

Would It Have Seemed Less Subversive If They Carried Banners Against Democracy?

"One banner [in the Buddhist demonstration against the U.S. and the Huong government] paralleled a slogan of the Communist guerrillas, 'We desire democracy, freedom and peace for the Vietnamese people'."

—Another AP dispatch from Saigon implying that the Buddhists are fronts for the Reds, *N.Y. Times*, Jan. 23.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIII, NO. 4

February 2, 1965



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The Arms Lobby and LBJ's Great Society

Ours is a muscle-bound society. The job of shaking it loose from the conditioned reflexes imposed by its huge vested interests, and giving it new directions, is terribly difficult. Looked at from within the Budget Bureau, where the pressures converge and the hard decisions are made, Mr. Johnson and the men around him must feel that they have made a start. A poverty program has been launched, education expanded, a beginning of medicare is in sight, the steep rise in military spending since the Eisenhower Administration has been stopped; the arms budget is down a little.

Poverty and War

But this shift in emphasis should not put us off our guard. The new budget shows that the main concern of the government is still war; the main beneficiary of its vast expenditures, still the military bureaucracy and its Siamese twin, the armaments industry. The budget advertises a quadrupled appropriation for the attack on poverty, but the dimensions are still minuscule. The budget enables us to see in cold money terms the prime concerns of our society, and the prime determinants of policy. At one end of the scale, more than \$50 billions for the war machine, 50% of the administrative budget. At the other end of the scale, \$1.3 billion for that purely metaphorical "war on poverty", 1.3% of the budget. The total budget for space, that breeder of new Houston millionaires, that additional gravy train for missile and electronic makers, will get \$5.1 billion in the next fiscal year, or almost four times as much as the poverty program, though "quadrupled". \$1.3 billion divided among 35 million living a substandard existence figures out to a little over \$30 a year, or \$2.50 additional a month, hardly enough for an extra beer a day. If only somehow fat profits could be made out of building men, as they are out of building missiles, the poverty program might be something more than a bone tossed from a well-laden table. The fast buck is still in making and inventing ways to destroy, to kill and to waste.

Many grudge even the bone, and there is already grumbling from the military-industrial complex. Its authentic voice can be heard in David Lawrence's column (Jan. 25). The President in his defense message to Congress looked forward to a levelling-off in military expenditures, so that even "if we continue to spend the same amount of dollars annually" this will become a smaller percentage of a growing national income and release more funds "for other vital needs, both public and private." But who is to judge, Lawrence asked,

When We Last Saw Churchill

"The huge and garish Presidential room of the Statler was jammed. . . . Sir Winston, with that big cigar, looking more and more like the late W. C. Fields, brought the house down when he appeared, followed by Anthony Eden, who had the pleased and incredulous look of a small boy allowed to go along and watch a gifted grandpa do card tricks. Churchill was magnificent. I never expect in my lifetime to hear and see a greater man. Beyond the puckishness and the hamming, there came through with tremendous sincerity the last, desperate effort of a noble old man to stem the tide toward war. His plea for 'a good hard try' at peace and co-existence could not have been spoken in a more unfavorable context; such talk has long been regarded here as subversive. The atmosphere was vividly indicated for all time when Churchill felt it necessary to assure his audience that he was not a Communist!"

—From our Weekly, July 5, 1954, on the press conference in Washington at which Churchill, at the height of McCarthyism, pleaded unsuccessfully that the death of Stalin called for a reversal of Western policy toward Russia and China. All the obituaries recall that Churchill was the prime architect of the cold war; few, that he was also among the first to propose its end.

"whether the defense program is adequate and whether it can be measured primarily by the desire to spend more money on 'The Great Society'? Some of the top men in America's military establishment do not believe that such a rigid rule can be applied to defense expenditures. They do not wish to leave a stone unturned to obtain the most efficient armament that scientific minds can develop." That way lies a sky's-the-limit arms race.

Johnson and McNamara, in an effort to appease the military, seem to be resorting to a qualitative arms race. Looked at from the viewpoint of numbers, we have somewhat scaled down our projected strategic forces. Instead of 1200 intercontinental ballistic missiles, we are to have 1,000. This force will be supplemented by 900 long range bombers and 41 Polaris submarines, each with 16 missiles, or 656 in all. This adds up to a strategic striking force of 2,556. Just how stupendous this is may be seen if we realize that there are probably not more than a dozen prime targets in the Soviet Union; if these crucial industrial and urban areas were wiped out, its back would be broken. In terms of numbers, how-

(Continued on Page Four)

Plans for Three Highways By-Pass Kentucky's Poorest Rural Counties

This Year's Appalachia Bill Even More Disappointing Than Last Year's

It is a pity that the people of Appalachia have come to expect so much of the Appalachia Development Bill. They will be disappointed. The bill as unveiled at Senate hearings last week is about as resourceful as a surgeon who assumes in advance his patient cannot be saved. Administration witnesses spoke of making Appalachia "just like the rest of the Nation" in 20 years, but the bill betrays them. If this is really a long range development program, it is the only one we know of with such short range plans. The life of the Appalachia Commission expires in just six years. The bill is so innocuous that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other like groups did not bother to testify against it. It even lacks the usual handouts to big business, which in Appalachia means coal, chemicals and railroads. "We couldn't come up with any solutions that were acceptable to all involved," said John Sweeney, the chief federal planner, "and therefore we had best avoid it." Evasion is the bill's one distinctive trait. (Also see box below.)

A Self-Defeating Standard

This bill is even weaker than the one the Senate passed last summer. A new section has been added which requires federal funds to be concentrated in areas where there is "the greatest potential for future growth, and where the expected return on public dollars will be greatest." Shouldn't the government be as interested in need as in profit? Isn't this just a polite way of saying that the most impoverished areas will receive the least funds? If so, the addition is superfluous for the entire administrative procedure tends to by-pass the poorest areas. The federal government is not permitted to initiate any projects. The purpose of this is to foster local self-help, but the effect is to give unfair advantage to the well-organized, administratively sophisticated urban centers which already have had some experience with government programs. By the time the more backward communities submit development plans, there will be little money left.

This isn't merely cynical speculation. Near the close of its hearings the Senate Public Works Committee heard testimony from two representatives of Jackson County, Kentucky. Jackson has the lowest median family income in the state. This means that 60% of its families earn less than \$2,000 a year and 75% earn less than \$3,000. About 10% of its homes are graced with hot running water. There is maybe one lawyer in the county to help with development plans. Jackson's spokesmen told the Senate committee that what

Taking The Sting Out of Antitrust

"The Internal Revenue Service Ruling in TIR-615 is bad law, bad public policy, and bad public administration. It permits an antitrust offender, already convicted of a criminal antitrust violation, to deduct [from his income tax] the treble damages paid to his victims. The legal question before this Committee is whether conduct which constitutes a criminal antitrust violation is conduct that is 'ordinary and necessary . . . in carrying on any trade or business' within the meaning of the statute [governing] income tax deductions. From the standpoint of public policy, the question is whether the 'sting' of treble damages should be lessened by shifting from the shoulders of criminal antitrust offenders to the taxpayers approximately one-half of treble damage awards. From the standpoint of public administration, the question is whether the Internal Revenue Service by an administrative ruling, not subject to judicial review, should in effect amend the antitrust laws by mitigating treble damages. . . . The attitude that a violation of our antitrust laws, even a flagrant criminal price-fixing conspiracy, is no worse than a traffic ticket is the major premise of TIR-615."

—Rep. Celler (D., N.Y.), in a statement to the Joint Comm. on Internal Revenue Taxation, Jan. 22 (abr.).

Jackson and its four surrounding counties need most is a better highway. The present one, U.S. 421, is narrow and winding. It frightens off tourists and makes it hard to market the produce of the area. Highway construction is the central program in the Appalachia Bill and one would think that the Jackson region would be a priority target.

It isn't. When these Jackson men visited the state Appalachian planning office, they were told of tentative plans to build three highways all of which will neatly by-pass the poorest counties in Kentucky. There is no indication that the state will revise its plans, and Jackson is not entitled under the bill to appeal to Washington. All projects, according to another new amendment, must come through the state representative.

Appalachia's planners envision flourishing timber and tourist industries as the foundation of the region. Even if they are successful, the achievement is not an inspiring one. Timber is an uncertain business and some say demand is declining. Tourism is seasonal and low-paying. Surely this is not the best we can do. The bill is a challenge to Congressional liberals. We look to them for strengthening amendments.

Appalachia Gets Sewage Systems But Needs "Just Plain Water"

Sen. COOPER (R., Ky.): . . . Is there a gap in the [Appalachia] bill in that this section would not be available for the provision of just plain water to some community? I know it would provide sewage facilities . . . but there is no provision for water. And I know that there are many communities in my state, several county seats, which do not have any water facilities, they still use wells. In many cases, it is brackish mine water and very very dangerous to the health of the people and to the children in schools even. . . . I think we should correct that.

Mr. SWEENEY (Chairman, Federal Development Plan-

—Hearings on Appalachian Development Bill, Senate Public Works Committee, Jan. 19.

ning Committee for Appalachia): Senator, let me explain why it is not in the bill. We are aware of this. There are also no funds for school construction. It was our judgment and the President's judgment that until Congress had resolved this question nationally, we ought not to ask for a special program in Appalachia. When those two questions are resolved and there is a national program for water supply on a grant basis and also for school construction, . . . we [will be] in a position to recommend the needs Appalachia actually has. . . . This whole bill is an extension of existing programs to meet Appalachia's needs."