

By The Author of "The Limits of Defense": Strategy, Politics and The 19th Century

Balanced Deterrent Implies Co-Existence But Counter Force Nuclear Victory

By Arthur I. Waskow

Now unhappily coexisting within the Kennedy Administration are two opposed views of the world, both out of date. Their coexistence gives us the military Mix and a foreign policy that vacillates between seeking "rollback" and settling for "stalemate." Which element in the military Mix dominates at any one point may be to *angelologists** an index of which foreign policy is coming into ascendancy.

The implication of one of the competing strategies, "counter-force," is that military power or the threat thereof can roll back the Communist empire. The implication of its opposite number, "minimum deterrence," is that unhappily the Communist empire is here to stay and must be accepted as a fact of life.

Discriminating H-Bombs

"Counter-force" suggests that H-bombs can be trained to destroy other H-bombs but let people alone. If two nations try this gambit but one can grow and train a great many more H-bombs than the other, that nation has a "credible first-strike capability." For it can threaten to attack the enemy's forces and destroy them without fear that the far weaker enemy can destroy *its* forces. And since the enemy is of course carefully adhering to the arrangement not to kill people, the nation with a bigger brood of H-bombs can "win" or "prevail" without much damage to itself.

What this means is that in a great crisis the United States, with a counter-force strategy according to Defense Secretary McNamara and with overwhelming thermonuclear power according to Deputy Secretary Gilpatric, can demand a Communist retreat. Obviously, this possibility appeals to those who cry for "total victory." These men are 19th-century Americans in a late 20th-century world. They remember defeating Indians, Britain, Mexico, Spain, and even Germany and Japan. They remember that American free enterprise conquered new territory, won new markets, and had world-wide respect. These descendants of the manifest-destinarians do not understand why the advent of the H-bomb might make difficult the march to far frontiers.

Opposed to these 19th-century Americans are what might be called 19th-century Europeans. They model their foreign policy on the 19th-century balance of power and they scorn the "illusion of American omnipotence" as a dream of youth and innocence. They counsel patience and cunning, the virtues of 19th-century diplomats. They look forward to a world in which the United States is secure but its power limited, the Soviets and Chinese feel secure but their power is contained, and the arts of diplomacy and old-fashioned limited war can be used to settle conflicts of interest.

The preferred strategy of such men is "minimum" or "stable" or "balanced" deterrence. They believe that if each side builds a limited number of thermonuclear missiles, enough to destroy the other side's cities, and if each side carefully makes this limited missile force "invulnerable" to attack, and

* Opposite of demonologists; hence, students of power shifts in the White House.

A Modest Proposal on Guerrillas

The new faddists for "counter-insurgency" and "guerrilla action" hark back to America's frontier days for evidence that we make good guerrillas. They forget that the Green Mountain Boys were fighting in and for their own country, not in either Viet-Nam or Poland. If this fad for guerrillas continues, we suggest that the idea be tried out in one country that might arouse among some Americans both the zeal for revolution and the identification with the people that the Green Mountain Boys had. The testing ground we propose is South Africa, and of course the guerrillas we suggest are American Negroes.

The guerrillas-to-be might be trained in Mississippi with a few forays, both violent and non-violent, against county sheriffs or local radio stations. The training cadres could be made up of CORE and Black Muslim veterans of action. A series of controlled experiments, comparing the success of violent and non-violent action, could thus be arranged. When training was complete, the new War Corps could be smuggled into South Africa. Then we could announce our intention to aid in the overthrow of the Afrikaaner government on or before July 4, 1970.

Since the Soviet Union does not have a Negro population, it could not match our program; so we would at once win a major propaganda victory. By 1970 we would have a full file on modern guerrilla techniques. It is also probable that till 1970 the attention of civil-rights enthusiasts would be riveted on South Africa, so that American politicians would be happily released from pressure to pass civil rights legislation.—A.W.

if neither side tries seriously to protect its populace from attack, then both sides will be "deterred." Neither can strike first without committing suicide as well as murder.

Since minimum deterrence could only be used in response to an H-bomb attack, this strategy would require conventional and commando forces to deal with lesser clashes. Thus the 20th-century weapons would be nullified, instead of being incorporated into the regular arsenal as "counter-force" strategists would urge. And thus the United States would accept a basic world-wide stalemate of opposed imperial powers—like the Kaiser and the Tsar, before 1914.

The bomb, of course, makes the 19th century obsolete—either in its American or European versions. It is possible to imagine a policy that would temporarily use the minimum deterrent to preserve a temporary military safety, while redirecting the resources that now need our counter-force weapons. Those resources could go both into the non-military conquest of Space (with inspection invited to prove that the conquest was indeed non-military) and into the provision of liberty and food for the hungry nations. Such a policy would make disarmament much more likely, since it would press the Soviets into non-military forms of competition with us. Such a policy would also break through the stalemate of terror to reduce the military supports for totalitarian states and to win victories for free men.

But unfortunately such a policy belongs in the 20th century. It will therefore not be accepted until the 21st—which is probably too late.

Behind the Appeal the Supreme Court Refused to Hear

How the Soblen Trial Fell Below the Highest Standards of Justice

Dr. Robert A. Soblen's story begins with one witch hunt and ends with another. The first was the witch hunt within the Communist movement against Trotskyists. The second was the witch hunt in the United States against Communists. The story is an ugly one. He and his brother, Jack Soble, became Communists in their student days in Germany in the 1920s, were expelled for Trotskyism in 1929 and then recruited by the GPU to spy on their former Trotskyist comrades. The story begins with the betrayal of party comrades and ends with the betrayal of the wife and friends who put up \$100,000 in bond for him.

It must be admitted however, that his trial and sentence did not conform to the highest standards of justice. The Court of Appeals in upholding his conviction said it thought the sentence imposed upon him "somewhat harsh." His brother was given 7 years, Dr. Soblen life imprisonment. Yet in any other type of prosecution, the statute of limitations would have debarred action and the necessary evidence of intent to obtain American defense secrets was tenuous.

On A Psychotic's Testimony

Two briefs *amicus* were filed on his behalf. A group of psychiatrists wanted the Supreme Court to decide whether a man could be convicted on the testimony of a psychotic. The American Civil Liberties Union wanted the Court to spell out "the full extent of the obligation of government prosecutors to disclose information of value to the defense."

Newly retained counsel on appeal had asked for a new trial on the ground that the defense had been unaware (1) of testimony by a prison psychiatrist that Dr. Soblen's brother was too sick mentally to tell truth from falsehood and (2) of facts which cast doubt on the other key witness, a Mrs. Beker. The plea for a new trial was rejected on the ground that these facts were "readily available to a diligent defender."

One crucial point, however, could not have been unearthed at the time even by diligent counsel. The prosecution withheld the fact that Dr. Hans Hirschfeld, a prominent Socialist official of West Berlin, had denied before a Grand Jury here under oath Mrs. Beker's story that she passed Dr. Soblen a

If It Weren't The FBI

Dr. Soblen is the sixth convicted Communist in recent years to skip bail. The first was Gerhart Eisler who fled in 1949 after the Supreme Court refused to hear his appeal from a conviction for contempt of the Un-American Activities Committee. Two years later, four top Communists eluded the authorities and went into hiding after their Smith Act convictions were upheld. Dr. Soblen made his getaway a few days after the Supreme Court turned down his appeal. If he had fled to Russia instead of Israel, his whereabouts might still be unknown, the FBI still looking for him.

If any other agency were involved, we may be sure there would be indignant editorials asking why surveillance was so slack. The FBI boasts a network of informers. It has so many in the Communist Party that sometimes they inform on each other, as came to light in recent Un-American Activities Committee hearings in Cleveland. If it were an agency less sacrosanct, with a chief less the sacred cow than J. Edgar Hoover, there would be demands for an investigation.

Some Birchite might even ask, knowing how devious counter-intelligence becomes: When the Communists are so infiltrated by the FBI, can one be sure the FBI is not just a little infiltrated in return?

letter from Dr. Hirschfeld during the war saying that the U.S. was working on a new secret weapon. This gave the trial an "atom bomb" angle. The Solicitor General's answer was that "the transcript of Hirschfeld's grand jury testimony would not have been producible since Hirschfeld was not a government witness." But was this a fact the government could honorably withhold?

The Court of Appeals earlier set aside the conviction of Mark Zborowski whom Dr. Soblen's brother, Jack Soble, had named as another member of this same spy ring. The Court ordered a new trial on the ground that the government had withheld from the defense medical reports on Soble's mental illness and inconsistencies with his grand jury testimony. Zborowski is to be retried in September. Should Zborowski be acquitted, it would also cast doubt on Dr. Soblen's conviction.

Please Specify Which Issue in Sending Envelopes for Free Sample Copies to Friends

**I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.**

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name

Street

CityZone.....State.....

7/9/62

Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name

Street

CityZone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class
postage paid
at

Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last Monday in August and the first in September and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U. S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.