

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 6

FEBRUARY 12, 1962



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

An Arms Budget Designed to Terrify

In terms of size, shape and military doctrine, the new Kennedy arms budget is a terrifying document, and intended to terrify. In terms of size, it is roughly \$10 billion higher than Eisenhower's. During his Administration the arms budget was somewhat higher than \$40 billions. Under Kennedy it emerges somewhat higher than \$50 billions. A decade ago, just before the Korean war, it was barely past \$10 billions. In terms of shape, the arms budget resembles that advocated some years ago in the Rockefeller Brothers report on military policy, i.e. the armed services are being recast and merged functionally, with separate commands and striking forces for thermonuclear war, for continental defense, and for limited "police" actions on the periphery of the Soviet bloc to stop up any fissures in the wall of containment. In terms of military doctrine, the budget embodies a more adventurous policy than Eisenhower's. Where Eisenhower said war was now "preposterous," Kennedy is prepared to play the terrible game in three forms.

More for Chemical and Germ War

The one that seems to fascinate him most is that of paramilitary operations: the use of secret small detachments for undeclared war. Three new centers for such "special forces" are to be added to the two already in existence at Fort Bragg, N.C. and Fort Gulick in the Panama Canal Zone. Of the three, one is to be for trans Pacific operations, another for Europe and the third for the Middle East. The second form in which Kennedy is ready to play the war game is that of limited conflict, conventional or with so-called tactical nuclear arms. In both para-military and limited war, a larger role for chemical and biological weapons is foreshadowed by the new budget; the Army's spending plans for these is up 67% to \$85 millions. For so-called limited war purposes, the new budget adds two divisions to the Regular Army and provides the Army with improved conventional weapons; the Navy, with more ships; the Air Force, with four more wings of tactical aircraft.

The third form in which Kennedy is prepared to play the game of war is that of all-out thermonuclear conflict. The new budget represents the defeat of those who advocate the establishment of a stabilized nuclear deterrent of some 200 "invulnerable" Polaris and solid fuel Minuteman missiles under whose protective umbrella disarmament might be negotiated. The budget programs an enormous force of some 1600 missiles although it is now recognized that there is no "missile gap", that even in ICBM's we are ahead of the Russians. The missile program mounts staggeringly, as if earlier fantasies about the Russians having 500 ICBM's (when apparently they have only about 50) were realities. Plans for so huge a force must make the Russians feel that we are moving from

Economic Impact of Disarmament

When John J. McCloy was adviser to the President on disarmament, he named a panel under Emile Benoit of Columbia to study its economic impact. What began in a burst of zeal seems to have ended in a damp little squib. The panel submitted its report last October but has just been released now by Wm. C. Foster, director of the new U.S. Arms and Disarmament Agency, probably the capital's most timorous executive. It reads as if prepared or revised under instructions not to alarm the Pentagon. It begins, incredibly, with this sentence, "Threats to national security now require an improvement in U.S. military capabilities," not the most evangelical start for a study of disarmament and difficult to reconcile with Secretary McNamara's boast the same day that the U.S. armed forces were strong enough to ride out any currently possible nuclear attack and "completely destroy" the attacker. The report's "Model of General and Complete Disarmament" envisages a gradual reduction over the next 15 years to 10 billions in arms spending and 500,000 men in the armed forces! Just how this constitutes "complete and general" disarming is not explained. The report, which we may discuss in more detail later, finds as expected that the economic problem this would create is not insoluble, but its meager and cautious analysis is neither inspired nor inspiring. The manner and timing of its release reflects an official atmosphere less than passionate about the whole subject.

the idea of a deterrent to the preparation of a possible attack. The pyromaniacs are jubilant; Joseph Alsop in recent columns has been hinting joyfully that we have at last abandoned Eisenhower's "never strike first" doctrine.

This may overstate the intention but not the drift of policy. The truth is that the path of least resistance is mass production of missiles, and the only doctrine that can justify this is one which holds that "under great provocation" we must be ready to strike first and have a missile force so huge it can wipe out even hardened bases on the other side, win the war and survive. The corollary of this is a shelter program, private or communal, to make this "credible" not only to the Russians but to ourselves. The shelter program has become another facet of the familiar Democratic armament policy begun under Truman; another way to prime the pump of business and at the same time support a "tougher" foreign policy.* With this is revived the Acheson notion that if we build up overwhelming power we can dictate terms, particularly if we make it clear that we are ready—if need be—to risk war to enforce them. This, my friends, is not a peace race.

* See the National Planning Association's January bulletin which says the shelter program would take up the slack in steel and cement while making a first strike strategy "credible."

What Cuba Had to Say in Its Own Defense at the Punta del Este Conference...

We are sorry to see Cuba go the way of Marxism Leninism just when revelations about Stalin show how inevitably a one-party state without a free press breeds injustice and degenerates into bureaucratic authoritarianism and thought control. But U.S. behavior toward Cuba hardly constitutes an advertisement for the ideals of Jefferson. It was very hard to tell from the news dispatches in our own free press what Cuba had said at Punta del Este. In the interest of fairness, we present on these two inside pages excerpts from the speech made by President Dorticos of Cuba at Punta del Este on Jan. 25.

We believe Punta del Este marks another step down a disastrous road. It splits the hemisphere; on one side are mostly the petty dictatorships of the Caribbean area. On the other side are the major republics with a majority of Latin America's land and peoples, more fearful of U.S. interventionism than of Castroism. Within these countries, the military and the rightists, as in Argentina, are using the Cuban issue to regain power at the expense of precarious democratic institutions. The effect will be to polarize the struggle, and to weaken those moderate elements which are the only support of the Alliance for Progress. Finally we believe the conference will strengthen rightist elements at home. Their appetite for stronger measures against Cuba has been whetted. Kennedy's fixation about Cuba led to his first great setback last April. We believe worse are ahead. How can we campaign for world law when we violate the law of the hemisphere by economic and military aggression against Cuba?—IFS

From the Dorticos Speech

"This meeting [Pres. Dorticos said] was promoted to prepare a favorable climate in the Hemisphere for a new physical and military aggression against my country and as such I denounce it. . . .

"But as we shall see later, this meeting also has another aim. This is not only a meeting against Cuba, it is not only a meeting against the Cuban people. At this meeting there are some who also conspire against the inevitable future freedom of many Latin American peoples. They wish to take the practical measures and precautions deemed necessary not, as they so often repeat, to prevent the propagation of international communism in this hemisphere, but simply to put a stop to national liberation or anti-imperialist movements among many peoples of Latin America. . . .

"In the future, strikes will be suppressed more violently; bloodshed and bullets will be used to try to destroy farm workers' movements; and, perhaps, the power of circumstances themselves may, some dramatic day, make this continent the scene of another colonial war. On the one hand will stand the peoples, longing for freedom, determinedly rising in rebellion; on the other will stand fierce imperialism,

If the Pope Can Co-Exist With Castro

It is easy to imagine the outcry from the Senate Internal Security Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee if leading Protestant clergymen were now to give a friendly reception to an emissary from Castro, as the Pope did on February 3 when he accepted the credentials of a new Cuban Ambassador to the Vatican and accorded him a private audience. The new envoy, to top it all, is (according to the UPI from Vatican City) "a leftwing intellectual who fought on the Loyalist side in Spain." If a Senate committee can investigate the United Nations, as Internal Security did a few years ago under that devout son of the Church and friend of Franco, McCarran—why not the Papacy? If it can pillory the Protestant clergy for not being soft on Communism, why not the Pope for being soft on Castroism? Alternatively, if the Pope can co-exist with Castro, why can't we?

seeking with marines, transported armies, and specially trained groups, to put down the efforts of the peoples. . . .

"Thus are we attacked and injured by those who invoke the sanctity of human rights. Why were these champions of human rights in our hemisphere not stirred or even moved by the report that a field worker in our literacy campaign, a 16-year old worker, was murdered by a gang of counter-revolutionaries equipped by the U.S. intelligence service? . . . But the OAS took no note; the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, some of them listening to me now, took no note. . . .

"We are also charged with violating the exercise of democracy. . . . Speak of representative democracy to the American Indian, to the U.S. Negro, to the illiterates of this hemisphere, to the poor and the hungry. Gentlemen, once illiteracy has disappeared from your countries, once there is no poverty, no discrimination—then is the time to speak of democracy. . . . Democracy. Does it by any chance exist in Paraguay? Are you about to demand that I prove that there is no democracy in Paraguay? Democracy in Nicaragua. Are you going to ask me to prove the lack of it in the face of notorious fact? . . .

"And furthermore, gentlemen, with all these old evils, are periodic elections the only way that the people have to express their will? Would you try to ignore history? Are you trying to disregard the scientific truth of history? Do you seek to ignore the fact that history has been spurred on by revolutions, that revolutions are the exceptional, glorious and culminating experiences of the people, the real expression of their will?

"Obviously, all revolutions and among them the Cuban revolution, work toward creating institutions, including an electoral system. Cuba is not an exception to the rule. Our

U. S. Charged With Enmity to Cuban Revolution Even Before It Turned Socialist

"I wish to reply here to the statements made by the Secretary of State of the United States. He said that the North American government had no quarrel, originally, with the Cuban revolution; the fact that our Revolution became a Socialist revolution, that we declared its basis to be the Marxist-Leninist ideology, which we make no attempt to hide, is what has provoked that country's enmity. What a short memory!

"Have they forgotten that they began to send insolent diplomatic notes in early 1959 because we had merely proposed an agrarian reform? Have they forgotten that before we nationalized one North American monopoly they began to cut our sugar quota? Have they forgotten that before we adopted any socialistic measures or even any

nationalizing measures in our country, in 1959, many planes coming from North American territory set fire to our sugar fields and harvests and burned many of our farmers' homes?

"This enmity on the part of the Government of the United States is not only against the socialistic revolution. We are not claiming or aspiring or trying to export our socialism to any American country. But that won't matter; if any other country of America makes a nationalistic liberation attempt that includes true agrarian reform, nationalization of North American companies and intervention of North American utility companies, it will be enough to cause in those countries a repetition of the events of which we were victims since early 1959, even before our revolution became socialistic."

—President Dorticos of Cuba addressing the Punta del Este Conference Jan. 25.

We'll Send A Free Sample Copy of This Issue —