

Post 9/11/67

## Today and Tomorrow . . . By Walter Lippmann Secretary Rusk and Organized Peace

Secretary Rusk said the other day that "a central problem of our Nation . . . must be to pursue an organized peace—a lasting peace, a world in which disputes are settled by peaceful means . . . There is no doubt about that. What we are arguing



Lippmann

about is whether the policy we are now pursuing, the policy of which Secretary Rusk is a principal architect and the principal spokesman, is in fact directed towards an organized peace in the world.

Secretary Rusk's main reason for saying that our war policy is directed towards world peace is that we have signed alliances with 40 nations pledging our support against aggression. "The integrity of these alliances is at the heart of the maintenance of peace." And these alliances will have lost their integrity, Secretary Rusk thinks, if we do not succeed in compelling the North Vietnamese to allow the South Vietnamese and the Vietcong to be dealt with by General Ky's government and ourselves.

AN ARGUMENT can be made that South Vietnam should be kept free of Communist power and influence. But no argument can be made that our war in Vietnam is contributing to an organized peace. In this, the fourth war fought by Americans in this century, the United States is either at odds with or at least iso-

lated from all the great international organizations of peace, with the United Nations, with the Holy See, virtually with all the Protestant and Jewish churches, and with all the great powers of the world. Our only fighting allies come from client states and, in token numbers, from two British countries cast adrift in the Pacific by the Dissolution of the British Empire.

How does Secretary Rusk persuade himself that as he stands apart from all the great military and spiritual powers of the earth he is engaged in organizing a lasting peace? Apparently he has satisfied himself on this point by telling himself that if only Hanoi knuckles under now all our 40 allies will have been made confident that if ever they get into trouble in the future, there, standing at their side, would be the United States in all its might and majesty.

IT IS MORE LIKELY that the reverse is true and that our war in Vietnam will have an opposite effect on the integrity, or shall we say the credibility, of our alliances. What is being said privately in Washington must have occurred to people abroad: The lesson of Vietnam is "never again." It has become inconceivable that the United States would or could mount another intervention like that in Vietnam somewhere else in the world. Far from proving that our allies can count on our willingness to die for the integrity of the alliances, the Johnson-Rusk intervention is demonstrating that if the alliances entail such wars as this one, they are worthless, if they are not dangerous, to all concerned—in-

cluding the ally who is to be saved.

Far from our being in pursuit of an organized peace, we are in the way of demonstrating with blood and fire that the postwar mania for making alliances was, if not mere diplomatic hot air, a booby trap.

SECRETARY RUSK'S trouble is that he has confused the idea of an organized peace with a network of cold war alliances which was put together in the 1950s. Except as the State Department digs up one of the pacts to justify something that it wants to see done, the old Dulles network of pacts is in its dying phase. The country will not be able even to begin to work for an organized peace until it finds a way to work itself out of the isolation into which we have stumbled.

© 1967, The Washington Post Co.