

## ... New York's Pro-War Parade Was A Rightist Pro-Buckley Demonstration

London by the Foreign Office. Here Murray Marder (*Washington Post*, Oct. 30) was the only State Department reporter to give the story the coverage it deserved. "Officially", the Department told him, the report had not yet been received in Washington, though a copy was available at the Canadian Embassy. Unanimous reports by the ICC are rare. The failure to make this report public all these months must have embittered Prince Sihanouk.

### The New York Demonstrations

The press belittled New York's anti-war parade of Oct. 16 and exaggerated the size of the pro-war parade Oct. 30. Most papers out in the country used the figure of 65,000 for the pro-war, which its backers claimed in advance; New York papers scaled this down to 25,000. Fact is that the two parades were about equal in size. "The protest parade," Rasa Gustaitis of the *New York Herald-Tribune* (Oct. 31) noted in the best account, "had lasted slightly longer." Fifth Avenue was lined with a friendly crowd for the anti-war parade. "But whole blocks were empty," Miss Gustaitis noted of the pro-war parade. While the press and TV focus on beatniks in peace ranks, there was little notice taken of the fact that it was a small organized gang of young louts who ran alongside the peace parade, shouting insults and hurling eggs and paint. (I myself in the first row of the peace parade got hit with an egg, fortunately fresh.) Similar vigilante elements attacked pro-peace spectators during the pro-war parade. This was organized by the New York *Journal-American*, mobilized professional anti-Communist organizations and turned into a pro-Buckley rally. No other candidate for Mayor appeared on the reviewing stand, but Senator Javits turned up, explaining that he did so to "show my opinion," but added that this did not change his desire for negotiation, thus planting his feet firmly in both camps.

### Big Brother Here, Too

The memoirs of Col. Penkovsky, "our man in the Kremlin",

### War of Nerves Dept.

"The RAF and the U.S. Air Force have produced a joint target plan for all-out nuclear and conventional attacks on China should the need arise. The coordinated plan could be put into operation at short notice. Permission for its execution has to be given by the Prime Minister or the President. The plan was drawn up to avoid confusion over targets, which might have resulted in one air force destroying the other by an uncoordinated attack on the same place at the same time. It will also prevent 'over-kills' of targets and will mean that no target is overlooked by both countries . . . The sort of situation that would trigger it off would be Chinese intervention against either Vietnam or India. This would mean instant retaliation by Britain or America, or both. Whether nuclear or high explosive weapons were used would depend on the sort of attack made by China."

—London Daily Telegraph, Oct. 18.

are being serialized in the U.S. press. Frank Gibney explained in his introduction to the second installment (*Washington Post*, Nov. 1) why this Soviet professional soldier and General Staff officer turned against his own country. Gibney said Penkovsky was "increasingly appalled by the network of spies and informers" in the Soviet Union "fully eight years after de-Stalinization had supposedly thawed Soviet society." We seem to be moving in the same direction. On NBC's "The Big Ear" program (Oct. 31) a former U.S. Army intelligence agent disclosed that he tapped Eleanor Roosevelt's private telephone conversations. A society in which snoopers spy even on a First Lady is badly infected with totalitarian attitudes. That was in 1943. Since then our gumshoe apparatus has mushroomed. There are now 12 different U.S. spy agencies represented on our U.S. Intelligence Board, with technical devices undreamed of a decade ago. The secret police are more powerful in the Soviet Union than here but the growth rate of ours seems to be faster.

### British Press Reports Out of China Support Japanese Rather Than U.S. Views

The Communist Chinese recently took a group of English writers on a junket to Peking. Their reports are beginning to appear in the British press. These seem to agree on the whole with the Japanese rather than the official U.S. position on China. The contrasting views were presented in a debate at Arden House last week-end by Wm. P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, with Dr. Matsumoto, of Tokyo's International House. The former pictured Peking as irretrievably expansionist and warlike. The latter insisted that we take the belligerent statements of its leaders too seriously, that they are primarily concerned with internal development.

This is also the impression in the first three British reports we have seen: in the London Times (Oct. 26); in the Manchester Guardian (*Washington Post*, Oct. 28) and by Hugh Trevor-Roper in the London Sunday Times (Oct. 31). Trevor-Roper's report, the most critical of the three, reflects the boredom of the foreign visitor deluged by the interminable propaganda in China, and by its smugness and parochialism. But he finds the comparison with Hitler Germany unfair: "The basic note of aggression is lacking." He ends by predicting that the fanaticism and puritanism, like that of the Bolsheviks, will give way to more comfortable co-existence policies "if capitalism in the

rest of Asia is detached from 'colonialism'." This is an important if.

In Russia, revolutionary intransigence began to die out with internal improvement and national security. "So long as Peking does nothing rash," the London Times reported, "the days of civil war and famine seem finally to be over. Peasants and workers are guaranteed some kind of minimal subsistence level, and this is an enormous improvement on pre-1949 days." U.S. policy hates to admit that Communism can work and our hard-liners are as unwilling as Peking's to practice co-existence in Asia.

The Manchester Guardian's reporter was "struck by the absence" in China of "the appalling squalor and poverty" in India and Indonesia. Unless we can help end that poverty, we may find ourselves fighting more Vietnams. "If the people of India, or Pakistan, or Burma," Senator Robert F. Kennedy said in a thoughtful plea for a much greater foreign aid effort in New York City Oct. 22, "do not believe their system is worth fighting for, each new crisis" will raise for us the question of military intervention. This, the Senator said, would be "terribly costly in the lives of our young men." And of a wider conflagration in Asia. This is why Japan fears Peking's tough talk less than our ideological rigidity and military reflexes.

## Brazil's Military Consider Its No. 1 Social Reformer Their No. 1 Enemy

(Continued from Page One)

despite the sacrifices imposed on wage-earners in the name of stopping inflation. Newspapers were also forbidden to publish statements by persons who have had their political rights taken away from them by the military, persons like former President Kubitschek.

### The Real Father of The Alliance for Progress

To focus on Kubitschek is to light up what is happening in Brazil. The Alliance for Progress really originated in Kubitschek's proposal two years earlier for an Operation Pan America. Under his presidency 1956-60, Brazil had one of the greatest periods of development in its history. Its growth rate was about double its rate of population increase. Though this was accompanied by the galloping inflation endemic in Latin America, the benefits of prosperity were widely shared. It is revealing that today Kubitschek is the No. 1 target of the Brazilian military. He has been deprived of political rights and subjected to constant interrogation at the expense of his health. It was the victory of his party in five of the recent gubernatorial elections which led the military to suspend the Constitution, and to forbid the press to publish anything he might say. The man who comes closest to being Brazil's hope for leadership in the direction of democratic and peaceful reform is regarded as No. 1 enemy by the military with support. Our primary concern under Johnson and Mann is not social change for the benefit of the masses as envisaged by Kennedy but the maintenance, by force if necessary, of what is called a favorable climate for U.S. investment in Brazil. Such climates, though made favorable today, risk being paid for by an explosive popular resentment tomorrow.

Another primary concern of the Johnson-Mann era is to maintain in power in Brazil the one major military force in the hemisphere on which we can count for such joint operations as our recent intervention in the Dominican Republic. There is something risible about a crusade to make the Western Hemisphere safe for democracy when its chief supporters with our approval set up a military dictatorship in their own country.

All this merits more than a casual glance as if at a distant error of policy. What if the military in Brazil were to be confronted by a mass uprising for the restoration of democratic liberties? What if the military were to split, as they did in the Dominican Republic and one faction to fight for restoration of the Constitution? What if Castelo Branco and his hard-line Army Chief of Staff, Costa e Silva, were in danger of being overthrown? Would we be asked to intervene in their defense? Would another Communist menace be conjured up, with the names and addresses of 57 agitators? Would we be told that American lives and property were in danger? Whether in Brazil or elsewhere in Latin America, future crises of this sort can easily be envisaged. The time to think about them is now before they happen. "After Indochina," a U.S. Special Forces lieutenant in Vietnam told the French novelist Jean Lartéguy (*Paris Match*, Oct 16), "we will have our Algeria. It will be South America." It could some day cost a lot of American lives to try and undo what our military proteges are now doing in Brazil.

### Alliance for Militarism—Not Progress

"News of the seizure of dictatorial power by the Brazilian military junta marks a disastrous reversal for liberty in Latin America. What is even worse is the continuation of American financial backing for such a regime. By so doing we are transforming the Alliance for Progress into an alliance for progressive militarism in the Western hemisphere. The semantics from Washington and from the Brazilian cabal, seeking to allay fears for democratic institutions in that great nation, will not fool any but those who want to be fooled.

"Abolition of political parties, suspension of legislative acts, destruction of constitutional rights, and rule by the fiat of those who seized power by force in the first place are hallmarks of totalitarianism. They look no better when they are supported by the U.S. in Brazil than when they are supported by the Soviet Union in Cuba. This military dictatorship in Brazil will in fact be a great aid to Communism to the south, for Communism has always fared best under military dictatorships. We will not restore the true intent of the Alliance for Progress until we restore the policy of the Kennedy Administration of suspending financial aid to coup governments."

—Wayne Morse (D.-Oregon), Oct. 29.

**We Deeply Appreciate The Diligence of Readers Who Send Us Clippings from Their Local Papers**

**I. F. Stone's Weekly** 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20015

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

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

11/8/65

For the enclosed \$5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

For \$5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

**I. F. Stone's Weekly**

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class

postage paid

at

Washington, D. C.

**NEWSPAPER**

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July 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.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG  
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED