Inter-Office Communication

January 3, 1967

To Walter

From Irv

Subject Draft for Look Magazine, Written by Scott Runkle

Dear Walter:

Vic transmitted the attached as a draft for an article for Look Magazine from Scott Runkle. I am personally not overly impressed with the draft, although you might well consider preparing an article for the magazine.

Ted Merello has now sent the text for the basic chapter of the peace proposal, copy of which is also attached. You might view this, properly edited and modified, as the basis for a Look article.

Fraternally,

IB/fw
opeiu42

att

UAW
WASHINGTON OFFICE

DEC 20 1966

SCOTT RUNKLE & ASSOCIATES
National Press Building, Washington 4, D. C.

TELEPHONE: ME·8-1652

18 December 1966

Mr. Victor Reuther
Director, Dept. of International Affairs
U.A.W.
Washington, D.C.

Dear Vic:

Welcome back! I hope that your well-deserved vacation was resting and pleasant. When you have a chance to clear off your desk, let's get together.

In the meantime, I wanted to send you two different sets of papers.

The first is the special research on labor in Venezuela, plus another backgrounder which deals with Venezuela's militant opposition to authoritarian governments. Let me know if you feel anything else is needed. The recent terrorist outbreaks in Caracas do not change the basic fact that the Communist guerrilla movement has evaporated as an organized force; the new terrorism has its origins in large measure in a factional power struggle between the "Moscow" and "Peking" wings of the Venezuelan Communist Party, on which I will fill you in when I see you - - a very curious and Byzantine sort of thing.

The second paper is something I put together on my own initiative for Walter and you to look over. It calls itself a first draft of a possible lead for an article in LOOK. I wrote it primarily to throw out one possible approach so that Walter, Irving and you could turn it over in your minds, and then inject your own thinking. With Europe increasingly in a state of political flux, the staleness of the U.S. foreign policy is increasingly putting us in a position where we are following rather than leading in international affairs. Walter's article would have the very great advantage of appearing in a near-vacuum of far-sighted U.S. thinking on foreign policy.

Do let me hear from you at your early convenience.

All the best,

Scott

FIRST DRAFT OF POSSIBLE LEAD

FOR AN ARTICLE IN LOOK

There is a deep and growing uneasiness in the country about America's foreign policy, which is by no means limited to our role in Viet Nam. And abroad there is even greater concern on this score; the nations of Western Europe, Latin America, and even much of Asia and Africa, are profoundly affected by our actions even though they have little opportunity to shape them. When the U.S. sneezes, it is said, a dozen other nations catch cold.

Wide respect still exists for our immense power and for our ability to put vast projects (like the Marshall Plan) into action - - a power which confers both the privileges and responsibilities of leadership on the U.S. But there is great doubt about our present vision and wisdom in foreign affairs. If General de Gaulle has been able to parlay his modest cards into a strong hand in international affairs, it is not because other countries are particularly sympathetic to him or to his often narrow objectives; it is only because he is believed to see the world scene and its historic trends with far greater clarity and realism than the United States.

Most of all, there is almost universal wonderment about what U.S. foreign policy is.

An honest and searching answer would have to be that there is no clear, coherent U.S. policy for the great problems and issue's of today's world. And inevitably, as a result, there is no Western policy, either. The closest we come to a policy is the tattered and obsolete one of "containment", which made considerable sense in the early Truman days of the Stalinist threat to Greece and Turkey. But today's dangers, problems and opportunities are vastly different from those of 20 years ago. "Containment" is now at best a vestige of a policy, and a negative one to boot. And its very sterility - - to say nothing of its costliness in Viet Nam - - is starkly evident to the entire world.

Seldom has there been greater opportunity and need for the U.S. to assert its leadership, by which I mean its moral and political leadership, far more than its military and economic muscle.

To earn this kind of leadership, we need urgently to see very clearly what the shape of today's world really is, to study and evaluate the historic trends now emerging, and then to do some hard and honest thinking about how we can best advance our ideals, interests and responsibilities in light of the changing realities.

With no pretense of geopolitical expertise, I hope I might open a wide and active debate by making my own analysis and some specific proposals for giving U.S. foreign policy new direction and new momentum.

Two profound changes have taken place in the last ten years. They have been so gradual, however, that they have not been fully apparent to the American people (our news media tend to ignore gradual developments in favor of dramatic, spot-news events).

The first is the world-wide retreat of international Communism as a militant, revolutionary force. And the second is the approaching economic and political crisis in the three-quarters of the world called "underdeveloped" -- a crisis accented by the huge and growing gap between the rich nations of North America and Europe and the poor ones of Asia, Africa and large parts of Latin America. Both of these historic trends profoundly affect the direction and form which U.S. policy can and should take.

The retreat of Communism is obviously of tremendous importance. Barely a decade ago, militant Marxism was on the offensive throughout the world, its powerful political and ideological thrusts backed up by awesome military power. The menace weighed heavily on Europe, and particularly at the fulcrum of Berlin; much of Asia seemed in acute danger; Africa was deeply if spottily penetrated; even nearby Cuba became a Communist base, threatening penetration of impoverished and uneasy Latin America.

How different today! The Soviet threat in Europe has so dissipated that the Western powers can afford the luxury of squabbling and disunity, confident that no

military or ideological menace is to be expected from Russia. And since the Cuban missile crisis (which now can be seen as a great water-shed in recent history), the Soviets have lost their taste for penetration of other continents, leaving the role of militant revolutionary action to the Chinese. In Asia, the overthrow of Sukarno was a body blow to Communist ambitions; the fall of Nkrumah and Algeria's B en Bella accented the fiasco of Communist efforts in Africa; the pro-Castro guerrillas have been roundly beaten in Venezuela and Peru, and Cuba itself is beleaguered and discredited in the Hemisphere.

Most important of all, historically, is what has happened in the Soviet Union itself. When Mao-Tse Tung accuses the Soviet leaders of being apostates to the creed of Marxism-Leninism, he is largely right. Though the trend has been gradual, and often camouflaged by murky Soviet rhetoric, the great shift of the 1960's is that the Soviet people are now very little concerned with ideology and very much concerned with pragmatic means of raising their own/living standards. Marxism-Leninism is about as obsolete as a system for organizing the economies of the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe as Adam Smith is obsolete in the Western countries. And the dethroning of Communist ideology, once the very heart and touchstone of Soviet life, presents one of the great opportunities and challenges to U.S. policy today, with exciting prospects from creative initiative which we have not seen since the end of World War II.

But this ideological defanging of the Soviet Union is counterbalanced, in the scale of opportunities and problems, by the ever-more ominous trends in the underdeveloped countries. An enormous crisis is shaping up which has very little to do with ideology. It is, at source, almost entirely an economic crisis, one in which billions of men are struggling to emerge from the "open-mouthed, relentless hell" of extreme poverty. Though they are working hard, and often effectively, most of the poor countries are barely inching ahead in their desperate race to increase production faster than population, and some of them are falling behind. There is even the specter, in some countries, of large-scale famine.

In the meantime, the wealthy nations of North America and Europe have increased their riches at an almost vertiginous rate. In 1965, for example, the per capita income of the average American rose by $190. The envy of the poorer countries becomes comprehensible when we realize that this is more than the <u>total</u> per capita income of two-thirds of the world, and nearly double that of 50% of the world's people.

At the time of their greatest prosperity, moreover, the rich countries are not only offering very little help to their less fortunate neighbors, but are actually offering <u>less</u> help every year in terms of their means. This year the United States, the wealthiest country in the world, is giving only 1/4 of one percent of its gross product for

economic aid abroad, exclusive of military support. It is as though a sick patient, increasingly ill, were to receive less and less medical help in its moment of desperate need from an opulent doctor.

This should troubleus on moral and humanitarian grounds alone. But if it does not, we need only remind ourselves that to allow three vast continents with ~~two~~ three-quarters ~~thirds~~ of the world's population to slide ever deeper into the morass of poverty, is to invite the kind of social and political chaos out of which could emerge a dozen other Viet Nams.

Ted Merello

PLAN

For the first time in history, man has the power to make a reality of his most ambitious dream--or of his most fearsome nightmare.

Suddenly, he can build a warless world free of the ancient plagues of hunger, disease and social inequality. As suddenly, he can destroy divilization... even wipe out the human race.

There is still the time and opportunity to realize the dream and to exorcise the nightmare. Tomorrow, there may not be.

For millenniums the world has survived armed conflict. One scholar reckons that of the past 3,400 years, only 234 have been free of a recorded war.

Similarly, man's social injustice to man is as old as humanity. Even today, more than half of the world lives out a miserable existence on the brink of dispair.

Such a record would seem to fortify the misguided optimists who shrug off reality with the cynical equation:

"There have always been wars, and the poor have always been with us. Therefore, we will muddle through."

(more)

The rationale is suicidal. Overnight, as history is measured, science and technology have worked elemental changes. Yesterday's thinking will not do today.

An unrelenting arms race spearheaded by nuclear weaponry is, of course, the most obvious new factor that shatters the comfortable survival-by-muddle formula. It was no alarmist rhetoric when President Kennedy warned:

"Today every inhabitant of this planet will be contemplating the day when it may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of ~~Xxxx~~ Damocles hung by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident, miscalculation or madness."

In this perilous situation, the nuclear powers are stuffing their arsenals of doom to the bursting point; the United States and the Soviet Union alone already have overkill stockpiles more than adequate for depopulating the earth. Britain, France and a bellicose Communist China are only a stride behind and coming up fast.

? Others are knocking at the door of the five-power nuclear club. A score of countries have the technological ~~xxx qualifications~~ (CREDENTIALS) to qualify for membership at will.

has

India .tc

(more)

By all logic, the East-West balance of terror has made World War III unthinkable. There can be no victor in a war that would incinerate the planet.

Yet the arms buildup goes on, carrying with it the inherent deadly risk of war by irrationality. Who can guarantee that Armageddon will not be triggered by "accident, miscalculation or madness"?

"If nations keep on amassing armaments," British novelist E.M. Forster warned in 1935, "they can no more help discharging their filth than an animal which keeps on eating can stop itself from excreting."

Four years later Hitler invaded Poland. The devastating World War that resulted stands as history's undisputable corroboration of Foster's gloomy thesis.

TODAY'S WEAPONS RACE HAS DRIVEN MAN to the brink. Clearly, then, we stand on the rim of a nuclear hell.

From another direction, civilization is being pushed toward chaos by a different but converging force: the revolution of rising expectations. It is a sullen rebellion which draws its power from the two-thirds of humanity that goes to bed hungry every night through a lifetime...the uncounted millions whose lives are needlessly blighted and cut short by preventable disease...the despairing who have borne their degradation in silence for ages but who are silent no longer.

(more)

It is the angry awakening of the have-nots, aware suddenly that other men no different from themselves live nobler lives--that their heritage of wretchedness is not dictated by an inflexible law of the universe.

This is the century's explosive tragedy: half the world lives in affluence, half in grinding ~~poverty~~ MISERY. The unbridged chasm between can be expressed in cold statistics:

Almost two-thirds of the earth's 3 billion people live in underdeveloped countries but have only one-sixth of the world's income. Of the total, 990 million exist on a annual per capita income of less than $100, and 1.15 billion on from $100 to $250.

Bracketed into the "middle income" group are 390 million with an income of from $250 to $750.

The "high income" classification comprises 810 million with more than $750. The elite are the 175 million in the Common Market countries who average $1,400 and, at the summit, 194 million in the United States with a per capita income of $3,000.

(more)

In Hobbesian terms, the miserable of the earth exist with "no arts, no letters, no society, and, which is worst of all, continual fear and danger of violent death, and the life of man solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short."

To the destitute, the most galling fact is the knowledge that in the mid-20th century, their humiliation is totally unnecessary. Modern technology has produced the tools to lift from their backs the crushing burden of malnutrition, pestilence, ignorance and want.

Herein lies the Free World's most potent weapon: an unsurpassed technological capacity for closing the gap between rich and poor. The more fortunate peoples should expect to do no less. The benighted peoples will be satisfied with nothing less.

But From whichever side they come, the empty promises from the ideologically divided advanced nations are rapidly losing whatever impact they had among the underprivileged.

United Nations Secretary-General U Thant stressed the futility of parading democratic slogans before hungry men when he said:

"To preach to them about the virtues of democracy, the virtues of human dignity, the virtues of fundamental human freedoms, is not only irrelevant but comic...I think the message will not go to their hearts."

Thus, there is more than humanitarian consideration behind the challenge. With the recession of colonialism, the new and underdeveloped lands have inherited the balance of power in a world teetering between irreconcilable ideologies. Enlisted in the ranks of the West, the "new peoples" can be a powerful force for universal democracy. Neglected, they are sure to fall to communism, tyranny or domestic chaos that jeopardizes world stability and invites war.

These, then, are the dominant and interlocking problems: How to halt humanity's headlong rush toward nuclear doom and how to end the bitter inequalities that rob half the earth's peoples of their God-given heritage as men. There can be no lasting peace anywhere without a quick solution to both.

The goal is clear: A peaceful, prosperous world of free and equal men released through disarmament from the costly, ~~waks~~ wasteful and deadly burden of a weapons race.

We have the means of reaching that goal. To succeed will require unfettered imagination...the daring to try the untried and think the unthinkable...an unshakable faith in the ancient vision; for, says the proverb:

"Peace is the dream of the wise, war is the history of man."

In the following pages, I propose to show that under the bold, enlightened leadership of the United States the world can and must start along the road toward that elusive dream today. This is a proposal for waging total peace— an international preventive war against ~~the~~ global want and armed conflict.

It is the only kind of war that nations can win.

(more)

In outline, here is the program:

As the first step, the President of the United States would announce an American economic aid commitment of unprecedented proportions, massive enough to raise the underdeveloped countries to the point of self-sustaining growth before the century runs out. Specifically, America would unilaterally pledge an average of $20 billion annually over the next 25 years.

The President's announcement would be coupled with an invitation to other industrialized nations--non-Communist and Communist alike--to join this Grand Alliance for Peace with financial support of their own. It would be made clear, however, that the American pledge would be honored with or without contributions from others.

Simultaneously, in a challenge directed primarily at the Moscow bloc and Peking, the United States would invite all countries to conclude a disarmament agreement with adequate provisions for verifying compliance and to shift the men and materials freed by the military cutback to economic development. Indeed, accession to the disarmament treaty would be a precondition for participating in the program either as a contributor or as an aid recipient.

(more)

Partly to avoid raising the ~~x~~ specter of "economic imperialism," the program would be administered by a new international agency, preferably--though not necessarily--affiliated with the United Nations.

Concurrently, some means would be sought to build a strong United Nations peace force capable of safeguarding international law and order when the ultimate goal of total disarmament is achieved.

The immediate impact of such a declaration of peace would be enormous. The program is nothing less than democracy's challenge to communism to transform their ideological contest from a war-bound arms race into a positive, aggressive peace offensive. Ideologically, the prize would be the scores of African, Asian and Latin American nations still undecided about whether democracy or communism holds the brighter future for them.

U.N. Secretary-General U Thant put it this way:

"The curious thing about the cold war is that it is not a battle for more territory or even for more political power. It is a battle...for the minds of the unconverted."

It is a colossal struggle between East and West for the hearts of millions eager to embrace any doctrine that proves by performance--not promises and slogans--that it can raise them out of their stagnation.

Their loyalties will go to the system that fills their empty bellies, clothes their naked backs, heals the ills of their bodies, opens the road to self-fulfillment and, above all, points the way to lasting peace.

This is the challenge that faces the free-society system and communism; the future belongs to whichever meets it.

Neither side can win by military power, however overawing. Along that path lies inevitable destruction for all--the most affluent as well as the poorest. In this nuclear age, the ideological tournament must be fought with other weapons: science, technology, industrial capacity and good-will. Few can doubt the outcome of such a contest.

Under American leadership, the industrialized democracies will go into the battle strong and fully armed against a Communist bloc with gaping chinks in its economic armor.

Leading from strength, we will be striking at communism's most vulnerable spot in my proposal for peace in our time.

(more)

For fundamentally, the Communists' promises of a brave new world is based on the claimed superiority of their economic system over ours. Only by the artificial and wasteful stimulus of war, their theoreticians contend, can the free countries keep from falling into economic chaos and, ultimately, collapsing entirely.

There is a distumbing germ of truth in the otherwise erroneous propaganda.

The disturbing fact is that never in peacetime has the United States' economic machine run at full speed. Between wars, America has slipped back into periods of recession or depression marked by unemployment and idle production capacity.

But that flaw stems from faulty practice, not from any irremediable shortcoming in the ideal.

Indeed, it is this very weaknēss--our unused men and machines--which can be America's greatest strength in the global peace race against the Soviet bloc. We need only imagination and courage to perform a dazzling miracle.

Harnessed, these wasted resources can meet the desperate needs of the under-developed nations without lowering our military defense below the threshold of national security or cutting back the flow to our normal domestic and overseas markets. At the same time, we would be able to take up the slack that plagues America with agricultural surpluses, ~~and~~ unemployment and throttled-down

(more)

industries even in the most prosperous peacetime periods.

Our steel mills, factories, machine shops and assembly lines--an appalling number of them limping along below capacity or shut down altogether--can pour out the trucks and tractors, tools and medical instruments, clothing and books that the stagnating half of the world needs to begin moving into the 20th century.

Our agricultural surpluses can feed hungry millions until, with our ~~technological~~ help, their own agricultural technology can take over the job. To our own jobless and underemployed citizens, the program will bring the blessing of permanent, full employment.

Thus, we can turn the liability of our burdensome, unused productive capacity into our most powerful asset.

The strategy hits the Communist giants where they are weakest. Latecomers to the industrial age, both Russia and Communist China are running far behind their blatant promises of producing a better life for their own peoples.

Such industrial muscle as they possess is overtaxed by their stubborn emphasis on the military buildup and, in Russia's case, on the space contest. In the consumer sector, their production facilities are stretched to the snapping point and yet are unable to meet the ever more insistent clamor of their own peoples for a higher living standard. Certainly, under these conditions,

neither Moscow nor Peking has much to spare for the impoverished beyond their borders.

This contrast between the West's latent productive capabilities and the Communist world's overstrained economies is the Archimedean lever of the total peace offensive. With it, we can raise the neglected populations to the economic and social level that is the heritage of all men in the atomic age. Simultaneously, we can pry open the door to total disarmament. Only then will the dream of peace become more than a hopeless illusion.

Faced with the invitation to join the free world in the Grand Alliance, the Soviet Union would have three choices.

Least probably, it would flatly refuse to help wage the peace under any conditions. But that would mean meekly ~~forxxxiting~~ forfeiting the global ideological struggle to the democracies, seeing Communist influence frozen at ~~and~~ the present level and ultimately risking defections even from those ranks.

Or, ideally, the Communist nations could embrace the peace proposal sincerely and without reservations. We would then have reached the millenium when the dangerous, uneasy coexistence of East and West is transformed into genuine and massive cooperation among nations to build a bright new world of tomorrow for all.

(more)

Realistically, however, it seems overoptimistic to expect the Communists to make such a happy choice--at least at the outset.

Their most likely course would be a third one: A declaration of economic war paralleling but competing against the democracies' peace offensive.

Perhaps unwittingly, that decision alone would be a first Soviet step along the road to international disarmament.

For while the American foreign aid budget remains at its current timid level of $3 billion a year, the Russians can stay in the race without significantly lowering their production sights.

But the $20 billion-a-year American challenge would force an entirely new production pattern on Moscow. Of all nations, only the United States has the industrial capacity to undertake a rescue operation of that magnitude among underdeveloped lands while still raising the living standards of its own people and maintaining necessary defense strength. We can afford both guns and butter; the Communists cannot.

How, then, can the Soviet Union compete with the United States in the contest for the loyalties of half the world's peoples? How can it hope to convince the uncommitted that the vaunted economic system of communism is, indeed, superior to the free world's way? For convince it must. It was in the economic context

--not necessarily the military one--that Nikita Khrushchev boasted to the West:

"We will bury you."

As one possibility, the Russians might try to match our $20 billion commitment by diverting the tools of peace from the civilian sector of their own economy. But for all its authoritarian grip on the Soviet population, it is highly improbable that the Moscow government would dare to risk such a dangerous course. Unlike the United States, the Soviet Union has no flexibility in that direction. There are already rumblings of discontent from the Russian people burdened by a voracious war establishment which for two generations has gobbled all but the crust of the Soviet economic loaf. Russian peasants and factory workers have waited too long for the fulfillment of bureaucratic promises of a living standard ~~in~~ matching the West's.

Under the lash of war and officially sponsored war hysteria, they might continue to accept their deprivation stoically if not willingly in the interest of national security. But they would not quietly sacrifice the fruits of a budding consumer industry to unknown peoples far beyond their frontiers.

(more)

Moscow knows the mood of its citizens. There have been reports of riots between workers and police when meat and butter prices were raised. And at the Black Sea port of Odessa, longshoremen staged a strike to protest the shipment to Cuba of consumer goods badly needed at home.

A similar situation prevails among the Kremlin's East European allies. The myth of an international Communist monolith dominated by Moscow has been exploded by the drift toward economic independence among Soviet satellites responding to the nationalistic pressures of their own populations for more consumer production.

Among Communists, too, charity begins at home.

With its consumer industries thus strained, the Soviet Union would be forced to look elsewhere for the resources to compete in the worldwide alliance for progress. There is only one other source: The military segment of the economy.

Only by diverting men and materials from their war machine can the Soviet Union hope even to match American economic aid to underdeveloped countries, as it must—tractor for tractor, clinic for clinic, school for school.

(more)

Faced with that inescapable truth, the Kremlin will be ready to take the only road open: toward disarmament.

It would no more consider disarming unilaterally than the United States would. But outflanked by American determination to wage the peace single-handed if necessary, the Russians would be forced to abandon the rigid position that for years has deadlocked East-West disarmament conferences.

Warily at first, the Soviet Union could be expected to accede to peripheral agreements aimed at lightening its own burden of armament expenditures. Whether these steps take the form of military budget cutbacks, a "bomber bonfire," a ban on underground nuclear testing or a nonproliferation treaty, the important thing is that the arms race inevitably would be slowed, braked to a dead stop and finally thrown into reverse. The world will then have backed away from the rim of destruction. It will be ready to steer a new course,along the highway toward peace.

Suppose, though, that by fringe cutbacks the Russians pared their arms budget only to the point where they could match America's $20 billion-a-year aid program. While significant, such a reduction would leave them in possession of a conventional and nuclear arsenal still formidable enough to touch off a global holocaust by design or by accident in this pushbutton age.

(more)

As with the original initiative, the power to force the Soviet Union below that critical threshbld lies with the United States.

Assume, for example, that the Kremlin were to agree with the United States to a balanced armament reduction sufficient to raise the $20 billion in Soviet overseas aid through savings on a pared-down military establishment. The United States then could trim its own arms spending by a matching $20 billion. Of that amount, half could be plowed into domestic programs--education, housing,pollution control and other projects of direct and immediate benefit to our own citizens. The remaining half could be added to our original pledge to the underdeveloped world, thus raising our annual foreign assistance outlay to $30 billion.

Again, the Russians would have to follow the American initiative by raising their competing fund by $10 billion. And again, their only source of financing would be their military juggernaut--a fact which would compel the Russians to return to the negotiating table for new and ever more significant disarmament agreements.

Once set in motion, the interacting drives toward disarmament on the one hand and elevated living standards on the other would continue to move foreward under the impetus of America's economic one-upmanship.

(more)

Thus, even with the Soviet Union competing outside my peace proposal, the world would gain enormous benefits. However modest, the arms curtailment would ease the danger of an all-destroying war. The mutual reducation of expenditures for military Frankensteins would lighten the appalling burden for peoples on both sides of the Iron Curtain. The swords of war would be reforged into the tools of peace for a grand assault against poverty, hunger, disease and ignorance.

Ultimately, the Russians could be expected to abandon their go-it-alone, competetive foreign aid program and accept the democracies' invitation to join the Alliance for Peace as a full-fledged, cooperating member.

The expectation is based onmore than pious hope. For without abandoning its goal of a worldwide ideological conquest, Soviet communism is mellowing with age. The iron-fisted extremism of the Stalin era has been blunted by the rising expectations of its own people, by incipient nationalism among its satellites and, worldwide, by the nuclear stalemate with the United States.

Less and less are the Russians willing to risk what they have so painfully acquired. Their own emergence into the ranks of the industrialized countries is making them more rational, responsible members of the international community. It is the natural evolution of those who have something to lose and nothing to

(more)

gain by recklessness.

Precisely because of its state of industrial underdevelopment, Communist China is a different and more stubborn case. Only now emerging into the international community, mainland China lacks even the rudimentary spirit of cooperation that the Soviet Communists have acquired during half a century in power.

The Chinese are still largely self-isolated behind a Great Wall of sullen suspicion and neurotic xenophobia. In their sternly limited dealings not only with the democracies but with other Communist nations, they are intransigently uncooperative when they are not--at least vocally--downright belligerent.

Nevertheless, as President Johnson has pointed out:

"We do not believe in eternal enmity. All hatred among nations must end in reconciliation. And we look to the day when the policies of mainland China will permit such a reconciliation."

To those discouraged by Communist China's warlike pronouncements, it may be some consoliation to study the record. For all its verbal ferocity, the Communist regime has exercised shrewd restraint of action in international dealings.

In Korea, its military forces crossed the Yalu River only when United Nations troops were hammering at the door of Manchuria and when the bombing of power installations and other targets on Chinese soil was being demanded by influential American strategists. Yet even under what it considered to be extreme provocation, Peking's response--backed by a then friendly Soviet Union's formidable military assistance--was deliberate and reluctant, not frenzied.

(more)

Peking's annexation of Tibet was less an example of wild Communist adventuring than an assertion of a historical territorial claim. Both the Nationalists on Formosa and the Communists in Peking insist on Chinese hegemony over Tibet.

Similarly, in the Sino-India[n] frontier dispute, the Communist Chinese could make a not altogether implausible case for "aggression" against their trans-Himalayan neighbor. In contesting the validity of the MacMahon Line border, the Chinese can claim with some justification that the boundary was imposed by a strong British colonial government in India at a time when China was too weak to resist. On this point, too, Peking and Taipei are in agreement.

Finally, two years after full-scale American military intervention in Viet Nam, Communist China was confining assistance to its Hanoi ally to a relatively niggerdly trickle of military and non-military matériel and advisers and a generous flood of belligerent polemic. With American air strikes at their very doorstep, the Chinese discreetly avoided entering the war, either with regular military forces or--as in Korea--with "volunteers."

(more)

None of this is to argue that the Chinese Communist regime is a peace-loving government, maligned and isolated by "Washington imperialists" with sinister motives.

But it does illustrate ~~xx~~ an often overlooked aspect of Peking's foreign policy. The fact is, there is a great deal more rationality in the Communist regime's behavior than in its pronouncements.

Militarily and industrially weak, its ideological bridges to Moscow all but burned behind it, Peking knows it cannot now risk an open clash of armed forces with a powerful United States.

The worst the Chinese can do for the moment is to harass their domestic backsliders, condemn Kremlin "revisionism" and Western "imperialism," proclaim the philosophy of "wars of liberation" throughout Africa, Asia and Latin America and, in Viet Nam, fight to the last Vietnamese.

Yet for all her weaknesses, Communist China is on her way to challenging the United States and the Soviet Union as a world power. It would be criminally short-sighted for the West to fob off as impotent a nation of nearly 800 million people with a fanatical ideological determination to catch up with the mid-20th century. Even now, the paper dragon has an industrial skeleton,

(more)

military sinews and--most ~~fearsome of all~~ fearsome of all--nuclear claws.

How, then, can the dragon be tamed before it grows formidable enough to tear the world apart?

The answer lies in India--the subcontinent to the south.

In many respects, the neighbors are twins. Both have borne the leaden weight of classical imperialism. India's population of nearly 500 million is second in the world only to China's. Both, though pitifully underdeveloped, have a boundless potential. Each is coping with ~~the~~ overwhelming industrial, Agricultural, ~~and~~ economic and social problems stemming from the "revolution of rising expectations" within its own borders.

Yet there is one elemental difference between the two colossi: Communist China represents Communist totalitarianism at its militant extreme; India is the world's most populous democracy.

Nowhere is the eyeball-to-eyeball confrontation of communism and democracy more dramatic. Nowhere are the stakes higher; for, in the words of the venerable Indian diplomat, B.N. Chakravarty:

(more)

"Political freedom will have no meaning if it is not accompanied by rapid improvement in our economic and social life. Economic and social progress is vital if our democratic way of life is to be preserved.

"If no substantial progress can be achieved, a different political system such as that in China may well look attractive."

Therein lies the challenge to the West.

The opportunity for a successful response is in our hands. We can help India to demonstrate with unassailable proof that she can achieve the cherished dream of economic and social betterment without sacrificing political freedom.

The lesson, we can be sure, will not be lost on the canny Chinese people.

Again, our keenest weapon would be the outpouring of our now-idle industrial capacity. With massive aid given now, we can help India to build a solid economic base, the launching pad from which her depressed millions can rocket to social and economic heights undreamed of a generation ago.

(more)

By pouring in not only emergency food shipments but the more lasting, self-starting gifts of farm machinery, fertilizers and technical know-how, we can free India of the devastating famines that crush her people, drain her economic vitality and engender political turmoil, the seedbed of communism.

Our medicines and public health techniques can mean the difference between a disease-wracked, cradle-to-grave existence and ~~[illegible]~~ robust longevity. For India is a region where not only malnutrition but malaria, cholera, yellow fever and a host of other ancient plagues needlessly take a heavy death toll. Nor are the survivors among the ~~[illegible]~~ infected spared; millions drag on, debilitated by afflictions that rob them of half their lifespan. It is an appalling statistical fact that the average Indian dies of old age at 45.

No less important is the assistance we can give in helping to control India's runaway population expansion, a stultifying factor economically and socially.

(more)

Stemming from and perpetuating these human miseries is India's starvation-level income per capital. True, the figure will inch upward as the country's incipient industrial base grows. But for all the determination of Indian planners, the growth rate is torturously slow--scarcely enough to keep the present subsistence standard of living from sinking further and certainly not fast enough to meet even the most/elementary needs of the exploding population.

Official data show how bleak the outlook is for the average Indian during the next decade:

The country's third five-year plan includes among long-term objectives "a 61 per cent increase in per capita income" during that period. On the face of it, the goal seems impressive. But translated into dollars, it means that even if the highest hopes are achieved, the average Indian's yearly income will rise from the 1960-61 figure of $69.30 to--in 1975-76--a paltry $111.30.

And this at a time when every American man, woman and child/today enjoys an average yearly income of $3,000!

(more)

Such a snail's-pace growth in Indian income is unlikely to impress Communist China. Certainly it will not divert the regime from its harsh and unyielding economic extremism. On the contrary, it would be grist for Peking's propaganda mills in their never-ending effort to convince not only the Chinese but the underdeveloped world generally that the Marxist way is best.

For with their brutal grip on every phase of Chinese life, the Communists can easily match--even exceed--the growth rate that adds only a few dollars each year to per capita income.

But suppose that, as it could with our unstinting help, an Indian's average income were raised by 1975 not to a meager $111.30 but to $500 or more. Such a genuine and dramatic Great Leap Forward would be too much for Peking to ignore.

To meet the challenge to the free-world showcase at its ~~very~~ doorstep, Communist China would be forced into the same choices that face the Soviet Union: a unilateral reduction of military spending or adherence to a universal disarmament treaty with its concomitant benefits of participation in the Campaign for Peace.

(more)

Admittedly, we are still far from coming to an idyllic accommodation with the men in Peking. But there is a growing realization among scholars and pragmatists the world over that there can be no lasting peace while one-quarter of the world's population lives in a backwater of angry isolation outside the social, economic and political mainstream.

Today is not too soon to begin probing for cracks in the Great Wall which the Communists have built around mainland China. Blueprints for breaching the wall already have been drafted. One of the most recent was prepared by a panel of eminent national experts for the United Nations Association of the United States of America.

As a ~~risk~~ first step, the study recommends, the United States must withdraw its opposition to U.N. membership for Communist China. The aim, it continues, "should be membership for both Chinas," the one governed ~~by~~ from Peking and the other from Taipei.

While the study acknowledges that the United States "must continue to protect is Asian allies, several of them China's close neighbors, from military attack," it adds:

(more)

"Many members, indeed probably the majority of the United Nations members, are not inclined to take as seriously as does the United States the extreme and often outrageous statements made by the leaders in Peking."

The benefits of exposing the Chinese Communists to the force of international opinion and broadened diplomatic contact would be wide-sweeping if not immediate. But the urgent necessity of action now is dramatized by the study's stress on the need to encourage "those moderate influences that still remain in China."

Tomorrow, the panelists conclude, may be tragically too late.

"The absence of effective general communication between Peking and large segments of the international community," the study emphasizes, "increases the difficulty for each making accurate assessments of the other's intentions... at a time when miscalculations could lead to an Asian catastrophe."

There are other means of coaxing Peking out of its iron cocoon: cultural exchanges...trade in nonstrategic materials...exchanges of newsmen, scholars and experts in medicine and public health.

(more)

True, the United States has made overtures along these lines without any positive response from Peking. But the stakes are too high to permit us the luxury of quietly accepting defeat under such rebuffs. We must persevere and continue to initiate because, as President Johnson said:

"...We believe that even the most rigid society will some day, one day, awaken to the rich possibilities of a diverse world...We believe that cooperation, not hostility, is really the way of the future in the 20th century."

Probably nothing can prod the Chinese people to "awaken to the rich possibilities" more quickly than the sight of a neighboring India grown prosperous through the Alliance for Peace.

While concentrating on rehabilitating our enemies of the moment, we must not neglect our allies.

Until now, the free world has been bound together primarily by defense alliances rooted in a common fear of Communist aggression. But in Europe, at least, the Soviet threat has receded. This development in turn has led to restlessness among America's allies, to a loss of unified purpose among those who feel that the raison d'être for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization--the once real Red peril--lacks validity in today's coexistent world.

(more)

France has gone fartherest toward striking out on her own. But Britain and West Germany, too, are showing increasing impatience with the burdensome cost of a NATO oriented solely toward an apparently waning military threat.

Yet a reshaped and revitalized NATO could become the core of the worldwide Alliance for Peace. Because of their prosperity and advanced industrial level, our fellow NATO members have enormous potential for expanding the international aid program into a powerful consortium of donor countries.

Harnessing that capacity to the battle against destitution would give a new and dynamic sense of purpose and accomplishment to the Atlantic Pact. Instead of tilting with windmills, NATO would be transformed into a brotherhood of crusaders pledged to free underdeveloped peoples from ~~the~~ perpetual want.

As the heaviest financial contributors to this unprecedentedly massive assistance undertaking, American taxpayers have the right to ask without apology:

"But what's in it for us?"

(more)

I have already suggested some of the benefits: relief from the monetary burden of runaway defense spending...the taming of belligerent communism... the moral satisfaction of helping those who cannot help themselves...the pullback from the brink of nuclear annihilation...the prospect of a just and lasting peace in our time.

More immediately, the proposed aid program would propel our own domestic economy to heights which, translated into added dollars, would be worth many times the $20 billion a year spent on waging total peace.

For the peace offensive would mean harnessing our wasted industrial capacity--our idle men and machines--to the giant task of turning out the staggering number of trucks and tractors, school and hospital equipment, tools and clothing that the wretched of the earth need so desperately.

It would mean work for our jobless men and women, a flood of orders for an outpouring of goods from factories now limping along below capacity or mothballed altogether.

(more)

Worker income would be in the form of high-velocity dollars, spent immediately for needs too long unsatisfied because of unemployment. In turn, the delayed buying spree would create a second wave of demand for goods and services, thus forming a chain reaction that would create still more jobs.

The spiral of worker earnings and managerial profits would yield new tax dollars at the local, state and federal level. The increased tax revenue would bring immediate domestic benefits through accelerated public construction and services: for schools and hospitals, pollution control and conservation, highways and homes. At the same time, there would be ample surplus for stepping up our contribution to the international war against want. For our own well-being can never be secure until all men have at least the rudiments of the good life.

To fulfill the maximum promise, the Grand Alliance for Peace would be financed by contributions representing a given percentage of each participating country's Gross National Product. As in the case of United Nations assessments, the contribution by each country would be based on a sliding scale which takes into account per capita income, economic growth rate and other factors.

(more)

Fund administration would be in the hands of an International Social and Economic Agency staffed by international civil servants drawn from all participating countries--donor# and recipient# alike.

It need not be a rigid requirement that the Agency operate within the United Nations framework, but there are compelling arguments for such an association.

In technical assistance, the U.N. and its associated bodies are a brimming reservoir of long and invaluable experience. For unlike the old politically oriented League of Nations, the successor world organization has through its two decades of history laid dominant emphasis on economic and social accomplishments. Some 80 percent of the United Nations personnel and budget are earmarked for development work. Projects of direct benefit to underdeveloped peoples are the immediate concern of the U.N. family's most active and effective organs, among them the U.N. Development Program, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the U.N. Children's Fund, the International Labor Organization and the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

(more)

Furthermore, United Nations affiliation would avert any suspicion that the International Economic and Social Agency is an American-dominated creation operated for the sole benefit of the United States. For however unjustified, the fear of "economic imperialism" has soured a discouraging number of our well-intentioned assistance programs abroad. Multilateral aid through the politically uncommitted United Nations treads more softly on a recipient's perhaps exaggerated national and ideological sensibilities.

The Agency would establish an eligibility formula for recipient nations computed on their per capita income. Assistance would be provided in goods and services or, under special circumstances, as monetary contributions earmarked for development.

It is essential that the assistance be considered as long-term, interest-free loans repayable only when the recipient country's Gross National Product reaches a specified level. In no case should a country's annual repayment exceed the "danger point" percentage of its GNP alluded to by George D. Woods, president of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, when he wrote:

(more)

"When all amortization, interest and dividend payments are taken into account, the backflow of some $6 billion from the developing countries offsets about half the gross capital inflow which these countries receive."

More ominously, Woods added:

"These payments are continuing to rise at an accelerated rate, and in a little more than 15 years, on present form, would offset the inflow completely.

"In short, to go on doing what the capital-exporting countries are now doing will, in the not too long run, amount to doing nothing at all."

To qualify either as a donor or recipient under the International Social and Economic Agency, governments would be required to accept specific conditions formulated to give maximum drive and meaningful direction to the peace offensive.

Recipient countries would, for example, pledge themselves to cooperate with the Agency to blueprint and implement programs of economic and social development and to carry out the provisions of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

(more)

They would commit themselves to exploring and effectuating proposals for the equitable distribution of new national wealth created by the impact of the War on Want. For a solid social structure cannot stand on the shaky foundation of misleading "average income" statistics when, on closer examination, the data reveals that--as in some "prosperous" countries--20 per cent of the population enjoys 80 per cent of the wealth. Such statistics do not fill empty bellies nor silence the dangerous rumblings of social and political discontent among the 80 percent cheated of their rightful share.

Above all, each participating nation would vow to take its finger off the trigger and apply a strong arm to the brake of war.

It would be a primary obligation for every participant not only to adhere to the nuclear test-ban treaty and any related international covenants but to work unceasingly, both alone and through bilateral and multilateral agreements, to explore new paths leading away from the brink of a worldwide nuclear conflagration. Ultimately, of course, the goal would be universal accession to the still elusive treaty of general and complete disarmament.

(more)

This, then, is the heart of my proposal: a self-perpetuating program of disarmament through economic aid...of accelerated development assistance through military cutbacks...an upward spiral toward a new epoch for manking--a world emerged from the ancient shadow of want and war into the bright sun of freedom, prosperity and peace.

#