

### The President Draws A Clear Line Between Himself and Goldwater on Peace

Q. Mr. President, I wonder if you feel, sir, if Senator Goldwater's rather bellicose statements on attitude toward the Communists and our foreign policy in general has increased the difficulties of this Government in its relations with its allies abroad?

A. . . . I have not the slightest doubt but what the uppermost problem in the mind of every American and the mind of most people of the world is how to live with our fellow man and how to achieve peace in this period in which we

live in.

And as long as I am permitted to hold the office that I now occupy, no single statement of mine—and no single act of mine is going to be in the direction of provoking a war. And I'm going to utilize every resource at the command of the Federal government and all of its people and all—and command the intelligence of all the people of both parties to try to find the road to peace."

—President Johnson's news conference July 18.

# I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XII, NO. 26

JULY 27, 1964



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

## Goldwater Rallies An Odd Tribe for A Strange War

The process of picking a presidential candidate bears only a distant relation to sober discussion of political issues. To see one in action is to see first of all that politics is a form of sports; the atmosphere in the crowded lobbies of the St. Francis and the Mark Hopkins in San Francisco, where each candidate had his rooters and his pennants, was much like that before a football game. At some of the most exciting moments, the convention seemed to call for coverage by an anthropologist. To descend from the galleries into the depths on the Cow Palace floor during one of the many demonstrations was to dive into a brightly lit jungle, a high forest of banners, with the horns blaring and the drums beating, as if for tribal war. At duller moments, during the long stretches of venerable clichés in the nominating speeches, the convention seemed to provide a psychic massage through semantic manipulation; all those familiar phrases about free enterprise began to seem like incantations, handed down from the past as sure formulas for the ills of the body politic. The platform could be read as ritual, as a form of verbal magic, the reassuring recitation of a secular mass.

### The Insecurity of the Rich

We are familiar with the politics of insecurity when it exploits the insecurities of the poor. At the Republican convention one could see in action the politics which plays on the insecurity of the rich. The Goldwaterites made their appeal to people who were afraid—rich, powerful, fortunate beyond any dominant class in history, yet afraid. Some of the fears were obvious: fear of losing their property and power, fear lest the value of their dollars be diminished by the inflation which accompanies the welfare state. Above all they did not want to lose the old familiar devil of their neatly Manichean universe, the need for a devil being as deep as the need for a God. Communism as the devil had long been one of the main pillars in the edifice of their simple faith. Now it, too, was threatened by more sophisticated and pragmatic attitudes.

Goldwater expressed their alarm when he told the platform committee, "I was surprised, and am concerned, that during these Platform hearings, mention even of the word 'Com-

### LBJ Puts McCarthyism Into The Campaign

"I criticized Senator McCarthy for practices he employed. I voted to censure him, as did every Democrat who was present at that time."

—Johnson at his press conference of July 18.

"Like him or not, McCarthy is the strongest voice now speaking in America against Communism. . . . To remove such a man from honor and influence in America at this juncture would be a strong victory for Moscow in the field of American public opinion . . . a propaganda triumph for the Attlees, the Mendes-Frances, and the double-talking co-existence-with-Russia crowd here at home."

—Goldwater against censure: Senate, Nov. 12, 1954.

munism' has been the exception rather than the rule." He complained that "even in the keynote address" it seemed to be taboo. "This Administration," he protested, "pretends that Communism has so changed that we can now accommodate it. Our party cannot go the final and fatal step and pretend that it doesn't even exist." They didn't want to hear about the differences between Russia and China or the deviationist tendencies in Rumania or to be told that some Communists were better than others. They wanted their old comfortable picture of a monolithic Communism restored. A pragmatism without a devil frightened them more than a Communism without a God. To realize that even at Republican platform hearings people had stopped speaking of Communism seemed to them almost impious, if not evidence of the subtlest Communist plot of all.

The Goldwaterite picture of themselves, as of their hero, is as distant from reality as the rest of the private universe they are defending. The frontier virtues they claim to embody are as synthetic as the frontier they inhabit. Their desert is air-conditioned and landscaped; their covered wagons are Cadillacs; their chaps are from Abercrombie & Fitch; their money, like their candidate's, is mostly inherited from grandpappy, or acquired with their wives. In their favorite campaign photos, on that horse and under that 10-gallon Stetson,

(Continued on Page Two)

looking into the setting sun, is no cowboy or even rancher but a Phoenix storekeeper. The Western trade he caters to, in business as in politics, is dude ranch.

### The Promoter of "Antsy-Pants"

This he-man's claim to fame in business is the development of "antsy-pants," men's underdrawers decorated with ants, a cute specialty item he advertised some years back in the wide open spaces of Manhattan through the *New Yorker* magazine. He roughs it in a \$150,000 gadget-filled show-place of a home, designed, his architect said, as "a rough-hewn house for a rough-hewn guy," a sort of de luxe model log-cabin to give one that authentic latter day Lincoln decor. Low education and low intelligence, Goldwater once declared to the delight of his equally well-upholstered followers, are the real causes of poverty. One wonders what he, who did not last out more than one year of college, would have done if a family fortune and a family business did not await him back home. What he preaches is the same "rugged individualism" with which Herbert Hoover sought to combat the New Deal 30 years ago. Its essential phoniness could not have found a more perfect embodiment. The crowning touch is that this half-Jewish grandson of a Polish Jewish peddler who won acceptance for himself and his family on the tolerant frontier should emerge into politics as the hero of the racist forces in our society. It's enough to make one anti-Episcopalian.

This Mr. Conservative of 1964 is quite different from Taft, the Mr. Conservative of 1952. In foreign policy Taft was an isolationist; he wanted to keep the country out of trouble. Goldwater, if not exactly an internationalist, is an ultra-nationalist, who's ready to get into trouble anywhere. Taft fought NATO; Goldwater wants to strengthen it with nuclear weapons. Taft was what used to be called a Republican standpatter but with progressive fringes; Scranton was right when he declared several times in San Francisco that on such specific issues as labor, education and housing, he was closer to Taft than was Goldwater. In the political spectrum Goldwater is half reactionary, half rightist European style. The same man who, in *The Conscience of A Conservative*, wrote that "our tendency to concentrate power in the hands of a few men deeply concerns me" could also say on ABC-TV's *Issues and Answers* (April 7, 1963), "I don't object to a dictatorship as violently as some people do because I realize that not all people in this world are ready for democratic processes. If they have to have a dictator in order to keep

### Goldwater on War and Peace

(With A Postscript by Dick Gregory)

"We should get back to the Eisenhower-Dulles doctrine of brinkmanship, where everybody knows we have the power and will use it."

—Press Conference, Hartford, Conn., Oct. 24, 1963.

"We do not, of course, want to achieve victory by force of arms. If possible, overt hostilities should always be avoided; especially is this so when a shooting war may cause the death of many millions of people, including our own. But we cannot, for that reason, make avoidance of a shooting war our chief objective."

—*The Conscience of A Conservative* (1960).

"If Goldwater gets in in November and Khrushchev makes him mad, ain't none of us gonna have no civil rights."

—Dick Gregory in San Francisco at the Hungry I.

Communism out, then I don't think we can object to that." It is no wonder that his nomination was regarded with dismay abroad everywhere but in Franco Spain and South Africa, and among the neo-Fascists of Italy and Germany. For this has been one of the principal alibis for Fascism ever since the March on Rome. Il Duce, too, only acted to save Italy from Communism, and there are Rightists who would emulate him here if they could.

The menace of the Goldwater movement, however, is not that its ranks are full of "kooks" but that on the contrary most of those who showed up at the convention were upper middle class solid citizens, no more (or less) looney than their fathers were 30 years ago when the American Liberty League and the Un-American Activities Committee under Martin Dies readily led them to believe the New Deal was a Communist plot, and that American workers then, like Mississippi Negroes today, would be wholly content were it not for foreign agitators and conspirators. Even the Southern delegation, whose headquarters at the Jack Tar I visited, in no way matched the dangerously delusive picture of this movement as made up of little old ladies in tennis shoes. The one Texan I talked to there said Johnson would probably carry Texas. Every one of the half dozen Southern delegates I talked with put "fiscal responsibility" not civil rights as the No. 1 issue. Whether this was how they really felt I have no way of knowing but I believe it was an accurate reflection of a major concern. The retired bulk large

### Views That Make Goldwater A Favorite With Germany's Rightists and Military Men

"Q. Do you want to give more military strength to Germany, too?"

"A. Yes, in fact, I'll say this—not because you're here in the interest of a German magazine—that I think the peace of this world depends upon a large measure to a constant alliance between our country and Germany. I think we have to work—although I can't suggest any route—to a united Germany. This is the one deterrent that has always worked against Russia.

"An alliance with Germany I think is imperative. I think two wars have demonstrated it. And I say this with all due respect to our military: had not Germany in both wars been subjected to the command of men—of a man in any case—who didn't understand war, I think Germany would have

won both of them."

—Goldwater's interview with *Der Spiegel*, June 30.

"I wouldn't be afraid of an armed Germany again. I think it's worth the risk, because the only country in this world that Russia really fears is Germany—armed. And if West Germany were armed we might find a solution for this [Berlin] problem. It might cause trouble, but I think it would be worth the effort. . . .

"Germany is a country we must keep as our ally this time. We've been in two scrapes with them and nearly lost both of them. Germany, had she been more wisely led militarily in the last war, would have conquered Russia and probably have seen an end to Communism, at least temporarily." —Radio Interview, *Fed. Women's Club*, 4/28/63.