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Speaking of International Outlaws

He (Capt. Edward Medina, the company commander) ordered the village burned, the animals shot, the wells contaminated and everything thing in that area killed.

—George W. Latimer, Lt. Wm. L. Calley's chief defense counsel, in his opening statement Dec. 10, the same day Nixon at press conference called North Vietnam "an international outlaw."
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In the negotiations to end the Korean conflict, the prisoner of war issue delayed a settlement by 18 months. During that time the United Nations Command suffered an additional 140,000 casualties, including nearly 9,000 more Americans killed. The delay and the additional casualties were due to a prolonged but little publicized campaign of "re-education" in the POW camps. This was designed to bring about mass defections. Chinese and North Korean soldiers were offered asylum and other inducements if they turned anti-Communist. When truce talks began the U.S. then insisted that prisoners be given freedom of choice to return home or remain on our side. The stage is being set for a replay of that long and costly wrangle by an unnoticed phrase in Nixon's Oct. 7 speech offering a 5-point plan to end the war. "I propose," Nixon then said, "all prisoners of war, without exception, without condition, be released now to return to the place of their choice." (Our italics.) It is typical of Nixon's tricky tactics that a sentence which began by speaking of no exceptions or conditions should end by covertly setting the same condition that proved so costly in the Korean negotiations. The "place of their choice" is the Korean war principle of "voluntary repatriation" rephrased. It means that instead of simply exchanging all prisoners on both sides, we enter into another long wrangle over who wants to go home. The purpose then was to impose a cold war political defeat on the other side, and (for those who still wanted a military victory in Korea) to delay a peaceful settlement in the hope that the war could be re-escalated.

Nixon's Secret New Obstacle to A Prisoner Exchange

No Right To Know?
The Korean war began on June 25, 1950; the truce negotiators first met a year later on July 10, 1951. The talks seemed to have reached their end when the prisoner of war argument began on Dec. 11, 1951. The talks did not end until July 27, 1953 when the armistice was finally signed after the longest truce talks in history. The casualty total was 305,000 when the truce talks began. It was 445,000 before the POW issue was resolved. A simple exchange of all prisoners on both sides "without exception" and "without condition"—to use Nixon's words—would have brought U.S. POWs home 18 months earlier last time. Their suffering and that of their families was prolonged to pay for a propaganda victory. It enabled Chiang Kai-shek to impose loss of face on Peking—and Surprenant Rhee a similar defeat on North Korea. Most of the Chinese "volunteers" and the North Korean soldiers elected not to go home. To suggest a "place of their choice" release again is to prepare the ground for a repetition of all this agony. Surely the country and POW families have a right to know what is being planned and to make their views known before so crucial a policy decision is made.

Clifford on Nixon's Backdoor Bombing Policy

The policy that he [Nixon] enunciated last night is a complete departure from any understanding that was had between the parties. This is a new element that he has added to it. I think it is really a distressing change. I might say that if there is any one lesson that I've learned, maybe with 5 years of experience about Vietnam, it is that the application of military force—in this instance, the increased application of military force—will not bring peace in Vietnam. That's why I think this policy could turn out to have tragic results.

We've been all through the bombing of Vietnam. We started in 1965, and in '66 and '67 and '68 we bombed North Vietnam. It was not effective then, and it will not prove to be effective now. It did not bring peace then, and I assure you it will not bring peace now. I tell you what the bombing will do, if it starts it again. It will mean more war, and more destruction, and more fighting, and more dying.

—Former Defense Secretary Clifford: CBS Dec. 11.

In the Korean war the South Korean regime, like the Saigon regime, balked at peace talks altogether because it wanted the U.S. to go on and reunite Korea by force, though China demonstrated that she would not allow this and had pushed our troops back to the 38th parallel, the old dividing line, with terrible losses on both sides. The South Korean regime and those U.S. military who, like MacArthur saw "no substitute for victory," seized on the POW issue to prolong the fighting in the hope that the peace talks would break down altogether, and full scale war could be renewed. Any resemblance between the situation then and the situation now is not coincidental.

A debate on this question should begin now and not when the country finds itself before another costly fait accompli. Two (Continued On Page 4)
Nixon Picks An LBJ Man As He Shifts to LBJ's War and Inflation Course

After Deficit Financing, Can Arms Race and More War Be Far Behind?

NIXON'S SPEECH TO THE NAM marked his conversion almost 40 years later to Keynesianism: deficit financing New Deal style as a means of stimulating business recovery. Unfortunately, John Kenneth Galbraith's recent Fabian Society lecture shows (see text in the London New Statesman Dec. 4) it is too late for Keynesianism. Big Business and Big Labor have made it obsolete. Only wage and price controls, Galbraith argues, can combine "adequate employment with reasonable price stability." But through labor leadership is ready for this, it is too big a pill for the G.O.P. to swallow.

The basic undertow will carry Nixon from deficit financing toward renewed arms race and more war. This is the historic Democratic way out, the profitable way to combat unemployment. Joblessness is now back to the 1963 level when the involvement in Vietnam began to mount. As the war began the Cold War ended. There are the objective factors which make return to tension and tough policies seductive. But it is too soon after the last inflationary binge to start a new one, and the road leads to disaster.

Just Gambling On More Inflation

RESUMED BOMBING OF THE NORTH will reactivate the peace movement here and the war spirit there. And it will further undermine the confidence of the business community. As it is, business loans have not responded to cheap money. All it has done is to set off a stock market boom which Nixon wants as the election campaign. But there is no substance behind it; it is just gambling on inflation.

THE REPLACEMENT OF KENNEDY By CONNALLY symbolizes Nixon's shift toward deficit financing. It also reflects his preference for yes-men in the Cabinet; just as Hickel was too independent-minded on his left, the Chicago banker, Kennedy, has been too outspoken on Nixon's right. Only a few weeks ago, Kennedy toured Western Europe to assure officials there that the U.S. was working to strengthen the dollar and to curb inflation at home. He must have been surprised to return and find Nixon encouraging inflationary speculation at home while making it obsolete, only wage and price controls, Galbraith says. Fortunately John Kenneth Galbraith's recent Fabian Society lecture shows (see text in the London New Statesman Dec. 4) it is too late for Keynesianism. Big Business and Big Labor have made it obsolete. Only wage and price controls, Galbraith argues, can combine "adequate employment with reasonable price stability." But through labor leadership is ready for this, it is too big a pill for the G.O.P. to swallow.

The basic undertow will carry Nixon from deficit financing toward renewed arms race and more war. This is the historic Democratic way out, the profitable way to combat unemployment. Joblessness is now back to the 1963 level when the involvement in Vietnam began to mount. As the war began the Cold War ended. There are the objective factors which make return to tension and tough policies seductive. But it is too soon after the last inflationary binge to start a new one, and the road leads to disaster.

The family assistance plan has been widely praised for the "forced-work program is a major feature. In fact, the program was referred to in the recent campaign as 'not a welfare program but a work-force program.' Today, when an employer is not covered by minimum wage laws, he is forced by the market to pay a subsistence wage. If he pays less, it is difficult for him to get anyone to work for him. But under the administration plan, he could offer as low a wage as he wanted and still be assured a continual supply of cheap labor. He need only inform the local welfare office that jobs are available; the poor must then work for him no matter what he pays or lose their benefits. This, it seems to me, encourages practices which even the free market by itself would not allow. It is a modern version of the debtor's prison—without walls.

Senator McCarthy Exposes Two Steps Backward In The Nixon Welfare Plan

The family assistance plan has been widely praised for providing a minimum income floor—$1,600, which is really a substandard level. Few people realize that it also sets forth a maximum benefit ceiling for Federal matching purposes. This is more significant and really more effective. Benefits would be cut off at a level determined by reference to the poverty level stated in the bill; thus, families are effectively prohibited from seeking payment above the poverty level. Two States, New York and New Jersey, already pay benefits at a level above the poverty line. By establishing a ceiling, the administration plan would reduce benefits for over 1,450,000 persons in these two States alone. Moreover, it would effectively prohibit other States from any future increases in benefits above the poverty line.

The forced-work program is a major feature. In fact, the program was referred to in the recent campaign as 'not a welfare program but a work-force program.' Today, when an employer is not covered by minimum wage laws, he is forced by the market to pay a subsistence wage. If he pays less, it is difficult for him to get anyone to work for him. But under the administration plan, he could offer as low a wage as he wanted and still be assured a continual supply of cheap labor. He need only inform the local welfare office that jobs are available; the poor must then work for him no matter what he pays or lose their benefits. This, it seems to me, encourages practices which even the free market by itself would not allow. It is a modern version of the debtor's prison—without walls.

Do They Keep Dossiers on Senators, Too?

FULBRIGHT: There have been two stories recently, one in the Washington Star Dec. 9 by Frank Getlein and another by Carl Rowan on the military intelligence apparatus activities as to civilians, including members of Congress. The first says, "The big news so far in December certainly has been the revelations on NBC's First Tuesday that various branches of military intelligence have been involved in investigating American citizens not in the least subject to legitimate military authority (including) candidates for the Presidency and the widow of Martin Luther King" and the other one says, "At Fort Holabird the Army was keeping a computerized master file of dissenters, protesters, and others suspected of being less than 100% loyal to what the military agents regard as the American way of life." I wonder, in view of that, if I should happen to vote against this appropriation (for Cambodia) would that be added to my dossier? [Laughter].

LAIRD: Well, I would question that, Mr. Chairman.

FULBRIGHT: Can you say categorically whether they do have dossiers on members of the Senate . . .

LAIRD: I would not think so . . .

FULBRIGHT: Would you let me see the dossier if they have one?

LAIRD: I would be pleased to. [Laughter].

—Before Senate Foreign Relations Dec. 11.
Hoover’s Preposterous Charges Against The Berrigan Brothers

If it was anybody else but J. Edgar Hoover, he’d be put down as a first class idiot for his attack on the jailed brothers Berrigan. If they are indeed head of a bomb ring planning to disrupt Washington and kidnap a high official in order to stop the war, he disrupted a valuable intelligence operation by talking about it in public and thus warning the plotters to cover their tracks. Secondly, if there is such a plot (and our prison system is so poor that these two priests can direct such a far-flung operation from inside Danbury) and they should be brought to court for this criminal conspiracy, the prosecution has been put in jeopardy by Hoover’s babbling. They can claim a mistrial on the ground that his conviction of them in the headlines before they were even indicted had destroyed any possibility of a fair trial, Nixon was evasive when asked about Hoover’s charges, Nixon said the Justice Department was studying Hoover’s testimony “and will take appropriate action.” The truth, of course, is that both the charges and Hoover’s conduct are preposterous by any rational standard.

The FBI May Not Draw Conclusions
But J. Edgar Certainly Does
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Nixon Picks An LBJ Man As He Shifts to LBJ's War and Inflation Course

After Deficit Financing, Can Arms Race and More War Be Far Behind?

NIXON'S SPEECH TO THE NAM marked his conversion almost 40 years later to Keynesianism: deficit financing New Deal style as a means of stimulating business recovery. Unfortunately John Kenneth Galbraith's recent Fabian Society lecture shows (see text in the London New Statesman Dec. 4) it is too late for Keynesianism. Big Business and Big Labor have made it obsolete. Only wage and price controls, Galbraith argues, can combine "adequate employment with reasonable price stability." But though labor leadership is ready for this, it is too big a pill for the G.O.P. to swallow.

The basic undertow will carry Nixon from deficit financing toward resumed arms race and more war. This is the historic Democratic way out, the profitable way to combat unemployment. Joblessness is now back to the 1963 level when the enactment in Vietnam began to mount. As the war began to escalate its cost, the objectives became a "race to disaster." The U.S. was working to strengthen the dollar and to curb inflation; only wage and price controls, Galbraith said, would make return to tension and tough policies seductive. But it is too soon after the last inflationary binge to start a new one, and the road leads to disaster.

Just Gambling On More Inflation

RESUMED BOMBING OF THE NORTH will reactivate the peace movement here and the war spirit there. And it will further undermine the confidence of the business community. As it is, business loans have not responded to cheap money. All it has done is to set off a stock market boomlet which Nixon wants for his election campaign. But there is no substance behind it; it is just gambling on more inflation.

The Replacement Of Kennedy By Connally symbolizes Nixon's shift toward deficit financing. It also reflects his preference for yes-men in the Cabinet; just as Hickel was too independent-minded on his left, the Chicago banker, Kennedy, has been too outspoken on Nixon's right. Only a few weeks ago, Kennedy toured Western Europe to assure officials there that the U.S. was working to strengthen the dollar and to curb inflation at home. He must have been surprised to return and find Nixon encouraging inflationary speculation at home while risking a deterioration in the balance of payments by re-escalating the war.

CONNALLY IS DESCRIBED by Texans who know him well as a "stuffed shirt" with no qualifications for the Treasury post. As an independent-minded Democrat, he will make return to tension and tough policies seductive. But it is too soon after the last inflationary binge to start a new one, and the road leads to disaster.

Senator McCarthy Exposes Two Steps Backward In The Nixon Welfare Plan

The family assistance plan has been widely praised for providing a minimum income floor—$1,000, which is really a subsistence level. Few people realized that it also sets forth a maximum benefit ceiling for Federal matching purposes. This is more significant and really more effective. Benefits would be cut off at a level determined by reference to the poverty level stated in the bill; thus, families are effectively prohibited from receiving payments in an amount above the poverty level. Two States, New York and New Jersey, already pay benefits at a level above the poverty line. By establishing a ceiling, the administration plan would reduce benefits for over 1,450,000 persons in these two States alone. Moreover, it would effectively prohibit other States from any future increases in benefits above the poverty line.

The forced-work program is a major feature. In fact, the program was refered to in the recent campaign as 'not a welfare program but a work-fare program.' Today, when an employer is not covered by minimum wage laws, he is forced by the market to pay a subsistence wage. If he pays less, it is difficult for him to get anyone to work for him. But under the administration plan, he could offer as low a wage as he wanted and still be assured a continual supply of cheap labor. He need only inform the local welfare office that jobs are available, the poor must then work for him or lose their benefits. This, it seems, is just a reward for a defeated Republican. We regret Charles Yost's removal; his knowledge and impartial sympathy of the Middle East made him ideal for the UN post as the time to prevent intervention is now.

Do They Keep Dossiers on Senators, Too?

FULBRIGHT: There have been two stories recently, one in the Washington Star Dec. 17 by Frank Getlein and another by Carl Rowan on the military intelligence apparatus activities as to civilians, including members of Congress. The first says, "The news so far in December certainly has been the revelations on NBC's First Tuesday that various branches of military intelligence have been involved in investigating American citizens not in the least subject to legitimate military authority (including) candidates for the Presidency and the widow of Martin Luther King" and the other one says, "At Fort Holabird the Army was keeping a computerized master file of dissenters, protesters, and others suspected of being less than 100% loyal to what the military agents regard as the American way of life." I wonder, in view of that, if I should happen to vote against this appropriation (for Cambodia) would that be added to my dossier? [Laughter].

LAIRD: Well, I would question that, Mr. Chairman.

FULBRIGHT: Can you say categorically whether they do have dossiers on members of the Senate ...

LAIRD: I would not think so ... FULBRIGHT: Would you let me see the dossier if they have one.

LAIRD: I would be pleased to. [Laughter].

—Before Senate Foreign Relations Dec. 11

against a peace plank at the 1968 Democratic convention.

GEORGE BUSH, TO REPLACE Yost at the UN, is better qualified for the Treasury; he was on the Ways and Means Committee in the House. But he does not have Connally's political advantages. Bush is completely unqualified for the UN job; it's just a reward for a defeated Republican. We regret Charles Yost's removal; his knowledge and impartial sympathy of the Middle East made him ideal for the UN post as the time to prevent intervention is now.

IF THE BASQUE TRIALS set off an explosion in Spain, will U.S. forces be used to support Franco? Will Europe's last surviving Fascist dictator, whose forces fought on the other side in World War II, be defended by U.S. troops along with the side in World War II, be defended by U.S. troops along with the effort at reconciliation, and his going may reflect pressure from the Zionist movement.

—The Nation

Washington Star

Dec. 9 by Frank Getlein and

Lawrence Fernsworth, who covered the Spanish Civil War for the London Times, spelled out the evidence of secret American commitments to Franco in The Nation last November, the time to prevent intervention is now.