
BLUE DRAFT #64

Vol. 11, No. 4

27 May 65

TRICON! NYCON III! BACK TO THE
GATE IN '68!

Fantasia in FIRST DRAFT/49...

Well, Ted, I warned you... In essence, I read your analysis of Nixon as follows: You claim that I think Nixon could've mopped up every major trouble-spot in the world; I merely dramatized my opinion that certain major trouble-spots (Cuba, Vietnam, the Congo, Yemen, Laos, were the ones I cited by name) could have been taken care of by someone who had the wit to understand what the situation was. For one specific example, I've been writing for a long time about Vietnam, in FIRST DRAFT, as you know, and as you also know, no one yet has seen fit to answer my repeated challenge, i.e., why couldn't a resolute American govt (Nixon's, say) utilize in Vietnam the techniques so successfully used by the British in Malaya and by the Philipinos against the Huks; both Malaya and the Philippines had to fight long dirty guerrilla wars against communist-led "National Liberation Fronts," combatting jungle conditions, brutal communist terrorism, and a powerful propaganda apparatus. They were wars that "couldn't be won." But they were won, and not by the clumsy hamhanded techniques that Johnson seems bent on using. Ok, Ted, so I claim Nixon had a good chance at settling that trouble-spot, and you're familiar with my reasons on that subject.

You cite other trouble-spots that I didn't mention: deGaulle, Nasser, the nasty batch of little Caesars in half-a-dozen new African nations. As you said, "These people have considerable control over the eventual outcome of the trouble-spot situations, and short of becoming world dictators we're hardly likely to be able to change that." I didn't say we shd or that Nixon wd just go in and Smash Things; of course you have to maneuver around the obstacles that are there. But we don't have to invent obstacles. For instance, we have to pay attention to deGaulle when we try to push some idiot scheme like that common European military force. But we don't have to pay attention to word one of what deGaulle says about what we shd or shd not do in Vietnam. Nasser? We have ways within our means -- quite legal ones, familiar in the weaponry of diplomacy for a long, long time -- to make him take his troops out of Yemen; but Lippmann and Morgenthau might start bleating again, and so we continue to send food and aid with utterly no strings attached... Africa? Do we really have to bow down before chamberpot dictators like Nkruma and blithering fools like the late and entirely unlamented Lumumba? Hear me now, I don't say we go in and stomp these clots; but if murdering swine like Gbenye and Soumialot incite their illiterate hordes of befuddled Simbas into slaughtering all the Congolese "intellectuals" they find (i.e., anyone who can read), and then these same Simbas start menacing hundreds of American citizens in Stanleyville, why the hell shd we apologize to Nkruma? Why shd we even listen to him? Intelligent statecraft lies in using power when power is effectually unopposed, and other diplomatic means where pure power cannot succeed. The US, on the other hand, almost invariably applies too little power, far too late, and doesn't understand diplomacy at all. The Democrats, anyway...

Null-Q Press

Undecided Publication #122

Ok, so last week's FIRST DRAFT wasn't one-side-only, as the Amorphous Blob thot and said it was; but Dave Van Arnam has got other thing more important on his mind, like wondering how the blue offset ink is gonna make this look on the various colors of paper I'm gonna run it on. Another thing I've got on my mind tonite is the fact that I am finally gonna be answering Ted White's attack (in maLaise/20) on my lil Nixon

But again, Ted, these are points I have made before and which you did not bother to consider in your comments.

Who stepped into the breach in free Cuba (you remember, that happened when Pres. Nixon supported the Bay of Pigs invasion with the decisive edge in the struggle, massive air power)? I forget the guy's name; I do know that several old Batista men tried to move in real fast and one actually got himself named President of Cuba, but then Nixon sent a battalion of marines to Habana and said in effect that there was going to be no more seizing of power in Cuba, by rightists or leftists. The news came to Senator Morse just as he was in the middle of a speech denouncing Nixon's coldblooded violation of all international law at the Bay of Pigs. He deftly inserted a compliment to Nixon in the matter of blocking the Batista man, then continued with his harangue...

Buddhism, like all religions, has some definite good points about it. But again like all religions, it is full of rotten spots; but fundamentally, one of the good things about Buddhism is that the bonzes are not repeat not to have anything to do with politics. Politics is not their business in the world. In Vietnam, however, one thing led to another, and what with the customary Propaganda Barrage against the Americans and Diem when the bonzes started their howlings about persecution, and setting themselves on fire, and all, well, the bonzes got the bit in their teeth, and newly full of piss and vinager, set seriously about the business of overthrowing a reasonably legitimate government. And you've seen the results. Buddha was right -- bonzes and politics don't mix and shouldn't. As to why they were setting fire to themselves, well, that's the same sort of Stupid and Useless thing religions have been inspiring their deluded followers with for the past five thousand years and more. Look at Malcolm X -- he knew he was on the Muslims' death list, but he had the Word, man, he had the Word.

And, finally, what is this "two-valued" "rigid aristotelian" crap, Ted? There are of course many fine shades of right and wrong, in international affairs as in anything else. But there are also some things that do lie at the end of the scale -- there are some things that are right/wrong -- especially when one views the scale in a practical context. China's invasion, occupation, and genocide in Tibet is Wrong. Russia's brutal annexation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia is Wrong. Russia's bloody interference in Hungary in 1956 was Wrong. North Korea's invasion of South Korea in 1950 was Wrong. *The Democrats are Wrong* Castroite terrorism in Venezuela is Wrong. The tens of thousands of examples of communist terrorism in South Vietnam, the terrorist techniques of executing all village leaders, all who dissent when the Viet Cong require food and manpower, that is Wrong. That's not two-valued logic, Ted, that's observing that the permissible spectrum of activities has been grossly exceeded, that the proper limits of right action have been passed irretrievably. Some things are beyond the pale.

Ah, there, but I will admit one thing. I have long felt that there is no reason why we can't, when we feed one fourth the population of Algeria with our generous overproduction of food, use that fact as a lever on the leaders of Algeria from time to time; when we give a country a billion dollars worth of aid, why don't we have the right to expect that they give us a little something once in a while? Right? No, of course you say Wrong, but wait a bit -- I also feel that if we're going to influence leftist governments we aid, we shd also influence the rightist govt's too. We cd have slapped Rhee's hands away from the public till, told Diem to tone down the purely Catholic flavor of his regime, and hell, we could have simply kicked Batista out. But, you see, I only think Nixon's the best man around; I never said he was perfect, I was just hoping you were the sane.

-- dgv