

Nixon blueprints policy views for 1968

195

By Godfrey Sperling Jr.
Staff correspondent of
The Christian Science Monitor

A Monitor interview

New York

Former Vice-President Richard M. Nixon has detailed policy positions, both foreign and domestic, which he will present to the voters soon in his second bid for the presidency.

- In an interview here, he calls for "a new policy to shorten the war," one in which "massive pressure" — short of nuclear power is used.

He says that by 1970 Communist China may achieve nuclear parity, together with delivery capacity, and adds: "We must have a policy of bringing the war to a conclusion before the time of ultimate danger is here—only two years from now. It is time to fish or cut bait."

- He sees a "very close election in 1968, more like 1960" with a Republican candidate "having a much better chance than in 1964." He thinks that the people are tiring of President Johnson, and that the issues of "good times, peace, and inflation" are running against the President this time.

- He says "our prestige abroad" is a

great political liability for the President next year: "Never in the history of the United States have we been disliked in more countries than right now."

- He says some critics in the United States are imposing excessively high election standards on the South Vietnamese: "You can't change a people . . . indoctrinate a people . . . overnight."

He said that having an election, of itself, denotes great progress. And for the United States to pull out of Vietnam, he said, "Because their election is imperfect, would condemn them forever to the system which they have now elected to leave."

"When," Mr. Nixon asks, "is some columnist or breast-beating purist going to make the solid point that the real choice in South Vietnam is between some election and no election at all? And that in North Vietnam there never has been and never will be an election of any kind."

- He says a high-priority American for-

★ Please turn to Page 14

★ Nixon outlines '68 policy

Continued from Page 1

foreign-policy objective "must be to set up a new alliance—multilateral if possible, bilateral if necessary — which will keep Germany solidly on the Western side."

Red trade encouraged

- He says military superiority over the Soviet Union must be maintained and adds: "The cost of maintaining that superiority, including the development of an anti-ballistic-missile capacity, is a necessary investment in peace."

- He calls for a policy "which encourages more trade with the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries."

- He says "there should be no extension of long-term credits or trade in strategic items with any nation, including the Soviet Union, which aids the enemy in North Vietnam."

- He charges the President with "failure in ideological leadership" to meet the crisis in the cities.

- He takes a position against a tax increase: "I believe the private sector is soft and uncertain. Thus, a higher tax might produce less revenue than now."

- Of a George C. Wallace candidacy in 1968 he says: "If Wallace becomes a candidate, he might hurt the Republican candidate in parts of the South. At the same time he might help him in parts of the North. I think it would balance out."

Addressing himself first to Vietnam, Mr. Nixon said in an interview in his Broad Street law office:

"My difference with the administration is not that they have made a commitment there. We had to make one, to resist aggression in Vietnam and in the Pacific. If anything, the commitment should have been made earlier.

"I have consistently disagreed with the means toward the end in the administration's Vietnam policy. The President, by gradual escalation, has frittered away the advantage that massive pressure should have given us. Massive pressure is decisive only when used massively. When pressure is applied gradually, the enemy is able to increase its ability to sustain the pressure.

"The administration, in effect, has resigned America to a long war and a grinding war.

"I support the use of air and sea power—but not all of our power. I am opposed to the use of nuclear weapons. First, because they are not necessary. And, second, because it is not wise.

Three dangers seen

"I still don't believe the administration has responded in a way that meets the criticism of Gerry Ford [GOP House Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford of Michigan]. I talked to Gerry the other day, and he doesn't think so, either.

"What is needed is a strategic decision [to use massive power]. And then we must carry it through.

"I see three great dangers in Vietnam.

"The first is that we pull out. This would be a disaster.

"The second is that through gradual escalation the administration's policy gets us into World War III. If in 1970 China achieves nuclear parity, plus a delivery capacity, then there is a real risk of World War III.

"Therefore we need a policy to shorten the war. It is time to fish or cut bait.

"We must have a policy of bringing the war to a conclusion before the time of ultimate danger is here—only two years from now. We need a policy which, both militarily and diplomatically, is directed toward this end."

'We live in new world'

Now turning to his own ideas for a new, foreign policy, Mr. Nixon said:

"We live in a new world. Never in human history have more changes taken place in the world in one generation. It is a world of new leaders. Churchill, Aduanaud, Stalin, Khrushchev, Nehru, Sukarno—many of the giants of the postwar period are gone. It is a world of new people. One-half of the people now living in the world were born since World War II.

"It is a world of new ideas. Communism, Marxism, socialism, anticolonialism — the great ideas which stirred men to revolution after World War I have lost their pulling power. The young people in all countries on both sides of the Iron Curtain are groping for a new cause—a new religion. If any idea 'turns them on,' it is a new sense of pragmatism—'what will work.'

"Because we live in a new world, many of the old institutions are obsolete and inadequate. The UN, NATO, foreign aid, USIA [United States Information Agency] were set up to deal with the world of 20 years ago."

Foreign-policy proposals

What does he propose?

"Let us reappraise United States policy in the light of the new world in which we live.

"The highest-priority American foreign-policy objective must be to set up a new alliance—multilateral if possible, bilateral if necessary—which will keep Germany solidly on the Western side.

"Let us look at the third world—Africa, Asia, Latin America. We reach one inescapable conclusion: Foreign aid needs a complete overhaul. The United States should use its aid programs to reward our friends and discourage our enemies."

Of the Soviet Union he said:

"They are still Communists, and they

are committed to the goal of a Communist world. They are battling the Chinese for leadership of that world. They want to achieve that goal without war. At the same time they want more economic progress at home. They will work with us only when doing so serves one or more of these three objectives."

What then should American policy be toward the Soviet Union?

"Militarily, we must recognize that we have not had a world war for 20 years because of America's clear military superiority. That superiority is now threatened, both because of Soviet progress in missile development and because of an attitude in United States policy circles that nuclear parity with the Soviets is enough.

"Because the primary Soviet goal is still victory rather than peace, we must never let the day come in a confrontation like Cuba and the Mideast where they, rather than we, have military superiority.

"The cost of maintaining that superiority, including the development of an ABM [anti-ballistic missile] capability, is a necessary investment in peace."

Economically?

"Economically, we should have a policy which encourages more trade with the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries.

"We must recognize, however, that to them trade is a political weapon. I believe in building bridges, but we should build only our end of the bridge. For example, there should be no extension of long-term credits or trade in strategic items with any nation, including the Soviet Union, which aids the enemy in North Vietnam."

Soviet goal is different

Diplomatically?

"Diplomatically we should have discussions with the Soviet leaders at all levels to reduce the possibility of miscalculation and to explore the areas where bilateral agreements would reduce tensions.

"But we must always remember in such negotiations that our goal is different from theirs: We seek peace as an end in itself. They seek victory, with peace being at this time a means toward that end."

"In sum," Mr. Nixon said, "we can live in peace with the Soviet Union, but until they give up their goal for world conquest it will be for them a peace of necessity and not of choice."

Off the upcoming Vietnam elections Mr. Nixon said:

"I'm getting a little tired of the breast-beating among some of the American politicians and pundits which, in effect, imposes on the people of South Vietnam a standard for their elections that very few countries would have achieved.

"Certainly the elections in Vietnam this year and in the foreseeable future are not going to be the same as those in the United States nor will they meet the standards in Britain.

"But when they talk of those in power acting to retain themselves in power, I suggest they look at de Gaulle in France, among others.

"Now when is some columnist or breast-beating purist going to make the solid point that the real choice in South Vietnam is between some election and no election at all?"

Change comes slowly

"And that in North Vietnam there never has been and never will be an election of any kind.

"Therefore the South Vietnam election is a sign of some progress. At least, there is an election."

"It is high time," he emphasized, "that it be pointed out that we can't bring a country like Vietnam along 200 years in just two years' time. That is what we are trying to do."

He paused, then went on:

"Now, having said this, I want to say that I deplore any election excesses.

"But I recognize that you can't change a people . . . you can't indoctrinate a people . . . overnight.

"Therefore for one to say that, if in Vietnam election standards don't meet our standards, we should get out, this, in effect, is saying that . . . because their election is imperfect . . . that we condemn them forever to the system which they have now elected to leave.

"Why doesn't someone speak up and point this out?"

Progress based on law

Next came the Nixon comments on the crisis in the cities:

"First things should come first. There are commissions with their recommendations, some of which should be adopted. Something has to be done about the poverty—to correct it.

"But there can be no progress without the rule of law. There must be a stop to the violence before we can go ahead. I mean that you can't have progress without peace and you can't have peace without the rule of law.

"We must restore rule of law—combined with the programs of compassion and reconciliation.

"We need national leadership that will implement civil-rights legislation already on the books. I think the President has fallen down in terms of leadership during this crisis. Teddy Roosevelt called the presidency a "bully pulpit," and he used it in that way. He called on Americans to face toward the strenuous life.

"It is time that the President walked into this pulpit and spoke more effectively about the decline of respect for law and about the traditions that have made this country great.

"Generally, I give the President high marks as a political operator."

"But he has failed to provide ideological leadership.

Johnson called vulnerable

"This country needs something more than a politician in the White House. It needs inspiration. It needs a plan for the future."

Asked if he thought the President were

vulnerable in 1968, Mr. Nixon said:

"Absolutely. Six months ago when the President was low in the polls, the people on Wall Street were saying anyone could beat him. In the spirit of Hollybush, Glassboro, N.J. they were saying that no one could beat him. Now they are saying a Republican would have a chance.

"I think that 1968 will be a very close election, more like 1960. The Republican candidate will have a much better chance than in 1964 for these reasons:

"First, there is more unity in the Republican Party. Secondly, the Democrats are more divided than in 1964. Finally, Johnson is in a weaker position than in 1964. People are tiring of him. The issues are more on our side. In 1964 [the Democrats] had good times, peace, and no inflation going for them. Now, even outside Vietnam, there is disarray throughout the world. Now we are running into inflation or a soft economy. And we are not as prosperous as we were in 1964.

"Add to this the President's problems with race relations.

"So I see the Republican candidate having a good chance. It will be a tremendous fight."

Advantages outlined

Referring to what he sees as the Republicans' "advantageous position" in 1968 he said:

"We can start with the proposition that the 1968 election is exactly the opposite of 1960—in terms of issues.

"In 1960 there was talk of our prestige abroad being low.

"But now we are talking about our prestige abroad in these terms: Never in the history of the United States have we been disliked in more countries than right now.

"In 1960, too, there was talk of a missile gap. This issue, pressed by the Democrats, disappeared shortly after the election. It was found that we had an 8-to-1 advantage.

"Today the missile gap is here again and very real. By 1970 the Soviet Union could achieve parity with us—or even pass us. In megatonnage it is said that the Russians are already ahead of us.

"Now it will be up to President Johnson to defend the positions of the United States, at home and abroad, just as I did in 1960 as spokesman for the Republicans.

"The Republicans are now in the position of attacking what is wrong—and in presenting a vision for the future. This is a distinct advantage."