

National Security, Like Charity, Begins At Home

National security rests as much on the condition of our domestic society as it does on protection against potential physical attack on the United States by other nations. The most effective way of improving our relations and standing with other nations is by providing a model of democracy at home—a society in which respect for law abounds and in which all citizens are allowed to develop according to their potential.

—Sol Linowitz, chairman of National Urban Coalition, in asking for a major cut in the Pentagon budget, May 24.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XIX, No. 12

JUNE 14, 1971



WASHINGTON, D. C.

20 CENTS

How Much The Pax Americana Costs

The National Urban Coalition's testimony on the fiscal '72 military budget offers for the first time in clear form an answer to two basic questions. One is the cost of imperialism or the Pax Americana, as distinct from the cost of what can properly be called defense. The other is the question of how much is really enough for either and both purposes. Naturally neither answer can be precise. There are too many imponderables, variables and overlaps involved. But for the first time we have a sober approximate answer to two questions the Pentagon has always tried to avoid. Its size, its power and its expansion have depended on keeping both questions fuzzy, so that congressional debate and public decision could not focus effectively on the underlying choices involved in the military budget. As one witness for the Coalition put it to the Senate's Defense Appropriations subcommittee on May 24, "In the Defense budget as submitted to the Congress, it is practically impossible to relate money to programs and to relate programs back to the objectives." The witness, Dr. Robert Anthony, now Professor of Management Control at the Harvard Business School, should know. For he was Assistant Secretary of Defense from 1965 through 1968 and his job was that of Comptroller, i.e., McNamara's chief aid for accounting, auditing and budgeting.

An Alternate Budget

The Coalition's answers are made the more impressive by their Establishment auspices and their conservative character. The chief of staff in assembling and writing the Counterbudget it presented is Robert S. Benson, who served as an assistant to Anthony in the Pentagon. According to the Coalition, "a number of former senior military leaders and government officials in the field of military affairs" participated. Just as Secretary of Defense Laird presented his formal posture statement in March on the '72 budget and the Pentagon's 5-year projection for fiscal 1972-1976 inclusive, so the Coalition presented its own counter proposals and analysis for the same five year period.* The Coalition's military budget challenges none of the fundamental preconceptions of power politics. It is written as if prepared by an alternative Pentagon think-tank. It never uses the word imperialism nor the term Pax Americana. It seeks only ways to do the job at less cost in order to free revenues and energies for the primary purpose which led to the Coalition's founding in the riot-torn summer of 1967, and that is to improve life in the nation's cities. Its members include business leaders as prestigious as David Rockefeller of Chase Manhattan and James Roche of General Motors.

*This is part of "Counterbudget: A Blueprint for Changing National Priorities" covering the entire Federal budget edited by Robert S. Benson and Harold Wolman for the National Urban Coalition, published in paperback by Praeger, \$2.95.

For Futile Death In a Futile War

We have a situation in which we have said to the youth of America, "This is a war which does not involve the vital interests of this country and we know now that it never did. It has not been worth the sacrifice of 50,000 deaths; the sacrifice of 300,000 wounded; the sacrifice of \$150 billion in treasure; the disillusionment of the youth of America; the loss of confidence of the people of this country in the decision making by the authorities." Every young man in America knows it. He knows that what we are doing—and it is the truth of the matter—is filibustering, seeking a pretext to get out of Vietnam and save face; get out. That is all there is to it. So we are saying to a young man, "While we are trying to devise a pretext to get out to save the face of the political leaders of this country, you go over there and risk your life." I would not ask my son to do that, and I would not ask anybody else's son to do it, either.

—Nelson to the Senate, May 25, on his amendment to keep draftees out of Vietnam, defeated 52-21.

The most startling discovery which emerges from the Coalition's analysis is that our role as policeman of the so-called "free world" is far more costly than defense proper. "Pure defense of the United States," the Coalition points out, "actually costs very little in comparison to the total size of our so-called 'national defense' budget." Most of our defense money is spent on conventional forces and these are largely geared to the defense of other countries, not the United States. In this '71 fiscal year, of \$74.5 billion in the Pentagon budget, strategic forces—both offensive and defensive—with required backup supporting components including intelligence and research add up to \$16.3 billion, or little more than one-fifth of the total**. "The surprise," the Coalition's report to the Senate Appropriations Committee continues, "is that not much more in U.S. military forces are really required for defense of the United States." No country in the world, the Counterbudget points out, "has the combination of sufficient troop strength, airlift and sealift capability, and amphibious landing capability to execute successfully a major conventional attack on the United States."

The Coalition might have gone further in its strategic analysis. It might have provided an antidote to the annual alarms the military-industrial complex propagates, by sketching in the strategic advantages the U.S. has over its one super-power rival, the Soviet Union. The U.S. has no borders

(Continued On Page Two)

**Even this is more than "pure defense" since this same nuclear umbrella deters attack upon our allies as well.

The Pax Americana Costs Three Times As Much As The Nuclear Deterrent

(Continued from Page One)

threatened by conventional attack. It has wide open seas on its east and west and the longest demilitarized borders in the world to the north with Canada and to the south with Mexico.* The Soviet Union on the other hand has the longest land borders in the world to defend, to the east with its heretical Communist rival China, to the south with Iran and Turkey, and to the west where it faces the double problem of confronting West European capitalism with its forward American nuclear bases and holding down the ever restive satellites in its own Soviet empire where there is always the danger that the demand for more freedom will spread from Prague and Warsaw to Kiev and Moscow.

Where The Money Goes

Our conventional or General Purpose forces are almost entirely geared to the defense (or control) of other nations. As McNamara put it, in a summation quoted by the Coalition from his final posture statement, "the overall requirement for General Purpose forces is not related so much to the defense of our own territory as it is to the support of our commitments to other nations." These General Purpose forces are costing more than \$44 billion in the current fiscal year, or almost three times as much as the \$16.3 billion cost of our strategic offensive and defensive forces. The Coalition points out that this \$44 billion goes to implement commitments of various kinds to 45 nations—21 in the Western hemisphere,** 13 in Western Europe, two in Central Asia, six in Southeast Asia and the Pacific, and three in the Far East. The Pentagon does not customarily display the allocation of these General Purpose forces to various regional contingencies. But Wm W. Kaufman, a Pentagon consultant under McNamara, author of "The McNamara Strategy" provided the first overview of these allocations last year in testimony to the Joint Economic Committee. The Coalition utilizes this to show that the \$44 billion spent on General Purpose forces this fiscal year (excluding the incremental cost of the Vietnam war), was allocated—

Europe	\$19.6 billion
Asia	\$15.8 billion
Latin America	\$ 1.3 billion
Strategic Reserve	\$ 4.3 billion
R and D	\$ 3.0 billion

*The strongest argument for disarmament, incidentally, is that if we once begin rearming these borders, putting troops on them as "deterrence," Canada and Mexico would have to follow suit, tension would rise and little arms races begin, with increasing instability and mutual fear.

**The imperialist character of these commitments is most

When Pentagon Overruled White House

Members of Congress for Peace Through Law seeks to cut the arms race and to strengthen the United Nations. It began on May 4 the release of 15 reports dealing with various Pentagon programs and policies. The first, by Senator McGovern and Rep. Seiberling, attacked the B-1; the second, by Senator Hartke and Rep. Bingham, criticized the F-14 and the F-15; a third, on June 7, by Senator Stevenson, was to deal with anti-submarine warfare. This organization (201 Mass. Ave., N.E., Wash. 20002) is bi-partisan and now has 29 Senators and 87 Congressmen. It is supporting the Proxmire-Mathias bill, to cut the pending \$75 billion military authorization for fiscal '72 to \$68 billion. Its report on military spending last year will be published by Praeger in July and outlined proposals it claimed would save \$100 billion over ten years. Air Force Magazine, organ of the Air Force association, rushed an 8-page preprint to Senators assailing the McGovern-Seiberling report on the B-1 and calling MCPL "a genuine threat to our security program." But judging by an article in the Feb. 1. Armed Forces Journal many of the same objections to the B-1 were raised earlier this year by George M. Schultz, Nixon's top budget man, on instructions from the White House which asked reconsideration of this costly manned airplane. But Deputy Defense Secretary Packard threatened to resign if overruled and the White House backed down.

The whole question of new priorities is clarified if we now look at the three purposes for which we are spending \$74.5 billion through the Pentagon this fiscal year:

Nuclear Deterrent For Defense	\$16.3 billion
Pax Americana	\$44.0 billion
Vietnam war	\$14.2 billion
Total	\$74.5 billion

Looked at this way, it is quite clear that the bulk of the money being spent by the "Defense Department" has very little to do with the actual defense of this country. The biggest menace to our security is at home. The black rebellions that set Watts and Detroit and parts of Washington afire were the Early Warning signals. At a time when \$3 to \$4 billion extra a year would end hunger and an extra \$4 billion a year could eliminate all substandard housing within five years, at

evident in Latin America which no one threatens except us, as no one threatens Poland and Czechoslovakia except the Soviet Union itself. The Brezhnev doctrine is Russia's variant of our Monroe Doctrine, a means of domination in the name of protecting satellite neighbors.

Shortest Missile Gap In History: The Truth Leaks Out About Those Fearful Holes

We have just witnessed the shortest missile gap in history. In mid-April, Secretary Laird and Senator Jackson issued a series of "scare 'em" statements based on the fact that the Russians had dug forty new holes. On the wholly unproven assumption that these holes were designed for the huge new 25 megaton SS-9 missiles, Secretary Laird told us that the "U.S. may be moving toward a second rate strategic position." Senator Jackson charged that "... the overall strategic balance may be tilting in Moscow's favor."

I said at the time that these were highly exaggerated and even semi-hysterical conclusions. I said that every year, just when the crocuses push through the winter soil and the forsythia and dogwood burst into bloom, one can predict a new round of speeches based on selected intelligence data telling us that the Russians are ten feet tall.

Now the facts are out. The New York Times reports today that "... the Central Intelligence Agency concluded that at least two-thirds of the large new silo holes recently detected in the Soviet Union were intended for the relatively small SS-11 intercontinental missile and not for a large new weapon as the Defense Department has suggested." The source was Senate Republicans who were informed of the CIA assessment by non-government arms control experts.

The strategic balance did not "tilt." We have not become a "second rate" power. In a month, without the U.S. lifting a finger or spending a dime, this missile gap was closed. The lesson is clear. Congress and the public should not be swept off their feet by leaks designed merely to propagandize for a fatter military budget.

—Proxmire, in the Senate, May 26 (abr.).

The Containment of China Costs Close to \$15 Billion A Year

a time when we are spending less than half a billion for clean water and hardly \$100 million for clean air, even minor economies in these huge military and imperial expenditures would help our crying domestic needs.

How Much Is Enough?

This brings us to the question of "how much is enough," enough for the nuclear deterrent and enough for the Pax Americana. The question was first raised in those words by Gen. Maxwell Taylor in his book *The Uncertain Trumpet*. He said the question "can and has been side-stepped for years." Enthoven and Smith failed to answer the question in their book, *How Much Is Enough?* published last year. The Coalition, operating on very conservative assumptions and after a close analysis of every military program, believes the military budget could be reduced by more than \$14 billion in the next fiscal year, from the current \$74.5 billion and Nixon's recommended \$78 billion for the next fiscal year, down to \$50 billion in each of the fiscal years 1973-76 inclusive. This would be \$22 billion less than is currently being spent. These take into account projected price rises, and they make no basic difference in military policy.

A measure of the Coalition's caution is its treatment of NATO. Its overall chart dispels much of the nonsense: NATO's forces are 50 percent greater than those of the Warsaw Pact. Western Europe is big enough and rich enough and populous enough to take care of itself, especially against a Russia with a hostile China at its back. Yet the Coalition merely suggests a 50,000 reduction in support (rather than combat) troops in the European theatre and the elimination of one of the four divisions at home which are earmarked for European defense. This would leave combat troops in Western Europe unchanged. If men estimating that cautiously and conservatively can see \$22 billion in safe economies a year during '73 to '76 inclusive, without basic change in nuclear strategy or U.S. imperialism, it is easy to see how much a more radical revision of priorities could divert from our swollen military expenditures.

We recommend the Coalition's analysis. It represents a tremendous amount of work. It gives us an alternative view of

Why MIRV-ing Should Be Held Up

The rapid deployment of MIRV can only give Soviet opponents of arms limitations an excuse to oppose the SALT agreements. The deployment of U.S. MIRV becomes potentially especially wasteful if an agreement on ABM is imminent since the MIRV is our answer to a Soviet ABM—an ABM which now seems especially unlikely to arise because it will be precluded by agreement. The irreversible deployment of U.S. MIRV tends to make agreements on MIRV impossible, just when there is a greater hope they might succeed. And it throws away our bargaining chip to secure a halt in the Soviet MIRV program by making our MIRV a fait accompli. An agreement on ABM might logically be followed by a U.S. Soviet agreement on offensive weapons like MIRV. President Nixon has stated that this preliminary agreement "will create more favorable conditions for future negotiations to limit strategic arms." Thus, the new SALT possibilities suggest, for many reasons, that this committee should escrow the MIRV funds until the negotiating situation is clarified next year.

—Dr. Herbert Scoville, Jr., chairman, FAS Strategic Weapons Committee, Senate Approp. Com. May 25.

the military budget as seen by men who have worked on it. It clarifies for the first time the basic questions of policy and their dollars-and-cents costs. It opens the way for more fundamental rethinking. Example: if Western Europe stood on its own feet militarily insofar as conventional armies are concerned, relying only on the U.S. for the nuclear deterrent, the saving would run close to \$20 billion. If we disentangle from the folly of trying to "contain" China by policing East Asia, we could save close to \$15 billion. If there were no Pax Americana, and most of the world between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. could be neutralized, our mutual navies and armies withdrawn, and the United Nations strengthened, we could save more than \$40 billion a year and the Russians a comparable amount. Even without SALT, the Coalition figures that the nuclear deterrent could safely be reduced \$5 billion by 1976. These figures indicate the dimensions of the military monster eating up the resources we need so badly at home.

The Case Against ULMS, The New Multi-Billion Dollar Underwater Battleship

ULMS [Underwater Long Range Missile System] is usually justified as having longer range missiles. But if the threat most often mentioned in connection with Polaris is the possibility—which we do not consider very plausible—that following Polaris submarines was the threat, what good would it do to build a new submarine with longer range missiles? Some respond that the ULMS submarine could be stationed in our continental waters where other submarines could not follow. But if we want missiles in continental waters, why build an ocean going submarine?

Even if by some technological breakthrough it were possible to make the oceans transparent so that submarines could be continuously located, and this is most unlikely, it would be necessary to have some mechanism for destroying all the submarines at a given moment. After all, the atmosphere is transparent to radar, but no one has any idea how to destroy bombers on air alert or how to build an ABM system which could provide protection to the population.

It is clearly premature to freeze on an ULMS design in the near future. The Administration proposal for trade-off studies would seem to recognize this, but the budgeting of \$100 million for FY '72 and the reference to submarine and facility design might indicate a freezing on the nature

of the system which would not be warranted at this time. This fear is further supported by Secretary Laird's statements over the past year on the need to make "tough" and "expensive" decisions within the next twelve months. There are reports that ULMS will be one and one half times as large as Polaris and carry 50% more large missiles with MIRV's. It is hoped that the Navy is not prematurely extending its outdated and costly philosophy of large battleships and large carriers to large submarines.

—Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, Science Adviser to Eisenhower, testifying for the Federation of American Scientists before the Senate Appropriations Committee May 25. He was one of four FAS witnesses, including Dr. Herbert Scoville, Jr., former deputy director, the CIA and the ACDA; Dr. Marvin Goldberger, chairman Princeton's Physics Dept, and Dr. Leslie H. Gelb, former Acting Deputy Asst Sec'y for Arms Control and Policy Planning under McNamara. They called for cancelling the Minuteman MIRV, deferring the Poseidon MIRV, cancelling the B-1 bomber and the AWACS bomber defense, halting the SAFEGUARD ABM and reducing the U.S. carrier force from 17 to 9. They estimated that over the next 10 years this program would save \$50 billion in procurement and from \$30 to \$40 billion in maintenance and operation.

It Doesn't Take Much Freedom To Qualify For The Free World

FREE WORLD, SOUTHEAST ASIA SECTION: M. Ngo Cong Duc, editor of the opposition paper, *Tin Sang*, whose arrest after a brawl raised a storm in the South Vietnamese Assembly, of which he is a member, published an article in *Le Monde* last year (April 8) entitled "Vietnamization Means Dictatorship and War." Last September in Paris he proposed the withdrawal of U.S. troops and a provisional government. He has long been a thorn in the side of the Thieu regime and the U.S. Embassy. Last October his home, and in March his newspaper office, were bombed.

FREE WORLD, FASCIST SECTION: Neither the wire services nor any other paper but the *Washington Star* (May 30: Richard Mowrer from Madrid) called attention to the significance of Nixon's sending Admiral Moorer, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, to represent the U.S. at the celebration June 6 of Franco's victory in Spain's civil war. Never before has the U.S. put its approval so explicitly on Spanish Fascism.

UNFIT TO PRINT? Earl Caldwell, who has been covering the Black Panthers for the *New York Times*, was picked to deliver this year's Henry F. Pringle address at the Columbia School of Journalism May 28, but not a line about it appeared next day in his own (or any other) paper. Caldwell spoke of his fight against a contempt conviction soon to come before the Supreme Court involving a reporter's privilege under the First Amendment in dealing on a basis of confidence with radical groups, in his case the Panthers.

NIXON DOCTRINE AND ASIAN CANNON-FODDER: Secretary Laird told the Fifth Annual Dept. of Defense Seminar for business leaders May 21, "In Asia, manpower is a resource which they have in abundance," and indicated that the Nixon doctrine means we will save money by arming Asians to fight Asians, adding, "but American military manpower on the ground, no, in that area of the world, and that's what this total force concept is all about . . ."

A GOOD ANTIDOTE to naval propaganda about the fear-someness of the Soviet Navy (and the need for larger appropriations for ours) was George C. Wilson's survey in the *Washington Post* (May 31), "Soviet Navy Still Far Behind U.S. Sea Power" . . . *Advertising Age* (May 31) reports that Gulf Oil will sponsor two NBC-TV specials on Tricia Nixon's wedding June 12. We suppose if this were England, Princess

Appeal For A Brave Judge

Those who saw the movie "Z" will never forget the brave magistrate who resisted pressure to dig out the truth in the Lambrakis affair. His name is Christos Sartzetakis. The rightist Greek regime took revenge on him last December. He has been held without formal charges in a secret military prison for five months. *Le Figaro* reports (May 28) that a delegation representing six different associations of French judges and lawyers, headed by Rolland, President of France's highest court of criminal appeal, asked the French Ministry of Justice to intervene on behalf of their Greek colleague. They protested that M. Sartzetakis is "in the hands of men known for the practice of torture" and presented documentation from the Greek Ministry of Justice at the time of the Lambrakis affair to prove the high esteem expressed for him by the Greek Ministry of Justice in those days. We hope some American judges and lawyers will follow suit.

Tricia's wedding would be sponsored by British Petroleum . . .

PARTICIPATION IN THE OPIUM TRAFFIC is fairly common among middle level government officials throughout Southeast Asia, John E. Ingersoll, director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, told the House Select Committee on Crime June 1. He said the heroin traffic is costing the U.S. \$3.5 billion a year. He revealed that 176 pounds of opium were found four weeks ago on a plane of Air America, the CIA's airline in the Laos war.

NECROLOGY: Max Lowenthal, at 83, a lawyer of exceptional qualities, who spent his life on many public causes, from the interests of railroad investors, and labor unions, to civil liberties. He was a close associate of Truman in the pre-war Senate railroad investigation and might have become a Supreme Court Justice were it not for the smear attack launched against him by the FBI in 1950 because of his critical book, "The Federal Bureau of Investigation," the first and still the best of its kind.

PERSONAL FOOTNOTE: On May 28 IFS was given the Columbia University Journalism award for lifetime achievement (it went last year to Walter Lippman) and on June 7 an honorary Doctor of Letters by Brown University.

We'll Send A Free Sample Copy Of This Issue To A Friend If You Send Us A Long, Stamped, Self Addressed Envelope

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed special pre-publication price of \$8.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, *Polemics and Prophecies: 1967-70* (Random House). Regularly \$10.

(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 Bi-Weekly

6/14/71

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

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

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

Second class
postage paid
at
Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-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.