

... What We Could Do At Home With A 10-Year \$500 Billion Program

has sometimes been primarily for military purposes: "During the 1950s, for example, 'economic' aid to Laos paid for the entire military budget in that country." A total of 78 countries have received U.S. military assistance since 1950. As part of this military aid program "some 10,000 foreign military personnel are trained annually by the U.S. at 175 centers in this country and at other locations overseas." The training includes "counter-insurgency," i.e. repressing social discontent by force.

Strange "Frontiers of Freedom"

Our own rival in imperialism is the Soviet Union, but it is a distant second in the power struggle. While we have 1.2 million men in more than 33 countries, it has 320,000 troops stationed outside its borders in four East European countries. The Brehznev doctrine is modelled on the Monroe Doctrine, and the Caracas corollary. This has made the Russians more unpopular than any other people in Eastern Europe, as we are unpopular in "our" part of the world. Just as Russia stifles liberalism in the Soviet bloc, we tend to stifle it in many of the countries under our control. Czechoslovakia and Greece are sisters in suffering. The military on both sides prefer hard-line regimes. Truman in March, 1947, pledged the U.S. to "support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure." In Greece, where the Truman Doctrine started, as in Vietnam, we now find ourselves supporting armed minorities in subjugating the majority, non-Communist and Communist alike. The "Frontiers of Freedom" around the Eurasian rim from Greece through Iran to Taiwan are manned by dictators. Each of these countries is a potential Vietnam.

Vietnam may end, but the effort to police the world goes on. Hardly a day passes without some story from the Pentagon about budgetary cuts but the details remain suspiciously vague. *Aviation Week* for Oct. 27 says Nixon has approved spending levels over the next five-year planning period at the Pentagon of \$70 to \$75 billion a year. If the new level for the next five years assumes an end of the Vietnam war, then it means a rise of 40% to 50% from the level of fiscal '65 just before Johnson sent in combat troops and Americanized the war.

Progress of Self-Determination in Saigon

President Thieu's moribund 6-party "ruling alliance", touted last spring as a move to "broaden" South Vietnam's government, lost one of its major members today. Trinh Quoc Khanh, leader of the Social Democratic party, led his splinter faction of the Hoa Hao religious sect out of the alliance, asserting that the President's coalition currently "cannot do any good for the country." . . . The political alliance that the Hoa Hao left today never attracted more than six right-wing splinter groups, and Mr. Thieu never displayed any willingness to share power even with the leaders of these groups . . . The inability of the alliance to hold one of its few important members . . . can only add to the Saigon regime's almost total reliance on the military.

—Woodruff from Saigon in Baltimore Sun Oct. 25.

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1965, the total budget outlay "by function" for the military was \$49.5 billion. A post-Vietnam level of \$70 to \$75 billion would mean a stepup of from \$20 to \$25 billion.

These figures show it is not enough just to get out of Vietnam, or even as Mansfield told the Senate Oct. 20 to get out of Southeast Asia "lock, stock and barrel"—after neutralizing it with an international agreement in which the Soviets and Communist China would be asked to join. Without a major shift away from the idea of a Pax Americana, there will be scant resources left for reconstruction at home. It is imperialism and militarism which must be recognized as our enemies. The Pentagon is fighting a rear guard action on bases and personnel, as it is on Vietnam, making no more concessions than necessary to appease public opinion. Richard J. Barnet in his admirable new book *The Economy of Death* (Atheneum: \$2.95) concludes that the militarization of America is now our No. 1 national security problem and warns that after Vietnam "there are waiting in the Pentagon wings 13 major new weapons systems which will move inexorably toward production and deployment unless the juggernaut is stopped." That is why we have to talk of militarism and imperialism and not just of Vietnam.

Nixon's Cry of "Character Assassination" A Way to Smear Haynsworth's Critics

"The President charges opponents of the Haynsworth nomination with 'vicious character assassination.' Personally and on behalf of the AFL-CIO, I resent this charge. The AFL-CIO privately conveyed to the President—before the nomination—as much as we then knew about the Judge's involvement in Carolina Vend-A-Matic. The President ignored our plea. The President has attacked 'piecemeal disclosure' of Judge Haynsworth's financial interests. The blame for this lies with the Judge and the Justice Department.

On June 2, before the Senate subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, the Judge declared: 'Of course, when I went on the bench I resigned from all such business associations, directorships and things of that sort.' The Senate hearings have shown this was not true. Judge Haynsworth finally admitted that he was not only a director of Vend-A-Matic but a vice-president until 1963. As the record demonstrates, approximately half of his wealth was involved in Vend-A-Matic. He owned 15 percent of the company which became a valuable investment only after he went on the bench.

"Neither the Textile Workers Union of America nor apparently the other members of the court were aware of the

Judge's substantial involvement with Vend-A-Matic. While on the bench he continued to serve as a vice-president, attended weekly luncheon meetings of the directors and received directors' fees. He was a trustee of Vend-A-Matic's pension and profit sharing plan and shared responsibility for the plan's failure to comply with the law by filing annual reports with the Labor Department. His wife was a Vend-A-Matic officer for two years while he was on the bench including the time when the Darlington decision was handed down.

In 1957, when he went on the bench, Vend-A-Matic gross sales were \$453,110. In 1963 when he resigned as a Vend-A-Matic official, gross sales were \$3,160,665. For an original investment of approximately \$3,000 in 1950, Judge Haynsworth received \$437,500 in 1964. It must be remembered that Vend-A-Matic was dependent upon the textile industry. Darlington was a key case in the industry's battle against unionization of its workers. Judge Haynsworth volunteered none of these connections until questioned by members of the Judiciary Committee. Why did he and the Justice Department conceal the size of his financial involvement in Carolina Vend-A-Matic?"

—Statement by George Meany (abridged) Oct. 22.

After Ten Months Still No Nixon Negotiating Position?

(Continued From Page One)

risk. Had this been said by the President at a White House conference, it would have reverberated in the headlines. One can only conclude that these are headlines Nixon did not want, that he is going into the talks half-heartedly.

Even Undecided On MIRV

Apparently after ten months of preparation, the Administration hasn't even decided just what it will propose in these talks. The *Washington Star* (Oct. 26) quoted unnamed officials as saying that they "expected the National Security Council to meet soon and decide exactly what should be proposed in Helsinki." This would explain why Rogers was so vague and cautious. He declined even to say what was meant by "strategic arms." He evaded a question as to whether there was "any thought on our part of proposing some sort of limitation on anti-ballistic missiles." When asked whether the U.S. might begin by proposing a mutual freeze on MIRV testing," he termed that "a complex subject" and added, "now that the talks are scheduled to start on the 17th, why we will consider how we will approach that subject." He indicated the main lines of the U.S. approach when he said we hoped (1) "to negotiate an arms limitation agreement which will keep us in the same relative position," i.e. securely ahead and (2) to be sure the agreement could be "verified, because if it can't and one side can cheat, then it certainly is not a viable agreement."

"Verification" has long been the main ploy for dragging out arms talks interminably. The negotiations for an underground test ban, now in their ninth year in Geneva with no end in sight, are an example. We spend billions on "verification" via seeing-eye satellites, flying hearing devices, and a wide variety of exotic sensors, smellers and sniffers. All the Pentagon asks in this imperfect world is the *absolute* fool-proof. If marriages were concluded only after the kind of guarantees against cheating required by our arms negotiators, the population explosion would soon be ended by universal celibacy.

Perhaps one reason the Nixon Administration is so unenthusiastic about these talks is that Nixon thought, as Dulles did years ago, that the pressure of the arms race could be

Oh

"Administration officials have emphasized that the President did not mean that he would take no notice of the protests but rather that he had a detailed plan for settling the war in Vietnam and could not alter the plan because of demonstrations."

—New York Times from Washington, Oct. 20.

used to exact political concessions from the Russians. This may have been part of that still secret "plan" he announced during his election campaign last year to end the Vietnamese war. At his first press conference as President he said he wanted to have "strategic arms talks in a way and at a time that will promote, if possible, progress on outstanding political problems." But when Rogers was asked whether the initiation of the arms talk would "affect the pattern of East-West relations" he broke in to say, "They are not conditional in any sense of the word. We haven't laid down any conditions for these talks."

Why, then, is the Nixon Administration entering the talks at all? One reason is that ratification of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Pact is lagging badly. The non-nuclear powers are waiting to see whether the nuclear superpowers are going to take seriously their obligations under Article VI. This obligates them to negotiate "cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament." Rogers said we had an obligation "under NPT treaty" to negotiate. He did not add that it was an obligation to do more than merely "curb" the nuclear arms race. Most Americans have forgotten—and both Washington and Moscow probably prefer to forget—that eight years ago in a joint declaration to the United Nations, Kennedy and Khrushchev pledged themselves on the basis of the McCloy-Zorin agreement to general and complete disarmament, with the elimination "of all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological and other weapons of mass destruction" and "all means of delivering" them so that war could no longer be "an instrument for settling international problems." That was eight years and several hundred billion dollars ago. We've certainly made rapid progress—backwards. Oct. 26

We Urge New York Readers to Vote For Lindsay

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed \$6.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, *In A Time of Torment* (Random House) regular price \$7.95

(To) Name

Street

City Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

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

Name

Street

City Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Weekly

11/3/69

4420 29th St. N.W., Washington, D. C. 20008

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

4420 29th St., N. W.

Washington, D. C. 20008

Second class
postage paid

at

Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. 2d Class Postage Paid at Washington, D.C. Published every other Monday except in August at 4420 29th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. An independent bi-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: \$17 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.