

2/3/72

Dear Js,

Got to read the Horowitz "The Making of America's China Policy" early this a.m., before I have to take Lil to work. Really very good. I'd have more trouble condensing all he says that with a longer piece, intended as tribute to him. The kind of thing that bugs me is inevitable with short pieces when they reach an audience so largely composed of the young, with no independent recollection of the events described. Example: the references to the surrender of the American-equipped armies. My recollection is that surrender is worse than an inadequate description, that the reality was desertion, changing sides, from the generals down to lowest privates, with all their American equipment. If this is minor in a fine writing, it remains the kind of thing that annoys me in my own, where I feel that I must make the most complete record possible.

One of the points impossible in such short space I hope is clear to the younger readers is the endless US pursuit of the idea whose time no longer can ever come, the strange political atavism that by withholding our trade and endorsement we can, somehow, tumble governments that have authentic popular support. We made with China the identical mistake we made with Russia, incapable of realizing that there was no single thing we could have done that made each more viable than might otherwise have been the case and in each case helped rally the people behind the government we sought to eliminate. Russian economic sufficiency was at least hastened by the lack of choice. What we would not let them have they dimly had to get for themselves. Having failed to learn from this experience, we made the identical mistake with China. And now with Cuba. No single thing could help rally the Cuban populace behind the Castro government than American policy and opposition. And in every case, while in no case did popular deprivation occur (by comparison with the past, the only meaningful one), it made the populace more willing to accept deprivation.

A minor point of curiosity, if you know or can reach Horowitz: is the C.B. Marshall, S-O vice Pres., father of or relative of Burke Marshall?

The middle paragraph in the first column of page 43 I do disagree with in that it suggests this policy was first tried with China. It is the identical policy that had by then failed with Russia, by then, in any honest assessment had to be recognized, from the Russian experience, as the policy guaranteed to be counterproductive. It is with the originality and absence of predictable result that I disagree only. Again attributable to space limitations.

The stupidity of Rusk in the next column, that China was a Russian puppet, is an incredible one for a man with his SEAsia experience in WWII. Don Castor, who Rusk replaced on Vinegar Joe's staff, was always an ultra-conservative. He then clearly foresaw the futility of this policy, which the "liberal" Rusk did not.

For Tiger the reminder of what I had forgotten, the attack on JFK for suggesting a moderation, is valuable.

Rockefeller on "this sort of rigidity has no place in a democracy (46) reminds me of my own OSS past, when I was in charge of two parts of a memo prepared for Nelson to use at Chapultepec, the Mexican conference preparatory to the UN founding in San Francisco. The purpose of this study was to lay a foundation for a move to keep the military dictatorship out of the UN as the Argentine representative, as a level for ending that dictatorship. Nelson just didn't do it. Later it was decided to update this study as a "blue book" on Argentina. I was in charge of the military part, as I had been of it and the economic, each dealing with Nazi control. I rather shocked everyone by refusing to take the assignment and was, without fuss, relieved. I assisted it with only the arranging of mechanical resources the scholars were incompetent to arrange for themselves, like microfilm-reading arrangements. I predicted, quite accurately, that with the changed context this was to be regarded as an intrusion into Argentine domestic affairs once the decision had been made at Chapultepec, and that even the Communists would side with the fascists on this point. That is precisely what happened.

Hasty thanks, HW