanik was attached to, concerned about union jobs that would move to the Soviet Union should U.S-Soviet trade increase.<sup>380</sup> But simply boiling their opposition down to only economic interests would be wrong in this case. Meany and the AFL-CIO supported efforts to create free and independent labor unions behind the Iron Curtain.<sup>381</sup>

Détente strengthened the Soviets and their hand to crush free union efforts in the Soviet Union

---

<sup>376</sup> Ibid. Fred A. Lazin, *The Struggle for Soviet Jewry in American Politics*, 47-48.

<sup>377</sup> Fred A. Lazin, *The Struggle for Soviet Jewry in American Politics*, 48.

<sup>378</sup> AFL-CIO Free Trade Union News, December 6, 1973, folder 19, Box 90, Richard Ichord Collection, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, Columbia, Missouri. George Meany letter to Congressman Richard Ichord, December 5, 1973, folder 18, Box 90, Richard Ichord Collection, Western Historical Manuscript Collection, Columbia, MO. U.S. Congress, U.S. Senate, Nomination of Henry A. Kissinger to be Secretary of State before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Testimony of George Meany, September 7, 10, 11 and 14, 1973, 93<sup>rd</sup> Congress, second session, 385.

<sup>379</sup> Joseph Beirne letter to Stuart Symington with attached statement on "head tax," February 26, 1973, , folder 6275, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>380</sup> George Meany letter to Congressman Richard Ichord, December 5, 1973, folder 18, Box 90, Richard Ichord Collection, C3699, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

<sup>381</sup> Ibid.

and Eastern Europe. There was no narrow, immediate economic gain to be won by supporting the amendment, though Meany and Kirkland might secure contributions from U.S. rank-and-file union members concerned about their union brethren in Communist countries. Meany and the AFL-CIO's support for Jackson-Vanik stemmed from a sincere belief in human freedom. The fact it dovetailed with economic interest was true enough, leading them to oppose the overall trade bill. But it was not the sole motivator.

Labor and Jewish activists worked to influence Congress on behalf of Soviet-Jewry. The support for and opposition to Jackson-Vanik inside the Congress cut across partisan and ideological lines. Liberals like Ribicoff, Missouri Senator Stuart Symington, and New York Senator Jacob Javits, a Jewish Republican, supported Jackson-Vanik.<sup>382</sup> Interestingly, these Senate liberals strongly supported détente and rarely saw eye-to-eye with Jackson on foreign policy.<sup>383</sup> Ribicoff even used the Holocaust imagery Jackson invoked in his 1972 speech on the amendment. Senator George McGovern, perhaps the most famous Cold War dove of the period, supported the amendment and questioned Secretary Kissinger about Soviet Jewry.<sup>384</sup>

But it was conservatives that abhorred détente most of all. Ohio Congressman and failed 1972 GOP presidential candidate John Ashbrook, Colorado Senator Gordon Allott, and New York Senator James Buckley were opponents of détente. Buckley used the term “spirit

---

<sup>382</sup> Eric Patrick Gilliland, “Richard Nixon, Détente, and the Conservative Movement, 1969-1974.” (MA thesis, Wright State University, 2006), 72-73 and 78. Henry Jackson “Dear Colleague” letter to Stuart Symington, September 27, 1972, folder 6276, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri. See also Stuart Symington letter to Mrs. Eugene Bortnick, February 24, 1973, folder 6275, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri. Stuart Symington letter to Mr. and Mrs. Wes Epperson, March 9, 1976, folder 6275, Box 3874, Stuart Symington Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

<sup>383</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 279.

<sup>384</sup> Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, “Nomination of Henry A. Kissinger to be Secretary of State before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Exchange between Dr. Henry Kissinger and Senator George McGovern,” September 7, 10, 11 and 14, 1973, 93<sup>rd</sup> Congress, 2d Session, 69.

of détente” with clear disdain.<sup>385</sup> Anti-detente sentiment came from Senator Buckley’s brother and *National Review* magazine founder William F. Buckley Jr., arguably the intellectual leader of conservatism in the late twentieth century. William F. Buckley Jr. argued that Jackson was trying to liberalize the Soviet Union,

“Those who are afraid of the political consequences of siding against Senator Jackson are endeavoring to vitiate the effect of his amendment by whispering that Jackson's true interest is in standing in the way of detente, that therefore he seeks to frustrate a trade agreement of any sort .But surely it is easier to understand Senator Jackson by starting the other way around? He seeks to civilize the Soviet Union, which has been the cause of more deaths and more misery than have been caused by any other state during this century .It is within the power of the Soviet Union to bring on a world war, and it is the continuing disposition of the Soviet Union to torture its citizens .After all, Jackson is not opposed to detente with England or France or Canada...<sup>386</sup>

Buckley suggested that Jackson did not want to prevent a working relationship between the two countries, but that the senator wanted Soviet accountability on issues like trade and human rights. But the Nixon administration did not see the issue the same way as Buckley or Jackson.

Nixon and Kissinger had some interesting allies of their own. Former Truman administration official and Soviet expert George Kennan, author of “The Long Telegram” establishing containment, condemned efforts to connect Soviet trade and emigration practices. Kennan questioned why the legislation would target one group or country. The amendment actually never mentions Jews, ethnic groups, or countries specifically, which is a point Jackson made to critics.<sup>387</sup> Democratic Senator J. William Fulbright, the powerful chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and usually a critic of Nixon and Ford administration foreign and

---

<sup>385</sup> U.S. Congress, Senator James L. Buckley, Remarks on the Senate Floor, 93<sup>rd</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> Session. Congressional Record (March 15, 1973), 503, part 7, 8078.

<sup>386</sup> William F. Buckley Jr., “Senator Jackson Rides Again,” Washington Star Syndicate, Inc., October 5, 1972, 2.

<sup>387</sup> Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, “Détente Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Testimony of George F. Kennan, August 20, 1974,” 93<sup>rd</sup> Congress, second session, 63. Quoted in Dialogue with Litton interview with Senator Henry M. “Scoop” Jackson, December 12, 1974, Jerry L. Litton Papers, C3730, Audiovisual Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

domestic policies, defended trade negotiators and condemned the Jackson-Vanik Amendment and its supporters.<sup>388</sup> Fulbright believed that interfering in the internal affairs of another country was meddling and even compared concerns over Soviet Jewry with Soviet concerns over American race relations or the treatment of American Indians at Wounded Knee.<sup>389</sup> Democratic Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield and Republican Senator Robert Griffin supported Fulbright's efforts to kill the Jackson-Vanik Amendment.<sup>390</sup>

One ally the anti-Jackson-Vanik senators had was business. The East-West Trade Council was a lobbying group made up of businesses such as the conglomerate Tower International and financial institutions like Chase Manhattan Bank. Former ambassador to the Soviet Union and financier Averill Harriman fought to keep Jackson-Vanik from becoming law.<sup>391</sup> The reason business wanted to bury Jackson-Vanik? Businesses and financial institutions in the United States wanted to expand trade with the Soviet Union in order to create jobs and earn profits.

Business attitudes towards Soviet dissidents and Jews were divided, however. Tower International sought to discredit Andrei Sakharov. The Nobel Laureate urged Congress to support Jackson-Vanik Amendment in 1973. He encouraged Congress to "find the strength to rise above temporary partisan considerations of commercialism and prestige."<sup>392</sup> The business

---

<sup>388</sup> Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, "Détente Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Testimony of George F. Kennan, Remarks by Chairman J. William Fulbright," August 20, 1974, 93<sup>rd</sup> Congress, 2d Session, 69.

<sup>389</sup> Quoted in Natan Sharansky with Ron Dermer, *The Case for Democracy*, 122.

<sup>390</sup> U.S. Congress, U.S. Senate, Senators Mike Mansfield and Robert Griffin, Remarks on the Senate Floor, 94<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1<sup>st</sup> session, Congressional Record (February 5, 1976), 157, part 3, 2465.

<sup>391</sup> East-West Trade Council letter and packet to Stuart Symington, folder 6277, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri. See also Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, "Détente Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Testimony of W. Averill Harriman," August 15, 1974, 93<sup>rd</sup> Congress, 2d Session, 11, 13-14.

<sup>392</sup> Quoted in Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 272.



conglomerate argued he had advocated a convergence between socialism and capitalism.<sup>393</sup>

Never mind Sakharov was a champion of political rights found in liberal democracies. A commitment to convergence meant that he had to be a Communist just like the old ideologues in the Kremlin. The gist of Tower International went like this: Surely there were no democrats in the Soviet Union—why, then, should human rights be connected to trade at all?

Harriman, for his part, sympathized with the plight of Soviet Jews, and urged the Soviets to free Jewish emigrants.<sup>394</sup> He warned that détente could be negatively impacted if the Soviets did not take action. However, he opposed the linkage between Soviet emigration and trade, however. He would not go as far as Tower International to discredit Soviet dissidents, but he would defend trade without conditions no matter what the Jackson-Vanik coalition said.

Although business and financial institutions complained and a few prominent political voices balked at the amendment's progress in 1973, support for the Jackson-Vanik amendment continued to grow. Labor, religious, and political voices on the right and left supported it. Senator Javits and Griffin brought up the issue to Soviet General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev during his visit to Washington, even exchanging numbers on how many Jews could leave the Soviet Union.<sup>395</sup>

Jackson's gambit enjoyed broad support on an issue blatantly uncomfortable to the Soviets and troubling to the Nixon administration. He continued the pressure on multiple fronts, pushing for the Jackson-Vanik Amendment while highlighting cases of Jewish and non-Jewish dissidents. He protested the imprisonment of Soviet dissident Andrei Amalrik, noting the

---

<sup>393</sup> East-West Trade Council letter and packet to Stuart Symington, folder 6277, Stuart Symington Collection, C3874, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

<sup>394</sup> Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, "Détente Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee," Testimony of W. Averill Harriman, August 15, 1974, 93<sup>rd</sup> Congress, 2d sess. 13.

<sup>395</sup> Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, "Notes on Luncheon at Blair House with Leonid I. Brezhnev," June 19, 1973, 1-5.

formation of an American organization that lobbied the Soviets to release the jailed historian.<sup>396</sup>

Jackson wrote to Brezhnev asking for exit visas in the cases of ballet dancer Valery Panov and Dr. Leonid Tarrasuk, former curator of the Leningrad Hermitage Museum. Jackson pleaded with Brezhnev, saying that:

...it is difficult to believe that the Soviet government would choose to extinguish rather than share with the international community the talents of those and other individuals...Such an attitude could not fail to cast a pall over the expanded East-West cultural exchanges that so many of us, both in your country and ours, have looked forward to for so long.<sup>397</sup>

Jackson publicized these cases to sow the seeds of doubt about détente. Détente could not move forward if a large coalition of individuals in the United States were concerned about the Soviets' intentions. By uniting so many factions with Jackson-Vanik, Senator Jackson found a way to stop the administration's forward progress on détente.

Several major events occurred in the last half of 1973 to increase the visibility of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment and weaken détente. In June of that year, General Secretary Brezhnev visited Washington to meet with President Nixon. The month before, Brezhnev privately promised President Nixon that emigration levels would remain at 36,000 to 40,000.<sup>398</sup> Several Jewish organizations organized rallies in Washington to pressure Brezhnev to free Soviet Jews.<sup>399</sup> The movement to pass Jackson-Vanik was bolstered by this activism and by Brezhnev's

---

<sup>396</sup> "U.S. Intellectuals Protest Imprisonment of Amalrik, Remarks on the Senate Floor," Senator Henry M. Jackson Press Release, July 19, 1973, Box 36, folder 9, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-006, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>397</sup> Letter to Leonid I. Brezhnev, Senator Henry M. Jackson Press Release, April 11, 1973, Box 312, folder 43, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-005, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. Tarrasuk was issued an exit visa in September of 1973, while the Panovs were allowed to emigrate in 1974. See above citation and [www.teleor.net/en/valery\\_panov.html](http://www.teleor.net/en/valery_panov.html) (accessed April 14, 2012).

<sup>398</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 100.

<sup>399</sup> Andrew Harrison, *Passover Revisited: Philadelphia's Aid to Soviet Jews 1962-1998*, 169. Fred A. Lazin, *The Struggle for Soviet Jewry in American Politics*, 48.

vague assurances on emigration levels when meeting with senators.<sup>400</sup> Sakharov's plea to Congress in support of Jackson-Vanik came on September 14.

Jackson sought to use recent events in the Middle East to mobilize American Jewry and pro-Israel groups. The Arab-Israeli War in October 1973 focused attention on the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. Jackson harshly criticized the Nixon administration's actions during the crisis. The senator wanted the President (clearly distracted by Watergate) and Secretary of State Kissinger to aggressively resupply the Israelis and hold a firm line if the Soviets decided to intervene.<sup>401</sup> The administration actually worked to prevent escalation of the conflict and to keep the Soviets out of the conflict until the prospect of a ceasefire was broached, which the U.S. pressured the Israelis into taking.<sup>402</sup> The administration also pushed the Israelis to oppose Jackson-Vanik in exchange for increased monetary and political support for the Jewish state. Both the Israeli government and American Jewish groups were approached with such an offer, but were rebuffed.<sup>403</sup> The Jackson-Vanik Amendment passed the House 319 to 80 on December 10, 1973 after intense negotiations with Ways and Means (the tax-writing committee) Chairman Wilbur Mills.<sup>404</sup> The negotiations between the White House, the senators, and the Soviets were now under way.

Negotiations continued well into the summer of 1974. Kissinger was quoted as saying that Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko Jackson by "was the easier party to work with" compared to Jackson.<sup>405</sup> Senators Javits and Ribicoff wanted to settle on the administration's

---

<sup>400</sup> Fred A. Lazin, *The Struggle for Soviet Jewry in American Politics*, 48. Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 100.

<sup>401</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 273-276.

<sup>402</sup> Ibid, 276. Mike Bowker and Phil Williams, *Superpower Détente: A Reappraisal*, 110.

<sup>403</sup> Fred A. Lazin, *The Struggle for Soviet Jewry in American Politics*, 49.

<sup>404</sup> Ibid, 49. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 271.

<sup>405</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 279. Fred A. Lazin, *The Struggle for Soviet Jewry in American Politics*, 49-50.

terms, but Jackson refused to budge.<sup>406</sup> An exchange of letters between Jackson and Kissinger took place, with Kissinger taking proposals to Gromyko.<sup>407</sup> Jackson asked for a figure of 100,000 Jewish emigrants from the Soviet Union, which was dismissed out of hand by Kissinger.<sup>408</sup> Continued exchanges finally brought the number to 45,000, which Gromyko grudgingly accepted. Soviet Ambassador to the United States Anatoly Dobrynin would go as high as 50,000.<sup>409</sup>

Secretary Kissinger and Senator Jackson continued to exchange letters with specific guidelines and promises, including a number of 60,000 thrown out by Jackson that was not contradicted by Kissinger. The exchange of letters concluded on October 18, 1974 with a private letter-signing ceremony at the White House attended by Ford, Kissinger, Jackson, Ribicoff, and Javits.<sup>410</sup> Jackson then held a press conference revealing the numbers discussed and pushed for more. This angered Soviet officials and the Ford administration.

Soviet General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev argued with Kissinger during their October meeting in Moscow. He refused to allow any more than 15,000, citing only 1, 815 “pending applications.<sup>411</sup>” Gromyko told Kissinger that the Soviets would not comply with a higher level of emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union. At no time did Kissinger tell Jackson about the Soviets’ frustration.<sup>412</sup> The Soviets continued to complain at their meeting with President Ford

---

<sup>406</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 279. Fred A. Lazin, *The Struggle for Soviet Jewry in American Politics*, 49-50.

<sup>407</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 101.

<sup>408</sup> *Ibid.*, 101.

<sup>409</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 104.

<sup>410</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 104-5. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 279-280. Anne Hessing. Cahn, *Killing Détente: The Right Attacks the CIA*. University Park, PA, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998, 44.

<sup>411</sup> Quoted in William Burr, *The Kissinger Transcripts* (The New Press: New York, 1999), 335-338.

<sup>412</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 106.-107. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 279-280.

in Vladivostok, Russia in November.<sup>413</sup> The Jackson-Vanik Amendment finally passed the Senate on December 13 by a vote of 88 to 0, the House 323 to 36, with a quick conference committee from both houses to go over the Trade Reform Act (the bill the Jackson-Vanik Amendment was attached to) before being sent to President Gerald Ford, who had taken over on August 9 after the resignation of President Nixon.<sup>414</sup> The bill featured another amendment from Senator Adlai Stevenson III that reduced the number of oil and gas production credits the Export-Import Bank would give to the Soviet Union.<sup>415</sup> This new amendment, combined with Jackson-Vanik, further irritated the Soviet government.

The Soviet news agency TASS released Gromyko's October letter and began a propaganda barrage against the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. Brezhnev blasted both amendments in a letter to Ford on December 25, 1974, but the President reluctantly signed the legislation on January 3, 1975 because of the bill's broad effect on trade relations.<sup>416</sup> Eleven days later, Secretary Kissinger announced the Soviets had backed out of the provisional trade deal between the two countries.<sup>417</sup> But Jackson-Vanik was now federal law.

Historians seem to agree that Jackson-Vanik played a part in undermining détente. John Lewis Gaddis, the dean of Cold War historians, argues the amendment had a mixed effect. He notes the amendment took the same position as the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights in stating "neither national sovereignty nor the demands of diplomacy should

---

<sup>413</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 106. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 279-280.

<sup>414</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 106. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 279-280.

<sup>415</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 106. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 279-280.

<sup>416</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 107. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 280.

<sup>417</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 107. Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 280.

allow states to treat citizens in any way they please.<sup>418</sup>” Anne Hessing Cahn sees the amendment as part of a nefarious scheme to undermine the progress made with détente. She argues “Jackson was profoundly skeptical about détente and not at all reluctant to see it held ‘hostage’ to the issue of human rights inside the Soviet Union, particularly if this might advance his own 1976 presidential ambitions.<sup>419</sup>”

To be sure, Jackson brought up the issue when considering a run for the presidency. A questioner at a town hall with Congressman Jerry Litton of Missouri asked the senator if it was appropriate to interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union any more than if the Soviets had a similar law regarding amnesty for Vietnam War deserters. Jackson was clearly disturbed by the phrasing of the question, particularly at the comparison between innocent Soviet Jews and “people who deserted their country in a time of war.”<sup>420</sup> Jackson responded with an answer relating to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and instead that the United States had to help Soviet Jews. In the unedited portion of the show (there was a 30 minute show and a 90 minute unedited segment); Jackson told the story of Admiral Hyman Rickover, the father of the nuclear submarine who immigrated to the United States from a Russian-controlled section of Poland bordering the Baltic Sea. Describing the atrocious treatment of emigrating Soviet Jews, Jackson concluded, “The amendment is meant to stop this. This is the greatness of America.<sup>421</sup>” The Soviet Jewry issue was good politics, but Jackson also thought it was the right thing to do.

---

<sup>418</sup> John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History*, (New York: Penguin Press, 2005), 182.

<sup>419</sup> Anne Hessing Cahn, *Killing Détente: The Right Attacks the CIA*, 40.

<sup>420</sup> Quoted in *Dialogue with Litton*, “Interview with Senator Henry M. “Scoop” Jackson,” December 12, 1974. Jerry L. Litton Papers, C3730, Audiovisual Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

<sup>421</sup> Quoted in *Dialogue with Litton*, “Interview with Senator Henry M. “Scoop” Jackson,” December 12, 1974. Jerry L. Litton Papers, C3730, Audiovisual Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, MO.

Jackson continued to fight for human rights by protesting the Ford administration's refusal to meet with Solzhenitsyn in April of 1975. The Nobel laureate toured the country speaking, even addressing a group of senators when the Senate would not invite Solzhenitsyn to address a joint session of Congress.<sup>422</sup> The president and his staff feared that meeting with the dissident would derail détente, particularly coming after the passage of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. Kissinger staffer Peter Rodman and White House Chief of Staff Dick Cheney argued that the Soviet author would be a good ally to have, bringing pro-human rights liberals to Ford's cause.<sup>423</sup> But Ford and Kissinger refused to budge, fearing the Soviet reaction to a meeting with Solzhenitsyn.<sup>424</sup> But Ford eventually warmed to the idea, telling reporters he would meet with the Soviet dissident. But it was too late. Offended by the delay, Solzhenitsyn refused to ask for a meeting.<sup>425</sup> The damage to the administration was done.

Soon after the Solzhenitsyn affair, many European countries met with the United States, Canada, and the Soviet Union to finalize the Helsinki Final Act. The agreement divided areas of cooperation into "baskets" or categories of economy, security, and culture. This development, which established non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, ironically provided a stimulus to Soviet Jews and other dissidents.<sup>426</sup> Basket three on human rights spurred the creation of Helsinki Watch Groups in the United States and amongst Eastern European and Soviet dissidents.<sup>427</sup> The information and oversight these groups would provide

---

<sup>422</sup> Jeff Bloodworth, "Senator Henry Jackson, the Solzhenitsyn Affair, and American Liberalism," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, Spring 2006, 97, no.1, 74-75.

<sup>423</sup> Jeff Bloodworth, "Senator Henry Jackson, the Solzhenitsyn Affair, and American Liberalism," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, (Spring 2006), 97, no.1, pages 74 and 75.

<sup>424</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 291-292.

<sup>425</sup> Jeff Bloodworth, "Senator Henry Jackson, the Solzhenitsyn Affair, and American Liberalism," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, 97, no.1, (Spring 2006): 75.

<sup>426</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 293. Mike Bowker and Phil Williams, *Superpower Détente: A Reappraisal*, 92

<sup>427</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 120. John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History*, New York: Penguin Press, 2005, 191

would provide valuable information on Soviet suppression of human rights and eventually serve as a force of liberalization behind the Iron Curtain.<sup>428</sup>

Jackson opposed the Helsinki Accords because he thought that they would strengthen the Soviet position in Eastern Europe, while doing nothing for human rights. But because of dissidents like Sakharov, Sharansky, and other members of the Helsinki Watch groups in the Soviet Union, Europe and the United States, Jackson was proved wrong. The senator was crucial in these efforts as well, speaking out on behalf of refuseniks and dissidents while defending the Jackson-Vanik Amendment:

The support that has come from the West for the brave people struggling to leave the Soviet Union will not diminish. They will not be bullied by Soviet brutality. And we will not forget them (underlining original)... We have always had international law on our side in this great struggle. We have always had justice and right on our side. We have always enjoyed the support of the American people and their elected representatives. And today we can be proud to say that we have a new ally in the struggle. We have the laws of the United States of America.<sup>429</sup>

That did not stop President Ford from trying to work around the amendment. He announced that he would attempt to work around the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, attempting to improve trade relations with the Soviet Union. Jackson blasted Ford's efforts, calling it "a reversal" of the pledge to Congress Ford made when signing the Trade Act of 1974.<sup>430</sup> Ford's efforts failed, in large part because the Soviets refused to issue more exit visas to emigrants, making it difficult for Ford to issue a waiver to the Jackson-Vanik Amendment.

---

<sup>428</sup> John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History* (New York: Penguin Press, 2005), 191.

<sup>429</sup> "Remarks By Senator Henry M. Jackson, Solidarity Day," April 13, 1975, Box 245, folder 15, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-005, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>430</sup> Letter to Carl Marcy, folder 16, box 245, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-005, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.



Jackson mounted a run for the White House, losing to Jimmy Carter, but continued to labor against détente during the Carter administration.<sup>431</sup> Carter initially was an ally, speaking out on behalf of Andrei Sakharov and Alexander Ginzburg. But Carter, fearing that the Soviets would walk away from the SALT II negotiations, deemphasized human rights in the Soviet Union. He continued to bring up certain cases to Brezhnev, but critics like Joshua Muravchik and Jeane Kirkpatrick accused him of focusing on the human rights record of U.S. allies as opposed to the Soviet Union.<sup>432</sup>

Carter did not help matters when he considered issuing a waiver to the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. Although he had pledged support to Jackson for the amendment during the presidential campaign, he wanted to improve relations with the Soviet Union by granting the waiver. Jackson strongly opposed an effort by senators (and his one-time ally Congressman Charlie Vanik) to give the President broader powers to issue the waiver after Jewish emigration levels rose in the late 1970s. Both the trade waiver deal and the SALT II arms limitation treaty fell through with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.<sup>433</sup>

Jackson continued to speak out for Soviet citizens suffering imprisonment and persecution. He carried a picture of Natan Sharansky during a “Solidarity Sunday for Soviet Jewry” march in New York City and continued to demand the release of Sharansky from prison.<sup>434</sup> He co-sponsored a resolution nominating the Helsinki Watch Groups of the Soviet

---

<sup>431</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 389.

<sup>432</sup> Coalition for a Democratic Majority Statement, November 3, 1977, Box 324, folder 7, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-005, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. Jeane Kirkpatrick, “Dictatorships and Double Standards,” *Commentary*, November 1979, [www.commentarymagazine.com/article/dictatorships-doublestandards](http://www.commentarymagazine.com/article/dictatorships-doublestandards) (accessed April 15, 2012).

<sup>433</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 132-133. Fred A. Lazin, *The Struggle for Soviet Jewry in American Politics*, 180.

<sup>434</sup> *The New York Times*, photograph, April 30, 1979, Box 40, folder 14, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-006, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. Letter to the Jewish Student Action Coalition, April 10, 1979, folder 15, box 42, Box Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-006, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Union for the Nobel Peace Prize.<sup>435</sup> His wife Helen co-chaired the Congressional Wives for Soviet Jewry, which lobbied Mrs. Carter and Canadian legislators.<sup>436</sup> Jackson went to the Senate floor to speak out for Lithuanian Baptist Pastor George Vins, who was imprisoned in Siberia:

It is important and appropriate that the American people, who are so blessed in the freedoms we take for granted, make clear to the Soviet Union that a genuine détente requires increasing respect for fundamental human rights.<sup>437</sup>

Jackson was tireless in advocating for human rights in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Jackson sent letters to all three presidential candidates in 1980, asking them to support enforcement of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment. Only Carter and Governor Ronald Reagan wrote back, both pledging support for the amendment.<sup>438</sup> Jackson reluctantly endorsed Carter in the general election, but was helpful to Ronald Reagan during his first two years as President.<sup>439</sup> Soviet Jewry saw some dark days in the early 1980s as emigration slowed to a trickle.<sup>440</sup> But through the efforts of President Ronald Reagan and the emergence of Mikhail Gorbachev, things began to change. In 1986, prominent Soviet dissidents such as Natan Sharansky and Ida Nudel were freed through the very method Jackson opposed: quiet diplomacy from the Reagan administration.<sup>441</sup> The Soviet government freed Sakharov in

---

<sup>435</sup> “Senate Votes 90 to 1 to Approve Jackson Resolution in Support of 1978 Nobel Peace Prize for Helsinki Monitoring Groups in USSR,” folder 42, box 226, July 13, 1978, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-005, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>436</sup> Congressional Wives for Soviet Jewry Activities Report, , folder 8, box 38, September 1978, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-006, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>437</sup> “Statement by Senator Henry M. Jackson on Religious Freedom in the Soviet Union: The Case of Pastor Georgi Vins,” Senator Henry M. Jackson Press Release, , folder 7, box 38, September 30, 1978, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-006, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>438</sup> Ronald Reagan letter to Henry Jackson, folder 12, box 40, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-006, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. Jimmy Carter letter to Henry Jackson, folder 23, box 245, Henry M. Jackson Papers, Accession Number 3650-005, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

<sup>439</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*, 415.

<sup>440</sup> Fred A. Lazin, *The Struggle for Soviet Jewry in American Politics*, 180 and 183-184.

<sup>441</sup> *Ibid.*, 212. See also Natan Sharansky with Ron Dermer, *The Case for Democracy: The Power of Freedom to Overcome Tyranny and Terror*, xxi. Sharansky spent nine years in Soviet prisons.

1986 after almost seven years in internal exile in Nizhny Novgorod, and Solzhenitsyn came home to Russia in 1994.<sup>442</sup>

But as the Cold War came to a close through the work of Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev, the numbers of Jewish emigrants exploded. Nine hundred fourteen left the Soviet Union in 1986, but almost 18,919 emigrated in 1988. That tenfold increase reflected an emergent Soviet liberalization. 71,196 left in 1989, 181,902 in 1990, and 178,566 in 1991, the year the Soviet Union finally collapsed. Soviet Jews continued their exodus throughout the 1990's, though the numbers slowed in the middle of the decade.<sup>443</sup> In 1994, Russia was certified as compliant with Jackson-Vanik and waivers were granted in every year since that time. The Jackson-Vanik Amendment still applies to Russia today. With the admission of Russia to the World Trade Organization, debate over its repeal has begun in Congress.<sup>444</sup>

Did the Jackson-Vanik Amendment lead to more Jews emigrating from the Soviet Union? In sheer arithmetic terms, the amendment did not have the intended effect. With the exception of the late 1970s, Jewish emigration remained at paltry numbers. If that is the only measurement of success, the amendment must be deemed a failure.

But even critics of the amendment admit that it focused world attention on Soviet Jewry.<sup>445</sup> Perhaps the best advocate for the success of the Jackson-Vanik amendment was the Soviet dissident Natan Sharansky, who has observed:

... With each additional emigrant allowed to leave, the level of fear inside the Soviet Union fell. Every obstacle that the authorities placed in the path of free emigration was reducing the fruit of cooperation with the West. The Soviet Union was finally being

---

<sup>442</sup> Joshua Rubenstein and Alexander Gribanov, *The KGB File of Andrei Sakharov*, 60 and Ericson and Mahoney, eds. *The Essential Solzhenitsyn Reader*, xxvii.

<sup>443</sup> Fred A. Lazin, *The Struggle for Soviet Jewry in American Politics*, 309.

<sup>444</sup> Desmond Butler, "US Trade Upgrade May Worsen Relations with Russia," NPR, [npr.org/templates/text/s.php?sId=149441271&m=1](http://npr.org/templates/text/s.php?sId=149441271&m=1) (accessed April 14, 2012).

<sup>445</sup> Petrus Buwalda, *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*, 108.

unmasked in the eyes of the entire free world. They could continue to violate the rights of their own people, but it now would come with an expensive price tag.<sup>446</sup>

Jackson's central goal in framing the amendment was to undermine détente and to draw attention to the plight of Soviet and Eastern European citizens of all faiths. Given the faltering of détente by the turn of the 1980s, he seems to have been successful in this regard. The Soviets were in a box on the issue of Jewish emigration. Jackson secured a spot for human rights on the U.S.-U.S.S.R agenda that Soviet dissidents, Jewish refuseniks, Reagan, and Gorbachev together exploited for the benefit of human freedom

---

<sup>446</sup> Natan Sharansky with Ron Dermer, *The Case for Democracy: The Power of Freedom to Overcome Tyranny and Terror*, 113 and 123.

## Conclusion: The Legacy of Henry “Scoop” Jackson

Senator Henry “Scoop” Jackson found himself in a strange position during the Reagan presidency. For only the second time in his career, he was a member of the minority party. Upon first glance, it appeared that Jackson’s power was diminished. But the senator maintained his position on the Government Operations Committee and Armed Services Committee. His old ally John Tower, with whom he agreed on national security matters even more than John Stennis, now chaired the Armed Services Committee. Reagan, Tower, and Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker realized that Jackson’s leadership was crucial on national security matters given the GOP’s lack of a filibuster-proof majority. The senator’s knowledge of defense matters and parliamentary procedure would be crucial in passing the Reagan national security agenda.

Jackson and Reagan were never close friends, but they had a good working relationship.<sup>447</sup> Part of this stemmed from the large number of former Jackson staffers and associates who served in the Reagan administration. Richard Perle served as Assistant Secretary of Defense with former Jackson staffers Frank Gaffney and Douglas Feith joining him at the Pentagon. Elliot Abrams served as Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, with Jackson’s old friend Edward Rowny as the chief negotiator for the START (Strategic Arms Reduction Talks) negotiations with the Soviet Union. Coalition for a Democratic Majority members Jeane Kirkpatrick, Joshua Muravchik, and Max Kampelman served as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, deputy to the U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, and chief negotiator to the Helsinki human rights talks. One of Jackson’s favorite experts, Richard Pipes, was

---

<sup>447</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 420.

Reagan's National Security Council adviser on the Soviet Union.<sup>448</sup> Jackson also played a role in the selection of Al Haig as Secretary of State (Haig would resign in 1982) and in the selection of John Lehman, a prominent critic of SALT II, as Secretary of the Navy.<sup>449</sup>

Reagan and Jackson not only shared the same taste in personnel, they also agreed on basic national security goals for the United States. Both men wanted to accelerate and enhance the defense buildup President Carter had initiated. More troops, more weapons systems, and a modernized nuclear arsenal topped the wish list. Reagan and Jackson believed that negotiating from a position of strength, not of weakness, would force the Soviets to the negotiating table and ultimately reduce the amount of nuclear weapons in the world. The Defense Department budget for Fiscal Year 1982 passed with a bipartisan majority.

But congressional liberals found the continued defense buildup frightening, fearing it would prolong the arms race. The nuclear freeze movement and debates over the MX missile and Central America provided Reagan's opponents with plenty of ammunition in the fall of 1982. Senators Ted Kennedy (D-MA) and Mark Hatfield (R-OR) proposed a freeze "on the production, testing, and deployment of nuclear weapons" in both the Soviet Union and the United States.<sup>450</sup> Speaking at American University, Senator Kennedy bemoaned the MX missile's possible deployment as a waste of money. He asserted that a freeze would allow money to go to domestic programs without endangering American national security. With a dramatic flair, Kennedy

---

<sup>448</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 407-408.

<sup>449</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), s 407-408.

<sup>450</sup> "Statement of Senator Edward Kennedy on the Nuclear Freeze and Reductions Resolution, March 20, 1982," John Danforth Collection, , WUNP5455, State Historical Society of Missouri, Box 103.

concluded said that the resolution would “make the world safe for human survival,” a play on Woodrow Wilson’s making “the world safe for democracy.”<sup>451</sup>

Jackson pushed back. Working with Virginia Republican Senator John Warner, he drafted a proposal that would reduce weapons on both sides at equal levels, almost an exact replica of the 1972 Jackson Amendment. The resolution encouraged both sides to look toward “the reduction of the world’s nuclear weapons to zero.”<sup>452</sup> This was in line with the Reagan administration’s arms reduction proposals and broadly supportive of the zero option in Europe, which proposed to stop the deployment of Pershing missiles in Europe in exchange for the withdrawal of Soviet SS-20 missiles. Despite protests across the world, including a New York demonstration that featured hundreds of thousands of protestors, the freeze resolution failed in the Senate. The Jackson-Warner resolution passed both houses of Congress, however, handing Reagan a significant win on the issue of arms control. The resolution, combined with Jackson’s call to establish a joint consultation center that would enhance communication between the United States and the Soviet Union, made “the Senator from Boeing” look like a peacemaker.

But Jackson’s strong support for Reagan’s positions on the Soviet Union and national defense did not translate to support for Reagan’s domestic agenda. Jackson was a harsh critic of the Reagan tax and budget proposals, and he decried the administration’s final elimination of price controls on oil. The rise of the “Reagan Revolution” made Washington state liberals appreciate the old New Dealer a little more. Jackson decided the 1982 election would be his last,

---

<sup>451</sup> “Statement of Senator Edward Kennedy on the Nuclear Freeze and Reductions Resolution, March 20, 1982,” box 103, John Danforth Collection, WUNP5455, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>452</sup> “Dear Colleague Letter, March 23, 1982,” box 103, John Danforth Collection, WUNP5455, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

and he won handily over Republican Doug Jewett.<sup>453</sup> Jackson dedicated his final term to fighting for a strong policy towards the Soviet Union and for liberalism at home.

Unsuccessful in advancing the nuclear freeze, more mainstream congressional liberals sought to cut the defense budget and end the MX missile by questioning that weapon system's logistical rationale.<sup>454</sup> They also argued that that the Reagan administration's support for anti-Communist forces in El Salvador and Nicaragua created a potential Vietnam in America's backyard. Jackson pushed back on all fronts, calling for a modified MX missile and securing funding for it in 1983, and he worked with Reagan and UN Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick to establish a bipartisan commission on Central America.<sup>455</sup> Its chairman was none other than Henry Kissinger. The two men chatted at a dinner with Kirkpatrick and began to repair their damaged relationship.

After that personal rapprochement, Jackson left for China. He met with officials, touring the country as he had in 1979. After flying home, he heard about the KAL 007 incident, in which the Soviets had shot down a civilian airplane. After a press conference on KAL 007, the senator collapsed and on the night of September 1, 1983, he died from a ruptured aorta.<sup>456</sup> During a national speech on the KAL 007 incident that night, Reagan paid tribute to Jackson, pointedly noting the late senator's efforts to secure passage of the MX missile and to forge a bipartisan consensus on foreign policy.

Had Jackson lived, he would have witnessed a marked change in U.S.-Soviet relations. Reagan gave his famous "Ivan and Anya" speech, calling for better relations between the Soviet

---

<sup>453</sup>Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 423.

<sup>454</sup> Congressional Record, 12480-12486, box 21, John Danforth Collection, WUNP5455, State Historical Society of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

<sup>455</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), 428.

<sup>456</sup> *Ibid.*, 430-431.



Union and the United States in January 1984.<sup>457</sup> Mikhail Gorbachev's rise to power in 1985 brought rapid changes in the military, human rights, and economic policies of the Soviet Union. Andrei Sakharov was released from internal exile in Gorky. Natan Sharansky was freed from Soviet prisons after nine long years. Soviet Jews began to leave the Soviet Union in droves. Reagan and Gorbachev agreed to eliminate intermediate-range missiles in 1987, and Reagan's successor George Bush worked with Gorbachev to secure ratification of the START I treaty in 1991. Political freedom came to Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. The Berlin Wall came down in 1989 and the two Germanys reunified the next year. Freedom and democracy spread throughout Eastern Europe. On December 25, 1991, the Soviet Union itself collapsed. The defining issue of Henry "Scoop" Jackson's career ceased to exist.

What role did Henry "Scoop" Jackson have in bringing down the Soviet empire? No one would claim he did it alone, or that he was a major reason for the collapse of Communism in Russia and Eastern Europe. But neither should his role be minimized. The testimony of dissidents like Natan Sharansky and other Soviet dissidents speaks to Jackson's impact. Few in Washington were talking about human rights and political liberty in the Iron Curtain during the early-to-mid 1970's, and even fewer were sounding the alarm about defense cuts that harmed the U.S. strategic position vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. To have done so while running for President in the Democratic Party in the era of George McGovern and Jimmy Carter, a time where liberals either abandoned their earlier assumptions about the Cold War or abandoned their liberalism, was even more impressive. Few members of Congress, Republican or Democrat, brought up these issues. But Henry "Scoop" Jackson was too stubborn to give up and too experienced to give in.

---

<sup>457</sup> Beth Fischer, *The Reagan Reversal: Foreign Policy and the End of the Cold War* (University of Missouri Press: Columbia, Missouri, 1997), 32.

To be sure, Jackson made mistakes. He sometimes pushed issues too far. His attempt to extract the absolute maximum number of exit visas from the Soviet Union infuriated Brezhnev and Gromyko, without any compensating payoff. On other occasions, he was overly flexible. He compromised on issues like Vietnam and Angola in 1975, and even temporarily endorsed the idea of cutting the defense budget in the run-up to his 1976 presidential bid. He was hot-tempered and at times difficult to work. But his flaws cannot obscure his courageous stand against U.S.-Soviet détente as it was pursued in the 1970s.

It should be remembered that Jackson did not oppose dealing with the Soviet Union, or having a positive relationship with Communist regimes. He was a strong supporter of ties with China as far back as the late 1960's.<sup>458</sup> He supported negotiations with the Soviet Union, even endorsing trade ties under the right conditions. But he believed that arms control agreements needed to serve the interest of U.S. national security, not the political prospects of American presidents. That was why he worked to improve the Limited Test Ban Treaty and SALT I treaties, signed respectively by a Democratic President and a Republican President. And it was why he viciously opposed SALT II when it was proposed by both Republican and Democratic presidents.

Peace cannot be achieved without the military strength to defend it. Jackson's efforts to keep American national defenses strong show that he understood this fact. Given that Reagan's buildup led to substantial arms reductions, strength can also push totalitarian nations to the negotiating table. Of course, it takes policymakers who were willing to maintain a strong national defense and who were willing to negotiate. Reagan and Jackson understood that both a strong national defense and negotiations were necessary for peace.

---

<sup>458</sup> Robert G. Kaufman, *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics* (University of Washington Press: Seattle, 2000), s 428-429.

Jackson also understood that foreign policy must have a moral component. Totalitarian nations are more willing to expand militarily if they have a free reign to persecute their own people and prevent them from emigrating. Given the exodus of Jews from the Soviet Union and Russia at the end of the Cold War and the Soviet determination to cut military expenditures, this point was important to make. Given the proliferation of human rights groups since the end of the Cold War, the issue has only increased in importance in the world. We tend to see this movement as one of the political Left. But the struggle for human rights continues to bear the imprint of that arch-Cold Warrior, Henry “Scoop” Jackson.

## Bibliography

### Primary Sources

Drachman, Edward R. *Challenging the Kremlin: The Soviet Jewish Movement for Freedom, 1967-1990*. New York: Paragon House, 1991.

*Foreign Relations of the United States*, Washington D.C.: (Washington D.C.: (Washington D.C.: (Washington D.C.: Department of State, 2012),, 2012),, 2012),, 2012.

Fosdick, Dorothy, ed. *Staying the Course: Henry M. Jackson and National Security*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1987.

Fosdick, Dorothy, ed. *Henry M. Jackson and World Affairs: Selected Speeches 1953-1983*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1990.

Danforth, John, Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

Eagleton, Thomas, Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

Ichord, Richard Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

Jackson, Henry M. Papers, Special Collections, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Litton, Jerry Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

Symington, Stuart Collection, State Historical Society of Missouri, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.

U.S. Congress, U.S. Senate, Congressional Record 1972-1976, 92<sup>nd</sup>, 93<sup>rd</sup>, and 94<sup>th</sup> Congress.

U.S. Congress, U.S. Senate, Hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 93<sup>rd</sup> Congress.

U.S. Congress, U.S. Senate, Hearings of the Senate Armed Services Committee, 96<sup>th</sup> Congress.

### Secondary Sources

Anonymous. "Valéry Panov in Ashdod." [www.teleor.net/en/valery\\_panov.html](http://www.teleor.net/en/valery_panov.html) (accessed April 14, 2012).

Berman, William C. *William Fulbright and the Vietnam War*. Kent, Ohio: Kent University Press, 1988.

- Beckerman, Gal. *When They Come For Us, We'll Be Gone: The Struggle to Save Soviet Jewry*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2010.
- Berkowitz, Edward. *Something Happened: A Political and Cultural Overview of the Seventies*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006.
- Bloodworth, Jeff. "Senator Henry Jackson, the Solzhenitsyn Affair, and American Liberalism," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly*, 97, no. 1, (Spring 2006): 69-75.
- Brown, Eugene. *J. William Fulbright: Advice and Dissent*. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa Press: 1985.
- Buckley Jr., William F. Syndicated Columns for The Washington Star Syndicate, Inc.
- Bowker, Mike and Phil Williams. *Superpower Détente: A Reappraisal*. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, Sage, 1988.
- Burr, Ty. "Giving Voice to the Struggle of Russian Jews," *Boston Globe*, May 30, 2008.
- Burr, William. *The Kissinger Transcripts*. New York: The New Press, 1999.
- Buwalda, Petrus. *They Did Not Dwell Alone: Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, 1967-1990*. Washington D.C., Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1998.
- Cahn, Anne Hessing. *Killing Détente: The Right Attacks the CIA*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998.
- Dallek, Robert. *Nixon and Kissinger: Partners in Power*. New York: HarperCollins, 2007.
- Dobson, Gwen "The Big Scoop Around Washington," *The Saturday Evening Post*, August/September 1974.
- Ericson, Eric and Daniel J. Mahoney, eds. *The Essential Solzhenitsyn Reader: Essential Readings 1947-2005*. Wilmington, Delaware: ISI Books, 2006.
- Gaddis, John Lewis. *The Cold War: A New History*, New York: The Penguin Press, 2005.
- Galchinsky Michael, *Jews and Human Rights: Dancing at Three Weddings*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishing, 2008.
- Garthoff, Raymond. *Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan* Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1994.

Gilliland, Eric Patrick; "Richard Nixon, Détente, and the Conservative Movement, 1969-1974." MA thesis, Wright State University, 2006. In Ohio History Link, [http://etd.ohiolink.edu/view.cgi?acc\\_num=wright1166382457](http://etd.ohiolink.edu/view.cgi?acc_num=wright1166382457).

Hanhimaki, Jussi. *The Flawed Architect: Henry Kissinger and American Foreign Policy*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Harrison, Andrew. *Passover Revisited: Philadelphia's Aid to Soviet Jews 1962-1998*. Danvers, Mass.: Rosemont Publishing and Printing Corp. 2001.

Herring, George C. *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations Since 1776* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Kaufman, Burton I. and Scott. *The Presidency of James Earl Carter*. Lawrence, Kan., University Press of Kansas: 2006.

Kirkpatrick, Jeane "Dictatorships and Double Standards," *Commentary*, November 1979. [www.commentarymagazine.com/article/dictatorships-doublestandards](http://www.commentarymagazine.com/article/dictatorships-doublestandards) (accessed April 15, 2012).

Kissinger, Henry A., *White House Years*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1979.

Kissinger, Henry A. *Years of Upheaval*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1982.

Kissinger, Henry A. *Years of Renewal*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999.

Kochavi, Noam. *Nixon and Israel: Forging a Conservative Partnership*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009.

Kochavi, Noam. "Idealpolitik in Disguise: Israel, Jewish Emigration from the Soviet Union, and the Nixon Administration, 1969-1974" *The International History Review*, 29, No. 3 (Sep., 2007).

Jackson, Henry Martin. *Fact, Fiction, and National Security*. New York: MacFadden-Bartell Corporation, 1964.

Johnson, Robert David. *Congress and the Cold War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 2006.

Kaufman, Robert G. *Henry M. Jackson: A Life in Politics*. Seattle and London, University of Washington Press. 2000.

Lazin, Frederick A. *The Struggle for Soviet Jewry in American Politics: Israel versus the American Jewish Establishment*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2005.

McCain, John with Mark Salter. *Worth the Fighting For: The Education of An American Maverick and the Heroes Who Inspired Him*. New York: Random House, 2002.

Nelson, Keith L. *The Making of Détente: Soviet-American Relations in the Shadow of Vietnam* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

Ognibene, Peter. *Scoop: The Life and Politics of Henry M. Jackson*. Briarcliff Manor, New York: Stein and Day, 1975.

Olson, James C. *Stuart Symington: A Life*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2003.

Prochnau, William W. and Richard W. Larsen. *A Certain Democrat: Senator Henry M. Jackson, A Political Biography*. New York: Prentice-Hall Books, 1972.

Reeves, Richard "The Inevitability of Scoop Jackson" *New York Magazine*, December 17, 1973, 50-54, 59-62.

Romano, Angela. "Détente, Entente, or Linkage? The Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in U.S. Relations with the Soviet Union," *Journal of Diplomatic History*, 33, no. 4 (September 2009): 703-722.

Rosenblum, Leo. "Involvement in the Soviet Jewry Movement." <http://www.clevelandjewishhistory.net/sj/lr-firstcontact.htm>. Published 2007, accessed October 15, 2010.

Rubenstein, Joshua and Alexander Gribanov, eds. *The KGB File of Andrei Sakharov*, New Haven and London: Yale University, 2005.

Schulzinger, Robert. *Henry Kissinger: Doctor of Diplomacy* New York: Columbia University Press, 1989.

Sherrill, Robert "Senator Jackson Enters Right," *The Nation*, February 1, 1975.

Smith, Gerald. *Doubletalk: The Story of the First Strategic Arms Limitation Talks Agreement*. New York: Doubleday and Company: New York, 1980.

Suri, Jerome. *Henry Kissinger and the American Century*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007.

*The New York Times*. Photograph of Senators Henry Jackson, Jacob Javits, and Daniel Patrick Moynihan. April 30, 1975.

Whelan, Joseph G. and Francis T. Miko. *Detente in Soviet-American Relations, 1972-1974: A Survey and Analysis* .May 1975.Foreign Affairs Division, CRS. CRS Reports -- Digital Collection.

*U.S. News and World Report*, "Détente: Loaded in Russia's Favor?" November 30, 1975.

Weisman, Alan. *Prince of Darkness: Richard Perle-The Kingdom, the Power, and the End of Empire in America*. New York: Union Square Press, 2006

Wieck, Peter. "The Last of the Cold War Liberals-Another President Jackson?" *The New Republic*, September 18, 1971.

Woods, Randall Bennett. *J. William Fulbright, Vietnam, and the Search for a Cold War Foreign Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Zelizer, Julian. "Domestic Politics and Détente," *Journal of Diplomatic History* 31, no. 4, (September 2009): 653-670.