

And B-52s, We Suppose, Are Doves

"I rate myself as a deeply committed pacifist."—Nixon to C. L. Sulzberger New York Times March 9.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XIX, No. 6

MARCH 22, 1971



WASHINGTON, D. C.

20 CENTS

Imperialism Is Not Internationalism

Internationalism made its appearance in American foreign policy with the administration of Woodrow Wilson. It rested on three premises whose validity was demonstrated by the great power rivalry which culminated in World War I. The first was that balance of power politics could not be relied on to preserve peace but only exacerbated mutual suspicion. The second was that the arms race which accompanied balance of power politics had itself become a primary source of tension and war. The third was the need for a world organization as a framework for peaceful settlement of international disputes and for the reduction of national armies to levels necessary only for internal order. This was the grand design with which Wilson declared America's intervention in Europe a "war to end war" and sought unsuccessfully to make that a reality by leading the United States into the League of Nations. By those standards Nixon is not an internationalist but an imperialist.

Not Every Little Firefight

On several occasions Nixon has wrapped himself in the mantle of Wilson and invoked the rhetoric of World War I to support the Vietnamese conflict.* But the policies outlined by Nixon in his interview with C. L. Sulzberger, as in his new state of the world message, clearly outline an attempt single-handedly to police the world. The supposed "low posture" of the Nixon Doctrine turns out to be little more than an optical illusion to appease a public sick of unilateral intervention. "Of course," Nixon told Sulzberger, "we're not going to get into every little firefight everywhere." But where other nations "are ready to fight a fire" we "should be able to furnish the hose and water." These homely but deceptive analogies apply only to the sideshows. "Our responsibilities," Nixon said grandly, "are not limited to this great continent, but include Europe, the Middle East, Southeast Asia, East Asia, many areas whose fate affects the peace of the world." This covers just about every place on earth except the South Pole. Of course our motives, Nixon says, are benign. But there has never been an imperialism yet from Kipling's "white man's burden" to the Kaiser's "Kultur" which did not claim to be altruistic.

Considering the territorial sweep of the Nixon Doctrine, it is hard to see how he can "seriously doubt" that "we will ever have another war" and add as he did, "This is probably the very last one." For a man who claims "I know this world" how can he overlook the scores of national rivalries and conflicts in this vast area, any one of them capable of flaring up into a good-sized "firefight" at any time? No cop ever volunteered for a wider and more dangerous beat. Yet Nixon could also say in the same interview that the period of "expansion as typified by Theodore Roosevelt and the idea of Manifest Destiny" is

Nixon And That Silent Majority

Let us give the people of America a chance, a bigger voice in deciding for themselves those questions that so greatly affect their lives.

—Nixon in his State of the Union message Jan. 22.

I am certain a Gallup poll would show that the great majority of the people would want to pull out of Vietnam. But a Gallup poll would also show that a great majority of the people would want to pull three or more divisions out of Europe. And it would also show that a great majority of the people would cut our defense budget. Polls are not the answer.

—Nixon to Sulzberger New York Times March 10.

Neither it seems—for Nixon—is majority rule.

"fortunately gone." No one ever dreamt in TR's day that we would some day consider it our destiny to impose a Pax Americana on the whole world, or to wield a Big Stick as big as our present Pentagon. Nixon told Sulzberger we confronted two great powers, Russia and China "motivated by a philosophy which announces itself as expansionist in character." What could be more expansionist than the Nixon Doctrine itself? It is dangerous to have a leader so unaware of any mote in his own eye.

In a realm of discourse in which words have lost all normal meaning, it is not surprising to hear that Nixon also told Sulzberger, "I rate myself as a deeply committed pacifist." Many men have been "committed" for less obvious lapses from reality. His is a pacifism which does not require extended surveillance by military intelligence. Nixon's pacifism implies a perpetual arms race. "We can't," he said, "foolishly fall behind in the arms competition." This from the leader of the world's most heavily armed nation, with an arms budget almost as big as the rest of the world's combined!

Even Laird, whose whoppers fill one with reluctant admiration, has never gone as far in misrepresentation as Nixon did when he told Sulzberger, "The Soviets now have three times the missile strength of ourselves . . . By 1974 they will pass us in subs carrying nuclear missiles." Table 2 of Laird's new posture report shows that we can launch 2600 nuclear "force loadings" or more than twice as many as the Soviet's 2,000. By 1974 the Soviets may pass us in the number of nuclear submarines but only because we plan to concentrate on MIRVing our fleet, increasing the number and accuracy of its warheads rather than the number of submarines.* The Institute for Stra-

(Continued on Page Four)

* I am describing Wilsonianism at its best. At its worst, in dealing with Latin America, it was as imperialistic as the "dollar diplomacy" of Roosevelt and Taft which the Democrats had criticized.

* As with land-based ICBMs where we have also concentrated on MIRVing Minutemen. The Soviets may be ahead of us in numbers of ICBMs but many are obsolete and few are solid-fuel. For a full picture see my "Memo to the AP: How Laird Lied" in the New York Review of Books last June 4.

Golda Meir's Hard-Line Position Would Bar A Palestinian Arab State . . .

THE BEST GUARANTEE OF SECURE BORDERS lies in friendly neighbors. Israel has a good case for some adjustments in the 1967 borders. But to push beyond this is to make harder the reconciliation with the Arabs on which Israel's future in the long run depends. The hard line taken by Mrs. Golda Meir in her interview with the London *Times* (*N.Y. Times* March 13) would prevent the establishment of a Palestinian state and reduce the West Bank to Israeli tutelage but without the benefits either of inclusion in Israel or of a separate state. Her views are disputed by many in Israel, including leading figures in her own party like Eliav and Sapir. A good discussion of the internal Israeli debate by a leading Israeli journalist, Victor Cygielman, may be found in the March issue of *Le Monde Diplomatique*. We hope American Jewish opinion will not let itself be stampeded into a monolithic lobby for the hard-liners nor allow Mrs. Meir to stall in the hope of injecting the Israeli issue into next year's Presidential campaign. There are already signs of movement toward a coalition of Zionists with the AFI-CIO and the arms lobbyists behind Jackson for the Democratic nomination. This is a time for Israeli magnanimity to match Egypt's readiness for peace.

The Truth About Tchepone

WHEN THE TRUTH ABOUT THE LAOS CAMPAIGN begins to leak out, we believe it will appear as a costly failure and it will be acknowledged that Tchepone itself was never taken by the ARVN forces. A careful review of the dispatches reveals (1) that the U.S. command was remarkably silent about Tchepone's supposed capture, (2) that Saigon began to admit that only reconnaissance teams had entered Tchepone and that the town was not (sour grapes!) worth taking, and (3) that some of ARVN's best battalions have been chewed up in this operation. Earlier in this invasion one could hear speculation that the French might have won at Dienbienphu with more air support and that, with the ARVN as "bait", our gunships were going to wreak havoc with the other side when they counter-attacked. Now a typical headline (*New York Daily News*, March 13) tells a different story, "South Viets Quit Sepone as 30,000 Reds Close In." Instead of seizing the chance to decimate the enemy from the air, we are ferrying out the ARVN troops in a swift retreat. Everybody lies in wartime, but we think our side has the bigger liars in this one. We recommend for a view from the other side Wilfred Burchett's account in *The Guardian* March 13. We believe it closer to the truth than the U.S.-ARVN accounts.

ACCORDING TO CHARLES BARTLETT (*Wash. Star* Mar. 9) Nixon had a fresh slice of that Ho Chi Mihn trail oil pipeline flown in on top priority for his press conference of March 4

But Papadopoulos Is Our Pet

While Allende's In The Doghouse

Elizabeth Drew (*Atlantic Monthly*): To what extent are we going to be concerned about what kind of governments come to power where?

Secretary Rogers: Well, I think we're going to be less concerned about that than we have in the past for the simple reason that we've found we can't affect the outcome to the degree that we thought we could.

Mrs. Drew: Well, let's take an example—Chile. We have said that we will not interfere with its domestic policies but we're going to watch closely its foreign policies and we made it pretty clear we disapprove of its establishing relations with Cuba. But what do we do about it? What are our sanctions?

Secretary Rogers: Well, we're not going to use sanctions in the sense that you use the word.

Mrs. Drew: Is that all we'll do, is to say we don't like it?

Secretary Rogers: Well, that's true in many cases. It's true in the case of Greece. We have very friendly relations with Greece but we've made it clear that we're somewhat disappointed that they haven't moved toward representative government more quickly.

Mrs. Drew: There's a question as to how clear—

Secretary Rogers: We've made it crystal clear.

—On PBS "30 Minutes With . . ." WETA March 9.
We've also made it pretty clear we prefer right wing dictators to freely elected Marxists.

in case anybody had asked him about the credibility gap created by the previous pipeline section shown at the Pentagon Feb. 24. The Pentagon admitted later that this earlier sample was not a trophy of our current incursion into Laos but had been obtained before. The important fact about this pipeline never did get into the papers, though revealed by Gen. Vogt himself at the Pentagon briefing. He said the pipeline was made up of sections with "a very clever simple disconnect system." Gen. Vogt explained that this disconnect feature despite intensive bombing "has made it possible for the North Vietnamese to take a ruptured section of the pipe out in a few minutes and insert a new section, and the flow continues." How ingenious those Stone Age people are!

FORMER SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO calls attention to a shift in the ratio of non-combat to combat deaths in Indochina. Since 1961 deaths due to accidents have averaged 20 percent

Jackson (Violating Secrecy) Launches—and Symington Rebuffs—A New Missile Scare

Sen. Jackson: It will come, I think, as a shock to a lot of Americans, after much discussion here, that they'd leveled off on the deployment of the SS-9's, to know that the Russians are in the process of deploying a new generation, an advance generation, of offensive systems . . . the new developments are ominous indeed. We do not know quite what it means, but I can say to you that these are huge, new missiles.

Robert Novak [columnist]: You say ominous, sir, do you mean that you think, seriously the Soviets might entertain a first strike with these weapons?

Jackson: I'm sure that I can't answer that question. I can only say to you, when you look at these huge weapons systems, you have to ask, what can they be used for, other than a first strike?

—*Face The Nation*, March 7

Many new occurrences come with spring—some pleasant—warmer weather, Japanese cherry blossoms; some not so pleasant—proposed higher defense budgets, warnings of grave new dangers to this country because of new developments in Soviet weaponry. Last week, in a session secret

to the point where no record was kept, the Senate Armed Services Committee was briefed about Soviet missile plans. This briefing included for the first time purported details of new Soviet missilery. One cannot fail to remember several comparable Spring announcements of previous years—in the early 1950's those thousands of long-range bombers the Soviets were going to build, but never built; in the late 1950's those hundreds upon hundreds of long-range missiles the Soviets were going to build, but never built. As a result of these and other inaccurate intelligence reports, however, the American taxpayer is currently bearing the burden of tens of billions of dollars of additional weaponry we know now is not needed for his or our security.

—Symington (D-Mo.), in the Senate, March 10

Symington speaks from experience. He was himself taken in by the bomber and missile gap scares of the 50's and 60's. He chose this way to tell the Senate that the information used by Jackson was classified. He might also have added that all U.S. intelligence has seen are holes for new missiles, not the missiles themselves. Jackson is an old hand at whipping up arms race nightmares.