

How The House Voted The Military More Than \$5 Billion An Hour . . .

WRITING THREE DAYS BEFORE,* it looked as if Nixon would be very lonely on Moratorium day. Everybody else seems to be on the bandwagon, except George Meany, Hubert Humphrey and the Weatherman-SDS . . . If we may be pardoned an exuberant pun, it also looks as if Nixon's first reaction to an event he said he would under no circumstances be effected by was to throw the students a Hershey bar. . . .

A MORE FUNDAMENTAL, though still oddly covert, concession to peace pressure seem to be an end of search-and-destroy missions, apparently the main reason for the sharp drop in casualties. Up to now we have been told by Laird and the military that the way to keep casualties at a minimum was to keep maximum pressure on the enemy. The signals seem to have changed but Laird was very unwilling to admit it when asked about it at press conference Oct. 9. When the question first came up all he would say was that battlefield tactics had changed "because of the change by the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese." Then he was asked whether the new instructions to U.S. troops were "not to go out and engage unless they are first engaged." He would admit only that new instructions had been issued in August but declined to go into detail. When he was asked whether the new orders no longer called for "maximum pressure" on the enemy, he finally replied "That is true." Another correspondent asked, "Do the U.S. troops still go out and wheel? Do they still go out and look for the caches? Do they avoid contact? This is what I think we ought to clarify." To this Laird would only reply, "I think the important thing here is to realize that the South Vietnamese are doing more of this than at any time in the past." It is a pity no correspondent was sharp enough to ask him how he reconciled his answers with General Wheeler's statement in Saigon only a few days before that the orders were still the same "maximum pressure" orders as in July! Laird is still the Administration's slipperiest operator.

THE MYSTERY MAY HAVE BEEN CLEARED UP next day by Goldwater. In a speech at New Orleans, he said the President had removed from contact with the enemy "95 percent of the men who are exposed to the possibility of casualty and that's why our casualty rates are dropping."

*We had to go to press early in order to speak at the Harvard-MIT undergraduate kick-off the night of Oct. 14 and next day in Washington at the Georgetown Law School all-day Moratorium event.

Words For Demonstrators To Remember

"Our investigation has shown that the U.S. failure in Vietnam has not called into question the basic premises of American foreign policy. Policy makers have not forsaken the policy of intervention — they merely wish to defend U.S. interests at a more acceptable level of cost . . . The U.S. will continue to intervene in other countries, using military and economic penetration (which we prefer to call 'assistance') and clandestine subversion . . . 'At the Pentagon', says a former high ranking member of the DOD Systems Analysis Office, ' . . . overall strategic objectives are never challenged; the basic premise is interventionism, and the topic of debate is the most effective way of configuring our forces to serve this policy.'"

—From a report by 11 college youngsters who worked at the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington on a "National Security Research Project" under Leonard Rodberg and Derek Shearer. In a summary released to the press and background studies to be published in book form, they have brilliantly applied the methods of "Nader's Raiders" to the Pentagon and come up with fresh insight and material.

THOUGH CONFRONTED BY THE LARGEST military spending bill in history, members of the House were given only two days in which to read the Armed Services Committee hearings on it, these totalled 2,660 pages. Most members barely had time to skim through the Committee report, which was 176 pages. Mendel Rivers, the Committee chairman and the Pentagon's most faithful ally, wanted to limit debate to 3 hours but settled for 4. Since the total bill was \$21.3 billion, that was more than \$5 billion an hour. Never did so many vote so much with so little time to consider what they were doing. The "debate" started with a 5-minute rule and then (on motion of Stratton, D. N.Y.) this was cut to 45 seconds!

TOTAL TIME WAS DIVIDED EQUALLY between the Democratic majority and the Republican minority, but the two-party system turned itself into a joke for the military establishment since both parties cooperated in steamrolling the House. Every amendment to cut the total was beaten down. Though the bill involved complex problems of weaponry and foreign policy, Rivers pushed it through with the corn-pone oratory of a back country patent medicine salesman. The result was \$1.2 billion more than the Senate bill, thanks largely to "Admiral" Rivers' insistence on giving the Navy \$960 million more than the Defense Department had asked.

Church Tells Senate Nixon's "Plan" Is A Formula For Staying In Vietnam Indefinitely

"In recent weeks there has been increasing talk of changing the military mix in Vietnam by replacing American ground troops with Vietnamese, while retaining American supply and support troops in their combat role. This is not a formula for extricating the United States from Vietnam; it is, rather, a formula for keeping up to 300,000 American troops engaged in Vietnam indefinitely. Its purpose is not to get out, but to stay in.

"The imperative is that we get out. This does not mean, of course, that the South Vietnamese Government would have to follow suit, or that it would be helpless in the face of its enemies. It would still have 1,500,000 men under arms against 135,000 Vietcong and 90,000 North Vietnamese soldiers now in South Vietnam. If the ARVN could be inspired to defend the Saigon government, it would survive; if it could not be so inspired, then the government

does not deserve to survive. We have done enough. We have fought their war for 5 long years and sacrificed 40,000 American lives. It is enough."

—Church (D. Idaho) in the Senate Oct. 7, sponsoring two resolutions. S. Res. 270, with Hatfield (R. Ore.), calls for "a more rapid withdrawal of American troops" and a commitment "to fully disengage from South Vietnam." The other S. Res. 268, with Senators Hughes, Cranston, Eagleton, Hatfield, McCarthy, McGovern, Mondale, Young and Yarborough, calls on the Saigon government within 60 days to free all political prisoners, end censorship, restore political freedom, and present a plan for a broadly representative provisional government. If these conditions are not fulfilled, the U.S. would terminate all military, economic and political assistance.

... State Dept's New Intelligence Chief A CIA Man Linked To Chiang

BUT THIS TRAVESTY OF REPRESENTATIVE government can be the beginning of serious trouble for the military-industrial complex. For the first time in years a half dozen weapons systems were challenged from the floor. On the ABM the opposition rolled up 105 votes, not far from one-fourth the House membership. Five members of Rivers' committee — Leggett (*D. Cal.*), Whalen (*R. Ohio*), Nedzi (*D. Mich.*), Pike (*D. N.Y.*) and Stafford (*R. Vt.*) — challenged the Chairman and defied pressure from military suppliers. This Fearless Five set up a bi-partisan study group and made independent recommendations, giving the House the benefit of opposition leadership with access to the Committee's classified information. The liberal Democratic Study Group sent out elaborate Fact Sheets which provided detailed analyses of the bill and the weapons.

ALL THIS ACTIVITY MAY PAY OFF when the authorization must be turned into an appropriation. The House Appropriations Committee this year is critical of the military. Laird expressed fear some weeks ago of a \$5 billion cut by House Appropriations. One item almost certain to be cut is the extra \$960 million for the Navy. There is now the beginnings of an informed and aroused opposition in the House to spiralling arms costs. It would be good if study groups could be established around the country to educate concerned citizens and mobilize counter-pressure against the military-industrial complex. Rivers threatened Leggett with reprisals from his California district, which has a number of military bases. We hope his constituents will support him against Pentagon blackmail.

IN THE WAKE OF THE GREEN BERET case, Asians will ask a question Washington has been too insensitive racially to consider. What if the victim had been an American, a white man, not a "gook", would the case have been quashed and the widow brushed off with \$6,000? Another question should concern us at home. Where are we drifting when an undercover agency is not only allowed to arrange murder but to make prosecution impossible by refusing to allow its operatives to honor subpoenas to testify? What if the next murder of this kind is at home? How does the Administration reconcile its stand for law and order with this impunity for murder?

If Only We Had Had More Carriers . . .

"We blundered in the long twilight preceding World War II, and found ourselves with only seven carriers all told, when the Japanese struck Pearl Harbor. . . .

"When the Korean War started we were again down to seven active modern 'attack carriers' of the Essex class, although just a few years earlier we had completed building 24 of them. If we had been able to station more than one in the Western Pacific, after the severe defense cuts by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson and the Congress in 1949, we might have deterred the invasion of South Korea. . . .

"Reason and common sense tell us, now, that North Viet Nam was also not deterred from invading the South by what they saw us doing to the readiness of our armed forces in the early sixties. Was it just a coincidence that the carrier was under severe fire by Defense Secretary McNamara as Ho Chi Minh made his preparations?"

—By Rep. Craig Hosmer (*R. Col.*) in *Navy magazine* (Oct.) reprinted in the *Con. Record*, Sept. 29, H8523.

IT IS APPALLING THAT AT SUCH A MOMENT the Administration should pick a veteran CIA man as director of the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research, with the rank of Assistant Secretary but without the title, so he is not subject to Senate confirmation. Ray S. Cline has not only been a top CIA man since 1949 but has close ties with the Chiang Kai-shek regime; he served for a time on Taiwan and was in charge of U-2 flights over China; he is a hard-line cold warrior and we hear that the influential Anna Chennault played a part in the appointment. Rogers and Richardson have been talking of a new China policy yet this key post goes to a man whose outlook has been molded by undercover work on Taiwan where (*Washington Post*, Oct. 4) he became a close friend of Chiang Kai-shek's son and expected successor. In his new capacity Cline will sit on the powerful Board of National Estimates, the government's highest intelligence body and in the words of State's announcement he will be the Department's "principal source of long range forecasts and analysis of political, economic and sociological trends throughout the world." Is the cloak-and-dagger the right training for a sane view of world politics?

How Saigon's Landlord-Legislators Are Balking Nixon and Thieu on Land Reform

In one respect South Vietnam is no dictatorship. Thieu may suspend newspapers, persecute the Buddhists and jail peaceniks. But when he tries to enact land reform, he runs into trouble. In the joint communique after he met with Nixon at Midway last June 8, Thieu "laid particular stress on his pursuit of a vigorous land redistribution program that would give land to those who work it" and Nixon offered American aid.

The idea was to undercut the Viet Cong appeal to the landless peasant. Thieu's plan would have distributed 1.3 million hectares to some 800,000 tenants. The program would have cost \$400 million and Nixon promised \$40 million. The landlords were to be paid \$80 million in cash, the rest in "rice bonds", linked to the price of rice, so their capital would not be destroyed by inflation.

But the Assembly, which is dominated by landlords, balked. Thieu's plan did not even get out of committee. The bill as finally passed (see John E. Woodruff from Saigon in the *Baltimore Sun* Aug. 26 and Sept. 2, the only

correspondent who seems to be covering this crucial story) would reduce the number of landless peasants benefitting to 480,000 or 290,000 (estimates differ). The cash compensation to the landlords was raised so sharply that U.S. officials here with whom we discussed it fear the inflationary impact. The bill would also make it harder for the peasant to get the land.

The bill is now before the Senate, which has just reconvened. Thanks to the peculiar way the elections were rigged, the Senate is dominated by Catholics, mostly refugees from the North, who won 35 of the 60 seats with about one-eighth of the total votes cast. The Catholics are close to Thieu. Thieu also has power to amend any bill, and it takes a majority vote of both houses to override his amendments. A long battle is still ahead. In Vietnam as in the Philippines and Thailand, the landed oligarchies of "free Asia" we spend so much blood and treasure to defend are remarkably unwilling to make any sacrifice themselves.