

The Day Goldberg Told the UN We Were Only Fighting to Save Freedom in Vietnam

"We seek only to insure the independence of South Vietnam . . . and opportunity for its people to determine their own future . . . by the principles of self-determination."

—Ambassador Goldberg at the United Nations, Sept. 23.

"At Da Nang, three persons were executed by a South Vietnamese firing squad. The execution, held in a soccer stadium, was postponed at the last minute until midnight . . . because news photographers refused to obey an order that no pictures be taken until the final shot had been fired. The three were among five persons arrested Monday during a demonstration by about 200 persons in downtown

Da Nang. They were protesting crop damage from artillery fire and air strikes by U.S. forces."

—Same day, Chicago Daily News from Saigon.

" . . . the fourth man would be executed later, but at the moment he was giving valuable information. He was described as 'a singing bird.' The fifth demonstrator, a woman, was sentenced to life in prison although the demonstration had been so small that few were even aware of it."

—From UPI account same day Washington Daily News.

These are the people now described as "terrorists" for whose death two Americans were killed in reprisal.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIII, NO. 32

OCTOBER 4, 1965

WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

The Grimy Foundations of the UN's Shaky Success

A few plain observations, free from humbug, may help to clarify the continued crisis over Kashmir. The first concerns the role of China. This is the second dispute on China's borders which the U.S., this time with the aid of the U.S.S.R., is trying to settle without Chinese participation. If it means peace, we hope they succeed. But in the long run, China cannot be shut out of such problems. It is as if Russia and China, between them, working through the UN, were settling a quarrel between Mexico and Panama while excluding us not only from the negotiations but even from the UN itself. We would make trouble in such a case. So, within the limits of its power, is China. A further point must be noted. The border quarrel over Sikkim between China and India concerns an historic invasion route; troops can move south through it into India, or North through it into China as Britain did in the 19th Century. The disputed Ladakh area in the north-west adjoining Kashmir also offers an historic invasion route from Western Asia into Tibet. The Chinese feel about our intrusion in these borderland quarrels as we did about Maximilian in Mexico.

Kashmir and Suez

Our self-congratulations about using the UN in the Kashmir dispute are becoming nauseous. This is another case of using the UN when it serves our purposes to do so, as in the Suez and Congo affairs. We use the UN as a buffer where we do not wish to take too open a position in a quarrel between friends, and where the quarrel threatens to upset our over-all strategy in our own bigger quarrels with Russia or China. In the Suez crisis, we didn't want to upset the oil-bearing Arabs or too much antagonize the British and French. Long before the Kashmir fighting broke out, we turned hostile to Pakistan when it left the cold war camp, sought Chinese aid as a counterpoise to India and gave China air landing rights. This broke the wall of containment around China and enabled its plane services to reach Africa and Europe. We'd like Pakistan humbled just enough to bring it back in our camp, but not enough to drive it further into the arms of China.

Strange Lovers of Peace

"The members of the UN, under the Charter, share a common responsibility to demonstrate to those who use violence that violence does not pay."

—Ambassador Goldberg at the UN Sept. 23 arguing against admission of Communist China.

"Justice Goldberg can't have it both ways. Who is at war and who isn't? Are the Chinese fighting anywhere? They may be doing some propaganda needling here and there. But it's you Americans in Vietnam and British in Sarawak and Aden, and Indians in Kashmir. . . . Now take Mr. Goldberg's argument against self-defense. . . . Was it self-defense when Britain and France invaded Suez? When Russians started mowing down people in Budapest? Was it self-defense to go into the Dominican Republic?"

—An African diplomat from one of the 10 nations backing Peking's admission to the UN, as quoted in the Christian Science Monitor next day.

This would happen if we openly shelved the long promised plebiscite in Kashmir; this can be done more tactfully through the UN. Neither we nor the Russians will press for the plebiscite, since that would antagonize India and both see India as an ally against China. Yet the coincidence of Russo-American interests in Kashmir, as in the Suez crisis, may again save peace and establish a valuable peace-keeping precedent. The UN, like every other edifice, must be forgiven its grimy foundations.

Just as the big powers have an interest in preventing war between India and Pakistan, so the small and middle powers have an interest in preventing war between the U.S. and China. They see China's admission to the UN as a means of ameliorating China's intransigence, which is more a matter of words than deeds anyway. But here we refuse to reciprocate, and Ambassador Goldberg's opening address to the General Assembly was given a cool reception not only because of its banality but because of its self-righteousness about China.

(Continued on Page Four)

AFL-CIO's Latin Labor Affiliate Only Latin Voice Raised In Favor of Interventionism

ADA's Don Edwards Says Selden Resolution Had "Tacit Support" of LBJ

Those members of Congress who understand the dangers implicit in our Latin American interventionism ought not to wait for a new crisis before speaking out again. A campaign of education is essential before new crises arise. One is building up over the government's attempt to organize an OAS force which, under the guise of peace-keeping, can be used as an interventionist tool against governments we consider too left for safety. The opposition to such a force is strong in every Latin country except those like Brazil, Paraguay, Nicaragua, and Guatemala which are ruled by the military with our aid. The second crisis may arise in the Dominican Republic if and when it looks as if Bosch or a Bosch candidate may win over Balaguer, the Trujillo leftover our oil and sugar interests favor.

Even Pro-American Papers Protest

The Selden resolution upholding unilateral intervention against the threat of "subversion" should be regarded as a blessing in disguise for it has awakened the whole hemisphere to the danger. Even conservative papers in Brazil, Colombia and Mexico, which normally support U.S. policy, have condemned it. Conservative legislators joined moderates in the unanimous resolution of condemnation passed by the parliaments of Peru and Colombia. The only voice in favor of the Selden resolution came from ORIT, the Latin American affiliate of the AFL-CIO (*Wash. Post*, Sept. 26, from Mexico City). Dodd criticized Fulbright for not quoting ORIT's statement in favor of the Dominican intervention!

When Rosenthal (D. N.Y.) told the House in the debate over the Selden resolution Sept. 20 that it threatened anarchy, he was not exaggerating. The resolution would allow any country in the hemisphere to intervene when it saw a danger of "subversion" in a neighbor. Uruguay, the oldest democratic regime in the hemisphere, has been alarmed by indications that the Brazilian and Argentine military were conspiring to intervene in Uruguay. The military we arm can carry on little imperialistic ventures of their own under cover of so vague a mandate as that afforded by the Selden resolution. Alarm is increased because our favorite Latin ally is now Brazil where the military are moving toward a Salazar type dictator-

The Alliance Against Progress

"The big bottleneck to progress . . . is the factions in the nations of Latin America that cling to the past and to their present power. . . . So long as these elements are aided and encouraged by the U.S. military aid missions and CIA . . . they will continue to block essential economic reform. . . . Many of these Latin American oligarchies and would-be dictators are using the American military to stay in power. They count on its gullibility, and our overriding obsession with Communism, to hold back the tide that would otherwise sweep them away."

—Morse in the Senate supporting Fulbright, Sept. 16.

ship, and where the *Tribuna da Imprensa*, organ of the nationalist Lacerda has just published the text of an alleged secret document in which Tom Mann offered Brazil the command of an inter-American military force (*Le Monde*, Sept. 23).

Brademas (D. Ind.) one of those who spoke out against the Selden resolution (passed 315-52) told the House he had been unable to get the State Department to say whether it was for or against the resolution. This was the line to which the liberals held in the debate to avoid a frontal attack on the Administration. But Don Edwards (D. Cal.) to his credit let out the truth when he told the ADA's national board (*Baltimore Sun*, Sept. 26) that the resolution had the "tacit approval" of the Administration.

That lack of candor Fulbright charged against the Administration extends to Congress. Clark (D. Pa.) in a speech supporting Fulbright complained (Sept. 17) that even the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was unable to hear three key Administration witnesses, albeit in executive session. One was John Bartlow Martin, who profited from his quick stay as Johnson's emissary in the Dominican Republic by selling a story to *Life* magazine which Clark called "highly inaccurate" but which pandered to the alarmist views spread by Luce. The second was special Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker. The third was McGeorge Bundy, the President's special emissary. "At one point," Clark told the Senate, "he said he would come and have tea with us, but then he refused even to do that."

A Rare Friendly U.S. Report on Cuba: It Illustrates What Fulbright Meant

"Cuba today is not the island of misery, oppression and starvation pictured by many Americans. Neither has Cuba achieved the unity and economic success claimed by the supporters of Fidel Castro. However, a 3-1/2 week visit traveling from one end of the Communist outpost to the other suggests that the present reality lies closer to the Castro hopes. . . . His popularity is immense. . . .

"The basic reason Fidel and his revolution continue to be popular despite Cuba's many difficulties is that the people now have something of overriding value that they previously lacked—dignity. Part of the Cuban resentment stems from the feeling that Cuban dignity had been affronted by U.S. economic domination. . . .

"Negroes, some 30% of the population, are particularly pro-Fidel. . . . Formerly landless farm workers . . . are another source of total support. . . . Before Castro, Cuban agriculture was dominated by immense sugar plantations owned mostly by foreigners, particularly Americans. . . .

Much of the expropriated land was given to landless peasants. . . .

"Despite the success of the Castro regime, there are many opponents who feel that the improvements will be more than cancelled out by the permanent loss of any hope of ever building a free society. They are men who would have built the liberal, democratic Cuba which American policy-makers say they want. But before the revolution, they were unable to make headway, primarily because of the indifference and insensitivity of the American government. . . .

"We must understand that it is in our national interest to encourage certain revolutionary changes, even when they include nationalizing American business holdings. If we attempt to block the needed changes, we may delay them temporarily, but they will inevitably come, dictated then by a new Fidel Castro."

—C. K. McClatchy, associate editor of the Sacramento Bee, condensed in the Washington Post Sept. 26.