

The Easiest Bloodbath To "Prevent" Is The One We Ourselves Are Carrying On

"The whole concept of Vietnamization is wrong. What we have to be aiming for is to get the fighting stopped. I have very little patience with the people who talk about the

massacre that may happen at some future date if we withdraw, because there's a massacre going on now."

—Averell Harriman at Johns Hopkins, November 14.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVII, NO. 22

DECEMBER 1, 1969



WASHINGTON, D. C.

20 CENTS

Bitter Battles Lie Ahead

From my days as an editorial writer on one of the few pro-New Deal papers in the country, I remember how bitterly the Democrats complained about the hostility of the press and radio; they portrayed Roosevelt as a dangerous revolutionary. When he won his landslide victory in 1936 it was over their overwhelming opposition. We felt as the Nixon crowd does now that the news media were one-sided, but there are crucial differences between the two periods. Poor people don't own newspapers. The news media now as then are in wealthy, mostly conservative and largely Republican hands. It takes a lot of steam in the boiler before they turn against a Republican President. Their growing opposition testifies to the unpopularity of the war and the spreading suspicion that Nixon wants to hang on, whatever the cost, until he can get a political victory. Nixon might as well complain about the unfairness of the stock market. It has been going down steadily since it sized up the Nov. 3 speech as the signal for a prolonged war. Nothing Huntley ever said to Brinkley is as subversive as the Dow-Jones ticker. Wall Street—the citadel of the GOP—has lost confidence in Nixon and in Nixon's war.

As In The Athens of Papadopoulos

Nixon's real complaint is that the news media don't agree with him. Since the First Amendment doesn't require the press to agree with the President, he doesn't dare say this openly and instead charges unfairness. It is remarkable how little evidence of this the Administration is able to cite, after gathering transcripts from every TV station on what they said about the Nov. 3 speech. When Agnew—Nixon's Papadopoulos and official cleanser of the U.S. media—went on TV ten days later all he could offer was a scurrilous attack on Averell Harriman and a colorful but curiously vague bill of particulars. He complained about "a raised eyebrow, an inflection of the voice, a caustic remark dropped in the middle of a broadcast." What caustic remark? What insidious inflection? Whose raised eyebrow? Couldn't Klein find anything more specific? Is this Athens where the cops even watch eyebrows?

Equally feeble in its vagueness was Agnew's attack a week later on the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*. You'd think Agnew could do better than complaining about one story which missed the early edition and that the Pope's support for Nixon made page 11 instead of page 1. Is that all the White House researchers could find? Agnew was so desperate he made like a liberal at one point and attacked "monopolization of the news." We welcome him to the fold. But neither New York nor Washington are one-newspaper towns. In New York the pro-Nixon *Daily News* circulation is far bigger than the *Times* and the *Post* combined. In Wash-

Not Since Marie Antoinette

For sheer balderdash it would be difficult to exceed Herbert G. Klein's estimate: "Had it not been for the highly effective work of the Washington police, of the National Guard . . . for the reserve forces of the Defense Department and the complete cooperation of all elements of the government . . . the damage to Washington (Saturday night and the night before) would have been far greater than . . . the riots after the death of Martin Luther King." . . . Does anyone seriously believe that Washington's undermanned police force could contain 5,000 or 50,000 or 150,000 demonstrators bent on violence? . . . (T)he Nixon administration was less interested in trying to keep the march peaceful than in trying to make it seem less large and more violent than it really was, and in trying to scare the daylights out of that putative Silent Majority. . . . On Saturday and Sunday, the President by his own account was preoccupied with the football games. It was a fine afternoon for watching football, he is quoted as saying on Saturday, and for sheer piquancy, we have not heard the likes of that since Marie Antoinette.

—*Washington Post*, Nov. 18.

ington, both the *Daily News* and the *Star* are conservative and pro-Nixon (as is the *Washington Post* quite often, most recently on Haynsworth and, alternate days, on his war policy). It is true that just three days after Agnew spoke a Washington paper had the impudence to write—

From the first announcement of the Mobilization plans, the Administration reacted by building a wall of indifference and hostility between itself and the demonstrators. The opposition was generally classified as the product of either stupidity or subversion. There was little attempt to reason, and a massive effort at rejection.

But that was an editorial in the conservative *Star* (Nov. 23).

We are seeing a marriage of paranoias. Nixon has always felt (remember his outburst after he lost the Governorship in California) that the media were against him. The military and its supporters in the State Department and the White House have been grumbling about press coverage ever since the Vietnam intervention began. The animosity deepened every time the reporters were proven right and the Generals wrong. The baldest and most recent expression of the bureaucracy's delusions came when Gen. Walt of the Marines told a press conference in Danang (*Washington Post*, Nov. 23) that the war would have been over a year ago if the American people had supported Lyndon Johnson! He criticized the news media for failing to present a "positive" picture of the

(Continued On Page Four)

STOCK MARKETS IN TOKYO AND NEW YORK the week Nixon and Sato reached their Okinawa agreement provided a lesson in militarism and imperialism. Stripped of empire, under a Constitution which renounces war and regular armies, Japan has become the third biggest industrial power, second only to the U.S. in the "free world." Tokyo's booming stock exchange set a historic high; for the first time average stock values rose above 2,200 yen. Here, burdened with the costs of empire, including the policing of Asia, the stock market has been plummeting in despair over runaway inflation and the Vietnamese war that caused it. The Dow Jones index of industrials fell to 823, a loss of 26.13 in one week. Nixon wants Japan to rearm and to share the burden of policing Asia. The Okinawa agreement brings that closer by allowing U.S. bases in Japan to be used for Asian wars. We are edging Japan toward the use of nuclear weapons. What if these are turned against us? Last time there was a militaristic Japan it claimed to be policing Asia against Communism. But when it struck, it struck at Pearl Harbor. What folly to invite a repetition!

Take SALT With A Grain Of...

THE PRESS IS FULL OF EUPHORIC NONSENSE about the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks in Helsinki. The test is MIRV, which we are already installing in our nuclear submarines. If Nixon believed in arms *limitation*, he would have opened the Helsinki talks with a proposal for a halt in MIRV testing. By the time the second round of talks begin in Vienna, it will probably be too late. The stage is set for a new and expensive upward spiral in the arms race.

DESPITE HEAVY DELETIONS BY THE PENTAGON CENSORS—one deletion is 14 pages long—the newly released executive session testimony taken by the Symington subcommittee on our commitments to the Philippines contains some basic revelations. One is the ludicrous character of the supposed threats against which we have been giving the Philippines an average \$22.5 million a year for the past five years. Admiral Kauffman admitted the threat from China was "very small," and was even "loath" to admit there was a serious Communist threat inside the country. The total armed men of the Huks, in three separate groups, is given as 400 and their "mass base" as 30,000 to 35,000—out of a population of 37 million. Encounters with the Huks from January 1968 through August 1969 cost the Philippine armed forces 18 dead. If the internal menace grows, it will not be for lack of arms but for

Why Land Reform Lags In Saigon

Among the landowners who were once ready to support the plan, including many who either are members of the Assembly or are influential with various deputies or senators, the change of sentiment is directly tied to personal economic considerations that will be increasingly hard to challenge as the government's position in the countryside improves.

One expressed the sentiment of that growing group this way: "Six months ago, the land-to-the-tillers plan offered me a chance, to be perfectly frank, to get some American money for land that I had not even seen in years and that might have remained contested or in Viet Cong control for many more years. Now the government is moving into new areas in the countryside, and some of that land is beginning to look like it might be valuable again after all.

—"Thieu Proposal On Land Reform Is Losing Favor", Woodruff from Saigon; Baltimore Sun Nov. 30.

lack of land reform, on which the corrupt Filipino oligarchy is dragging its heels. No doubt the smart money in Manila figure that if a civil war does break out, we'll fight it for them, as in Vietnam.

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF FRENCH WRITERS in a letter signed among others by Jean-Paul Sartre and Vercors has protested (*Le Monde*, Nov. 19) the expulsion of Alexander Solzhenitsyn from the Soviet Writers' Union, declaring it incredible that "the fatherland of triumphant socialism" has done to so distinguished a writer what even the Czar Nicholas had not dared do to Chekhov after he exposed the treatment of convicts in his book *Sakhalin Island* (1891), as Solzhenitsyn did the Soviet penal system in *The First Circle* and *One Day in The Life of Ivan Denisovich*. We hope American writers will make a similar protest to the Soviet Embassy.

"MAXIMUM PUBLICITY FOR MINIMUM CUTS by duplicate announcements is Senator Proxmire's characterization of Laird's highly publicized economy drive at the Pentagon. The same cuts are cited over and over again as if they were new. Some of them, Proxmire pointed out, only mean bigger spending in the future. He cited three major examples. The \$200 million the Navy claims as savings in mothballing old ships will be more than offset by \$2.6 billion in new ship construction in fiscal '70. The Air Force advertises a \$320.9 million cut in purchases of the FB-111 bomber but is going ahead on a new bomber, now called the B-1—the prototypes alone will cost \$2 billion and the projected fleet of 200 from \$8 to \$12 billion. The Pentagon even lists as an economy a "saving"

Silent Majority? Or an Outpouring from Republican Regulars?

Q. The President is stating what he believes to be a fact, namely, that his policy does have the support of the majority of the people and those who oppose it are in the minority. I am asking you, does he have facts to back that up?

A. Are you familiar with the recent Gallup poll?

Q. Is that the basis on which he is making that judgment?

A. I would not say that is the basis on which he is making the judgment. I would say that is an indication of the support that the President has.

Q. In his appeal to the silent majority, would he like to see an organization of demonstrations in support of his policy just as there are demonstrations against it?

A. Let me put it this way. I think the fact that we have had the response that we have had in terms of telegrams and phone calls indicates that the President's address last night has been very well received by the country. I think

that the President made this clear.

Q. That 200,000-name telegram the President got this morning was done beforehand. So the President's speech did not have any effect on that. This was signed by people who agreed with him before.

A. Yes.

Q. I am wondering if you got any feeling of how many people who were phoning or telegraphing actually had their mind changed by the President last night as against how many people are doing what the Republican National committee asked them to do in sending in their support.

A. As you know, the President in his address last night did not solicit telegrams or phone calls.

Q. He did solicit support however.

A. That is correct.

—Ron Ziegler's White House A.M. press briefing Nov. 4.