

Rodman

For Official Use Only



SPECIAL MEMORANDUM

*FOREIGN RADIO AND PRESS REACTION
TO PRESIDENT NIXON'S REPORT
ON U. S. FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE 1970'S*

For Official Use Only

26 February 1970

WARNING

Laws relating to copyright, libel, and communications require that dissemination of this publication be limited to persons having an official interest in its contents. Exception can be granted only by the issuing agency, and users are warned that noncompliance may subject violators to personal liability.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

C O N T E N T S

SUMMARY i

I. NONCOMMUNIST COUNTRIES

 West Europe 1

 The Middle East 4

 Asia 8

 Africa 11

 Latin America 13

II. COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

 The USSR 16

 East Europe 23

 Vietnamese Communist Media 28

 North Korea 30

 Cuba 31

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

i

FOREIGN RADIO AND PRESS REACTION TO PRESIDENT NIXON'S REPORT
ON U.S. FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE 1970'S

S U M M A R Y

NONCOMMUNIST COUNTRIES

WEST EUROPE: West European reaction to the President's report is mostly favorable. The British press widely welcomes the pragmatism of U.S. policies, and a number of editorialists concur in the view that Europe's share of defense costs should rise. French commentators express relief that an era of "U.S. interventionist policies" seems to be drawing to a close. West German observers describe the report's conclusions as sober and responsible. Elsewhere there is widespread approval, mixed with a few warnings that a gearing down of U.S. military might will involve some risk to Western interests.

MIDDLE EAST: The reaction of the Arab states is almost entirely negative, with commentators treating the report as confirmation of Arab views that the United States is pursuing a totally pro-Israel policy and will furnish more arms to Israel. Arab radios give extensive play to negative Soviet reactions to the report. Israeli reaction is cautiously optimistic and positive, with commentators lauding the President's stress on the dangers of Soviet intentions in the Middle East and welcoming his reassurances to Israel. The Athens radio hails the report for its "realistic assessment" of the world situation.

ASIA: Official Japanese circles and most of the major Tokyo papers welcome the report as indicative of U.S. efforts for world peace. A number of editorialists agree that Japan must accept increased responsibility for peace and progress in Asia in the new era, but some express concern at the possibility of a larger military role for Japan. Nationalist China commentators indicate a lack of sympathy for any increased reliance on Japan and disagreement with the President's position on Communist China. South Korean papers are fearful lest the reorientation of U.S. policy encourage aggression by Asian communists. Little comment is available from other Asian sources.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

ii

AFRICA: A Nigerian paper angrily denounces the President's comments on Africa, but available reaction from black Africa is otherwise negligible. South African and Rhodesian commentators see a measure of realism in the Africa section of the report. Tunisian reaction is favorable, Moroccan comment is mixed, and Algerian reaction is wholly critical.

LATIN AMERICA: Official circles in Bolivia, Chile, and Venezuela see "positive aspects" in the report and a measure of better understanding of Latin America's problems. Scant available newspaper reaction is mixed, with some editorialists describing the report as nothing but "rhetoric."

COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

THE USSR: Moscow concludes that the President has offered "nothing new," with the most authoritative commentaries--by Matveyev in IZVESTIYA and Mayevskiy in PRAVDA--pressing the Soviet propaganda call for deeds, not words. Soviet commentaries devote primary attention to Vietnam and the Middle East, but deal with both chiefly in stock generalities. Soviet propaganda has acknowledged the President's remarks on U.S.-Soviet relations, while complaining that he laid the blame on the USSR for their "far from satisfactory" state. To date there has been no Soviet mention of his remarks on Eastern Europe or on the strategic arms limitation talks. And Moscow comment has only belatedly acknowledged the observations in the report about comparative U.S. and Soviet nuclear strength. The President's remarks on U.S.-Chinese relations have been noted in Soviet media without comment.

EAST EUROPE: East European reaction is generally negative except for Romania's. While tracing a modification of U.S. "tactics" to domestic pressures, the media cite U.S. policy in Vietnam and the Middle East as evidence that Washington's "imperialist" goals have not changed. At the same time, East European coverage is marked by a diversity stemming from the individual countries' special political concerns. Hungary, for example, complains of "discriminatory" trade measures, and the now orthodox Czechoslovaks accuse the United States of "launching divisive sallies" against the East European countries. Bucharest alone refers to the President's comments on Romania, highlighting his recollections on his visit last year and his hope that equally good relations can be established with the rest of Eastern Europe. Albania, apparently concerned over the possibility of improved U.S.-Peking relations, underlines the theme that new U.S. tactics call for a stronger U.S.-Soviet "alliance" and strengthened imperialist pacts directed mainly at Peking. The Yugoslavs are notably critical in reading the message as a reaffirmation of a policy based on blocs.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBI'S REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

iii

THE VIETNAMESE COMMUNISTS: Hanoi press and radio comment and commentaries from the Liberation Front's radio and news agency describe the presidential report as a "rehash" of old positions. Both Hanoi and the Front repeat standard allegations that the United States wants to use Vietnamization to prolong the war and maintain that the Vietnamization program is failing. Hanoi reiterates the charge that the United States is responsible for the stalemate in the Paris talks.

NORTH KOREA: Typically vituperative Pyongyang comment takes the occasion to repeat routine charges that the United States is trying to incite a "war of aggression" in Korea. The North Korean press is personally abusive of President Nixon, describing him as "the boss of the U.S. imperialist war maniacs."

COMMUNIST CHINA: Peking has yet to mention the foreign policy report.

CUBA: Havana's comment, uniformly hostile, decries the President's emphasis on "partnership" as a "facade" behind which the United States intends to continue traditional "imperialist" policies. Cuban commentators emphasize the conclusion that the report offers "nothing new" on Latin America.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 1 -

I. NONCOMMUNIST COUNTRIES

WEST EUROPE

BRITAIN British reaction to the President's report is mostly favorable, with emphasis on the pragmatic nature of the policies set forth. Publicity for the report is extensive, most notably in the *TIMES*.

On 19 February the *TIMES* devoted half its front page to news dispatches on the report, plus a full inside page of extracts and a lead editorial. "Mr. Nixon keeps his hands free everywhere," the editorial says, "except perhaps on the antiballistic missile." This "lack of commitment to specific policies is not a weakness," the *TIMES* declares, but rather "liberates him from the shackles of past errors." On 20 February a *TIMES* editorial on the British defense white paper notes the President's "challenge" to European countries to assume a fairer share of defense costs.

The *DAILY TELEGRAPH*'s editorial calls the report "the most comprehensive and explicit statement of foreign policy aims and programs ever voluntarily made public by any major power." Stressing that the tone of the report is "inexorably practical," the *TELEGRAPH* expresses the hope that "somewhere in the Kremlin are sources capable of offering similar high-quality advice." The President's pledge not to disengage from Europe is welcomed by the *TELEGRAPH* and other papers. Several, including the *GUARDIAN*, go on to caution that this pledge does not mean U.S. military strength will remain at present levels and that Europe itself must use the time to search out "new alternatives."

The *SUNDAY TELEGRAPH*'s editorial page contains a lengthy favorable review of the report by Gordon Brook-Shepherd, who calls it a triumph of pragmatism over preaching. He says it marks the formal end to the 25-year Pax Americana, for the President has "ditched the moral approach to world affairs" and returned to 19th century practice by substituting national interests for supranational ideology.

The *Sunday OBSERVER*'s Raymond Heard, writing from Washington, calls President Nixon's comments on Africa a victory for the "realists" over the "liberals" and notes that his remarks have been applauded by South Africa and Rhodesia. The *SUNDAY TIMES* carries a report from Washington by Henry Brandon saying that the new Nixon Doctrine is aimed at protecting America's world role from being corroded by the "traumatic disillusionment" caused by Vietnam. Brandon observes that the report is more an analysis than an action document and that it proposes no drastic policy changes.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 2 -

The ECONOMIST argues in its lead editorial that the notion of "a new era of American policy" is "a grand idea" but "a bit too grand." According to the weekly, the closer one looks, "the more one doubts whether the role the United States plays in the world will have changed as much by the time Mr. Nixon leaves office as he is trying to make people think it will." The "solid core" of what the President is trying to do, the weekly says, is to persuade the allies to take on more of the strain of defense "while he gets his own country out of its shellshock." The ECONOMIST, agreeing that this aim is valid, publishes a chart to show how the allies' combined GNP has risen dramatically while they have stood pat on defense spending.

FRANCE Paris newspapers emphasize that the report signifies an end to past U.S. "interventionist" policies. LE MONDE says "the interventionist zeal of yesteryear has disappeared," and L'AUREOLE asserts that the President "has decided to break away from the policy of interventionism" and follow a future course in which there will be "no talk of domination or paternalism." A French radio commentator concludes that "the cold war era is now over for the United States" and "the era of great negotiations" is commencing.

An editorial in LA NATION asserts that France has been saying for years what President Nixon now recognizes, that West European countries must be responsible for European affairs. On the eve of President Pompidou's visit, the paper declares, "Nixon's statements enable one to predict that the two men will have no difficulties in agreeing on the future outlook for Europe."

The French CP organ L'HUMANITE carries a factual report on the main topics covered in the report and a critical commentary by Yves Moreau, who concludes that the President's new strategy "represents no break with the old policy of intervention which the United States continues to pursue in various forms and on all continents." As for peace in Europe, Moreau says that President Nixon has no intention of ending the divisive military bloc policy and that he rejects any notion of disengagement.

WEST GERMANY West German commentators, while judging the report to be long-winded and "preachy," in most cases describe its conclusions as sober and responsible. Hamburg's DIE WELT, in an editorial by Heinz Barth, praises the document for "establishing a system of priorities" and for attempting "to bring method and style to Washington's foreign relations," but expresses concern over the "carelessness" with which the suddenly discovered economic prosperity of America's allies is "assessed as an increase in political strength."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 3 -

Barth sees the United States "in a phase in which it has to make good on historical omissions." Because its foreign policy has not kept pace with its rapid growth, a "rehabilitation had to be tackled sometime." A successful rehabilitation, the editorial concludes, is possible only through "such a sober and antidoctrinaire administration as that of Nixon."

The Munich MUENCHNER MERKUR says the report "should be the constant companion of diplomats East and West" and sees it as an indication of President Nixon's "preeminent compulsion" to give a settlement with Moscow priority over his solicitude for his allies, a solicitude for which these allies "will now have to pay a higher price in hard currency." An editorial in FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU welcomes the "healthy sobermindedness" manifested in the report, particularly with regard to U.S. intentions "to treat the communist opponents primarily as nations which are pursuing interests of their own." Noting that the recognition or understanding of such interests is a prerequisite for trying to make conflicting interests compatible, the editorial warns that it is not easy to persuade the opposite side to make such a deal. Seeing merit in the President's call to shift power from the superpowers to the smaller nations, the editorial observes that "very soon it will become clear whether it can be successfully applied in day-to-day politics. The Middle East is a test case which does not offer much cause for hope."

ITALY The major Italian papers comment favorably for the most part. L'UMANITA feels the report will prove to be "one of the foundations of world equilibrium," while IL TEMPO calls it "a new political fact requiring all nations of the old continent to take concrete initiatives rapidly." IL MESSAGGERO notes approvingly that the President wants to see the development of a Europe based on stability and a healthy economy.

The communist L'UNITA sees nothing beyond fine words in the report and concludes that the references to the missile race mean that "the decade which has just begun is in danger of becoming another decade marked by a continuing arms race."

AUSTRIA An Austrian radio commentator sees the report as evidence that "America no longer wants to play the role of a world gendarme." While there is no completely new concept of U.S. foreign policy, he explains, the President is trying to adjust to world realities. A Vienna KURIER editorial says the consequences of the President's decision to gear down the U.S. military machine "may involve dangers for the Western world, but at the same time it will promote the development of all countries toward genuine sovereignty and independence."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 4 -

OTHER COUNTRIES Madrid's YA says that "Nixon has been explicit in regard to relations with Europe, and the era of making unilateral decisions is over." EL ALCAZAR feels that the report "will serve Nixon in good stead for his first meeting with the Paris government." The Portuguese DIARIO DE NOTICIAS says the President "errs on the side of overoptimism" in regard to the threat of communist subversion in Africa. The danger is still real, the paper asserts, "although our soldiers are contributing toward stemming that tide."

Little comment is available from Scandinavia; Oslo's MORGENBLADET says "the Nixon Doctrine reveals firmness as well as a desire to maintain a distance," which "does not imply another period of isolation."

THE MIDDLE EAST

THE UAR Cairo radio views the presidential report as demonstrating the validity of Arab charges of U.S.-Israeli collusion and U.S. hostility toward the Arab states. One commentator suggests that the timing of the report, immediately after the Israeli bombing of a UAR civilian factory, makes it a "new and flagrant provocation." Cairo's Voice of the Arabs radio and other broadcast media concentrate on the sections dealing with the Middle East, concluding that the President's declared intention is to continue supplying Israel with arms. Other sections of the report--on Vietnam and Africa--get only passing attention. The political editor of Cairo's MIDDLE EAST NEWS AGENCY (MENA) comments that the President "definitely confirmed the U.S. anti-Arab, pro-Israel policy" and the "complete agreement" between U.S. and Israeli policy. Observing that the President "ignored" Israeli attacks which had resulted in the killing of dozens of Arab civilians, the MENA editorial charges that "Nixon has personally played a major role" in supplying Israel with the "long-range offensive weapons" that make such attacks possible.

Cairo newspapers have said very little about the report. An exception is AL-JUMHURIYAH, which commented on 19 February that the President "confirms that it is useless to discuss the Middle East crisis on the basis of rights and justice" and that President Nixon "is leading the battle against us."

The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) radio, Cairo's Voice of Palestine, quotes the President as saying the United States has achieved none of its aims in the past 12 months. Both the Voice of Palestine and Cairo's Voice of Fatah single out what they term the President's "reaffirmation" of U.S. "determination" to supply Israel

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 5 -

with arms. A Voice of Fatah commentary exhorts Arab world listeners to fight to destroy "all imperialist interests in the area, particularly the Zionist presence," and adds that "all U.S. attempts to undermine our people's steadfastness and to subjugate them to a fait accompli must be destroyed." This commentary was followed by prominent play for the Moscow TASS' conclusion that major U.S. policy objectives are unchanged and that U.S. policy is based on military force. Subsequent Cairo radio coverage was confined exclusively to reports that PRAVDA had accused the President of hypocrisy and that Radio Moscow had criticized his call for a cease-fire in the Middle East.

SYRIA Damascus newscasts feature the TASS and PRAVDA comments on the President's report after broadcasting only one news story of their own--to the effect that the President declared his intention to supply Israel with more planes and weapons and that he attacked Soviet support for the Arabs. The radio also cites NOVOSTI reports of "mass rallies" in the Soviet Union--Moscow describes them as protest meetings at various enterprises--in support of the Arabs.

Two Damascus radio commentaries on the subject have been monitored so far. One of them terms the report a reaffirmation of U.S. "animosity for the Arab people" and of the "rancorous" U.S. attitude toward the Arab liberation movement, which is now "seriously endangering imperialist--and particularly U.S.--interests" in the area. The radio says President Nixon claimed "fear" of Soviet infiltration and growing Soviet influence in the area as a pretext for his decision to supply Israel with more arms. "Our people," it says, "know that the United States is not just their enemy but the No. 1 enemy," and they also know who their "natural allies" are.

IRAQ Iraqi comment is sparse, with Baghdad radio highlighting the report in only one newscast and thereafter confining its coverage to prominent play for the PRAVDA and TASS reactions. The only monitored Baghdad radio comment, on 23 February, says escalation of fedayeen action is "the" reply to continued "imperialist" support for Israel and U.S. policy as set forth in the President's report. Baghdad's AL-JUMHURIYAH is reported by the radio as suggesting that "liquidation of U.S. interests in the Arab world should be the Arab governments' first step" in making "the only answer to Nixon's message" and to "the White House rulers' flagrant aggression against the Arab nation."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 6 -

JORDAN There is no monitored Jordanian radio comment on the report. Amman radio carried no factual accounts of its own in monitored broadcasts, confining itself to citing international criticism--all negative--attributed chiefly to East European radios, NOVOSTI, PRAVDA, and LE MONDE of Paris.

LEBANON The Beirut radio, whose presentation of the President's report on the whole has been more objective than that of other monitored Arab media, reported on 18 February that the President "affirmed his intention to give arms to Israel," adding that he said "when necessary." It also acknowledges the President's statement that he had "frequently, and in vain, proposed to Moscow a complete ban on arms to the Middle East." Lebanese press reaction includes a Beirut AN-NAHAR appraisal likening President Nixon to John Foster Dulles in his views on U.S. and Soviet spheres of influence. AN-NAHAR says avoiding responsibility has become "second nature" to the United States, which avoids taking the lead in settling the Middle East crisis because of its commitments to Israel. Beirut's AL-ANWAR, a pro-UAR paper, contrasts Arab views of the United States and of the Soviet Union, saying the Soviet presence is regarded as "sympathy and support" for which Arabs are grateful, while the United States is heading for "another grave mistake" by "taking advantage of the Soviet desire for peaceful coexistence to go to extremes in its policy of arming Israel and intensifying the Middle East struggle."

ARABIAN
PENINSULA A Kuwait AR-RAY AL-AMM editorial says U.S. policy stipulates that the Arabs should confront Israel unarmed so that Israel can serve as an effective military base for U.S. interests in the area. The paper also represents President Nixon as saying the United States will abandon its role as "world policeman"--except in the Middle East.

LIBYA Bayda radio carries no factual coverage of the report but does cite PRAVDA. The radio denounces the report in two commentaries, saying the "fluctuating" U.S. policy in the Middle East is aimed solely at consolidating aggression and increasing tension in the area, primarily to secure U.S. domination of Arab countries and their rich natural resources. The radio imputes five objectives to the President in expressing "partiality" for Israel: 1) containing the Arab revolution, 2) liquidating the Palestinian issue, 3) striking at progressive forces, 4) enabling Israel to "reap more fruits from its aggression and while putting the United States in a position to bargain with the Arabs to restore U.S. influence," and 5) convincing the Soviet Union it should stop supporting the Arabs.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 7 -

ISRAEL Foreign Ministry Director General Gideon Rafael said on 18 February, in an interview broadcast by Jerusalem radio, that for Israel the Nixon report means: 1) President Nixon stresses that making peace is the responsibility of the two sides and can be done only through negotiations; 2) "most important" is the President's explicit appeal to the Soviet Union; and 3) the report is "one of the clearest declarations made by U.S. administrations in recent years" on Soviet intentions in the area. Asked whether he saw any hint on the arms procurement issue, Rafael replied: "We do not need hints, we are discussing the matter with them," and President Nixon has said the United States will supply arms to friendly states when this become necessary.

Cautious optimism is expressed by most Israeli papers reviewed by the radio. For example, ISRAELSKI FAR sees the President's call for a cease-fire and negotiations as the prime condition for peaceful settlement; it views his recognition of Soviet ambitions in the area and his firm warning against them, as well as his insistence on balance of arms, as indications that he has "finally been convinced that Israel's stand is right and realistic." Although most papers see little or no policy change in the report, all of them cite these points as positive and, in HAARETZ' words, as providing room for hope that U.S.-Israeli differences will become fewer and narrower. The radio says MAARIV also "praises" the President for "ruling out" the possibility of a U.S. departure from the region.

IRAN Teheran radio reports fully on the Middle East portion of the President's report and highlights the sections on U.S. relations with the USSR in the Middle East and Vietnam. On 19 February Teheran broadcast a commentary by Mohammad Reza Askari containing excerpts from the report and linking the President's remarks on the Middle East with recent French moves to sell arms to Arab nations. The commentator says the reactions to the report in Moscow and Cairo demonstrate that no serious hopes exist for a peaceful solution to differences in the Middle East. In his weekly review, Teheran radio commentator Turaj Farazmand notes the mixed reception given the report throughout the world, observing that it was received with pleasure in the West and Israel but had a "cool and sometimes hostile" reception in Moscow and in Arab capitals.

GREECE Greek media are enthusiastic in praise of the report, Athens radio commenting that it outlines U.S. foreign policy "with wisdom and clarity" and demonstrates America's love for peace, understanding, and willingness to cooperate with friends and negotiate with foes. ELEVTHEROS KOSMOS calls it a "realistic assessment" of the world situation. A commentary in NEA POLITIA,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 8 -

like other monitored Greek comment, concentrates almost exclusively on the President's remarks on the Soviet Union and the communist world, applauding his courage and firmness.

TURKEY Ankara radio broadcasts routine factual accounts with emphasis on U.S.-Soviet relations. No Turkish newspaper comment is available because of the Bairam holiday, when no papers were published.

CYPRUS The Nicosia radio's Greek service and the clandestine Bayrak radio's English service broadcast one factual account each, while the clandestine Voice of Cyprus notes that the report drew "violent" criticism from the Arab world and TASS. The main Cyprus papers have not commented.

ASIA

JAPAN Japanese Government circles and most of the wide-circulation papers welcome the report as indicative of the President's efforts for peace. The four opposition parties have issued statements reflecting their varying attitudes. The Japan Socialist Party, according to KYODO, "said that it contained nothing new" and that the emphasis on Japan's role "is nothing but an indication of a U.S. scheme to make a tool of Japan in continuing the policy of war of aggression and domination in Asia." The Komei Party "evaluated the new U.S. posture as one of trying to shift its policy from confrontation to negotiations" while retaining the "principle of power politics," KYODO reports. The Democratic Socialist Party noted the "main points" of the report and "said that the Government, grasping the new U.S. moves correctly, should be prepared to develop an independent and coexistent diplomacy of its own," according to KYODO.

A statement by the Japan Communist Party assails the report as an attempt to cover up U.S. "aggressive" aims, and an editorial in the party newspaper AKAHATA says the report "constitutes a challenge to peoples all over the world, especially in Asia, including the Japanese people."

All major Tokyo papers carry editorials on the report. The Mainichi papers, the MAINICHI DAILY NEWS in English and the MAINICHI SHIMBUN in Japanese, note that "Japan will be expected to assume the nonmilitary role of assisting Asian nations in economic matters but will not be asked to take part in military security matters outside Japan." While this U.S. expectation no doubt shows regard for national feelings in Japan, "it may also derive from the view that strengthening Japan's armaments might eventually pave the way for

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 9 -

the nuclear armament of this country, which would not be desirable from a long-term perspective of the world situation," the Mainichi papers say.

The Japanese-language SANKAI expresses satisfaction that the report "indicates maturity on the part of the United States." Foreseeing a speedup of withdrawal of U.S. ground forces from Asia, SANKAI comments: "Whether Japan likes it or not, we shall soon have to face up to the fundamental problem of Japan's own self-defense within the framework of the Japan-U.S. security system." SANKAI adds that "the climate of the world is changing and the United States is also making a large turn," and it asks, "Is Japan ready to change its diplomacy and defense policy?"

The ASAHI EVENING NEWS calls the report "an extremely important document" marking the end of an era in some respects. The paper expresses unease over the Vietnam section, however, arguing that Vietnamization, "which aims at bolstering the war potential of the South, has no connection with peace."

The English-language YOMIURI comments that President Nixon's reference to the proposed ABM system serving the goal of ultimate disarmament "has drawn criticism, yet it cannot be equated with the heavy emphasis on military strength characterizing previous American foreign policy." YOMIURI's conclusion is: "Certainly this country's responsibilities must increase in the new era of the partnership with the United States, but peace and stable security in Asia presuppose coexistence with China and the success of the development effort in the emerging nations. The U.S.-Japan partnership must be shaped so as to promote these causes; in particular, military coloring of any kind must be avoided."

REPUBLIC OF CHINA While Nationalist China media register disappointment with the President's announced foreign policy course and evince uneasiness about Japan's role, commentators draw solace from the reaffirmation of U.S. commitments to the Republic of China and from a conviction that Peking and Washington will never be able to reach an accommodation.

A Taipei radio commentary terms the President's expressed desire to improve relations with Peking "a great loss to the free world" and views it as "inconceivable that the United States, as the leader of the free world, should assume that the communist bandits will sooner or later return to the international community." Taipei's CENTRAL NEWS AGENCY (CNA) reports government spokesman Dr. Wi Yu-sun as praising the President's "incisive analysis of the prospects of establishing contact with the Peiping regime."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 10 -

Taipei newspapers reviewed by CNA charge the President with "risking the peace of Asia." The papers CHUNG KUO SHIH PAO and SHIN SHENG PAO warn that "Japan's seesaw foreign policies may ruin the hope of a partnership to maintain peace in Asia" and that reliance on Japan to shoulder major political responsibility in Asia and for Asians to be responsible for their own defense "is an ostrich-like policy of Asian defense" which cannot replace a tightly organized Asian collective security system.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA The Seoul radio reports favorable reaction in various world capitals, but the Korean press, as reviewed by the HAPTONG news agency, expresses concern and calls for caution. One paper, the KOREA TIMES, warns the United States that setbacks could be suffered in implementing the Nixon Doctrine in Asia "without due consideration of the realities of free Asian nations." The paper stresses that "mutual cooperation and assistance to prevent in advance any outbreak of emergency is the key to maintenance of peace and security."

CHUNG-ANG ILBO and TONGA ILBO convey concern over the "significant switch" in the orientation of U.S. foreign policy. They argue that Asian communists may be encouraged to pursue a more aggressive strategy against their free neighbors through a misreading of President Nixon's indication that the United States will refuse to be drawn into certain types of wars launched by the communists in the future. At the same time, according to HAPTONG, all the papers express "'conviction' that the new U.S. policy . . . will not affect the 'historic relations forged in blood' between Korea and the United States."

AUSTRALIA The Melbourne HERALD's political commentator sees the report as a "very important" statement by "a politician turning into a world statesman." The report indicates a "broad, low-profile policy for America's future dealings with Asian nations," including Australia, the commentator declares. The AUSTRALIAN calls the report a rationalization of President Nixon's intention to withdraw from Asia and shift greater attention to Europe, with Japan nominated as "heir-apparent" to "America's waning influence" in Asia. The AUSTRALIAN expresses gratitude for the President's "reinterpretation of the Guam Doctrine, which Mr. Agnew had so successfully obfuscated."

OTHER COUNTRIES The Saigon radio and press have not commented on the report, and Bangkok media have also been silent. No comment has been monitored from Indian and Pakistani sources. The only available item from Indonesia, a Djakarta radio

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 11 -

commentary, says that while there is "nothing new" in the report in terms of traditional U.S. foreign policy, "it offers new prospects."

AFRICA

NIGERIA The only available Nigerian reaction to the President's report is a hostile editorial of 23 February in the Kaduna *NEW NIGERIAN*. The paper deals solely with the section on Africa and sees the President's "indiscreet" statements as an embarrassment to Secretary Rogers, who was "still gallivanting around in Africa" trying to cram the Nixon African policy "down the throats" of African leaders. The paper rejects U.S. strictures against use of force to stop racial discrimination in southern Africa, declaring that constitutional means have failed to secure "fundamental human rights for Africans" and that "violence and armed conflicts cannot be ruled out." The editorial observes that Africans do not need to be told their economic salvation depends upon themselves and that Mr. Nixon's "ill-timed" policy statements on Africa, which it says should have awaited Rogers' return, constituted a superfluous attempt to "subtly warn" Africans of a possible cutback in U.S. aid.

SENEGAL The Dakar radio on the 19th suggested that the report's advocacy of nonviolent means to solve the South African and Rhodesian problems "certainly lost, at least for the time being, the sympathies of the Organization of African Unity Secretary General and a large portion of African opinion which militates in favor of using violence" in these cases. At the same time, it added, the President undoubtedly won the sympathies of those who "in the name of realism advocate a policy of overture toward the white regimes in South Africa."

SOUTH AFRICA The Johannesburg radio quotes South African Foreign Minister Mueller as saying the report's section on southern Africa "indicates a realistic approach to the problems of the area" and that the declaration that the United States would not intervene in African states' internal affairs but would come to their aid in the event of an external threat "was in line with South Africa's own thinking." A Johannesburg radio commentator views the President's African policy as "a refreshing approach" grounded in realism rather than in idealism. The radio calls Mr. Nixon's appeal to Africa to abandon violence "a service to the peoples of Africa," and it adds that most "moderate" African states will probably welcome the Nixon report but that the OAU will give it a "frosty" reception.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 12 -

RHODESIA A Salisbury radio commentary observes that "at no point in his references to southern Africa did President Nixon refer either to Rhodesia or to South Africa by name." Note is also taken of Mr. Nixon's affirmation that there would be no U.S. intervention in the internal affairs of African nations. In Salisbury radio's "Weekly World Survey," Harvey Ward sees the President's omission of any condemnation of southern African countries as "a slap in the face of the African states which have advocated force and other strong measures against white-controlled southern Africa." And the President's statement that the United States will not intervene in African internal affairs is seen as support for the right of independence and "again becomes a blow to the OAU," which plans "an all-out struggle against the white regimes of Africa."

TUNISIA Tunis radio broadcasts favorable accounts of the report, singling out the President's remarks on the Middle East and noting that there can be no chance of a solution until distrust is overcome. The theme of mutual trust runs through a short radio comment on the report, which says that the basic points of the Nixon Doctrine are cooperation to safeguard a lasting peace, maintenance of the power necessary to defend common interests against threats, and the will to negotiate.

The TAP news agency reviews a comment in the daily LA PRESSE DE TUNISIE, which says that what makes the Nixon Doctrine "so important and so different from all that one has become accustomed to seeing and hearing in the world" is the President's call for young nations to disengage themselves from all external interference. This paper sees "the greatest power in the world" as believing it possible and necessary to conceive of relations with its allies and enemies not in terms of strength but in terms of dialog and cooperation. This wish is not new, the paper adds; what is new is that "it is stated with such vigor by the head of a great power." According to a Tunis radio review, the paper AS-SABAH sees the report as a "clear admission of the misery in which the world is struggling." AS-SABAH declares that the greatest obstacle to extending international aid to relieve this misery is "the mad arms race between the two giants."

MOROCCO A Rabat AL-ALAM commentary observes that U.S. policy is not the work of a president or a party, but of "those with economic and colonialist interests who occupy key posts, particularly in the White House." It asserts that "the mess" in which America finds itself results from "a colonialist doctrine" closely resembling those of earlier European colonialist powers. The paper comments that the United States intends to renounce the role of "world gendarme" and adds that "President Nixon at least gives the impression of becoming aware of the dangers of letting oneself be

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 13 -

led down the dangerous path which American policy has been following since World War II." AL-ALAM is skeptical, however, about the chances that this awareness can be translated into concrete acts, because "capitalist interests" remain in control of foreign policy.

The Istiqlal party paper L'OPINION is quoted by AFP on the 19th as remarking that the President has decided the United States should "cultivate its own garden and not play policeman to the world any longer." Proof of the seriousness of the President's declaration on the "increasing importance" of Africa to the United States would be best displayed, the paper adds, through more economic aid, withdrawal of numerous "psychological advisers" who work in Africa "under various humanitarian pretexts," and "dealing with Africans as adults."

ALGERIA Consistently negative reaction from the Algerian radio and press is exemplified by a 19 February Algiers radio comment calling the report an outline of the main features of "what the new imperialist policy will be in the 1970's." The radio interprets the Nixon Doctrine as meaning the United States "wants to continue its aggression while not being held responsible for it," through a policy which employs "local wars waged by intermediary powers and forces" in the military sphere and "by means of systematic neocolonialization" in the economic sphere.

Algerian comment on the Middle East sections predictably lines up with Eastern Arab states, saying that the President "reaffirmed that the pivot of American policy is the Zionist state in the Middle East." An Algiers AL-MOUJAHID editorial on 19 February sums up the report as calling for "a general Vietnamization" of U.S. foreign policy, implemented by limiting direct U.S. intervention while "letting local puppets and strawmen take action to strictly implement a policy that remains unchanged."

LATIN AMERICA

ARGENTINA According to the Buenos Aires IPS news agency, four weekly Buenos Aires publications devoted the lead portions of their international sections to the Nixon report. Generally speaking, IPS says, the commentaries indicate that Argentine public opinion has not ascribed "any far-reaching importance" to the report.

PERISCOPIO, reflecting the opinion of "nonmilitant nationalists," says the report contained "long tirades full of sympathy, rhetoric, and formulas," although the measures it outlined do show hope for a "softer than usual position and a touch of realism." PANORAMA,

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 14 -

which IPS says represents interests close to former President Frondizi, says the report follows the spirit of the President's 31 October speech, adding that Mr. Nixon has apparently "changed the stand adopted on 31 October" on dealing with presently constituted governments and now feels that the United States must consider how to evaluate changes in Latin America.

ANALISIS, described as "interpreter of a new current of Argentine conservatism," ignored the president's references to Latin America, as did CORREO DE LA TARDE, spokesman for liberal circles. EL CRONISTA COMERCIAL, a businessmen's publication, points out that the tone of the statements on Latin America indicates that the United States is making efforts to abandon positions which "could be interpreted as interventionist."

CHILE The Chilean Foreign Ministry issued a statement through its diplomatic information service judging the report of "special interest" in that it shows "a new and positive outlook that will permit U.S. policies and programs to be in accord with the fundamental changes that have occurred in Latin America." The foreign ministry applauds the President's "clear recognition" of the problems in Latin America and says his desire to solve them gives rise to the belief that in the next few years the "old hopes of Latin America will be satisfied." The pro-government Santiago LA NACION sees little hope the United States will increase its aid to Latin America because of the tight financial situation, the fact that most aid programs are based on export subsidies, and the fact that the White House, with elections coming up in November, will not want to alienate voters with additional taxes for foreign aid. Nevertheless, LA NACION adds, the President warned that Latin America faces more instability in the 1970's if "bigger financial resources to bring about its development" are not forthcoming.

The independent EL MERCURIO sees the United States' "new attitude" as more "a matter of rhetoric" than anything else, because the Latin American continent "continues to represent the vital interests of which President Nixon speaks and, within the limits of his austerity plan, the Latin American republics cannot remain excluded from the preferential attention of the United States."

The communist EL SIGLO dismisses the report as "lyrical and hypocritical."

BOLIVIA IPS quotes Information Minister Alberto Bailey as saying that although the report contained some positive aspects indicating a deeper understanding of Latin America, Mr. Nixon made certain statements which "depart from reality, particularly regarding

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 15 -

nationalism." Bailey said that while the President complained of Latin American ultranationalism, he failed to "comprehend its causes." According to IPS, the President's report has aroused "expectation in economic circles and skepticism in political circles" in Bolivia. Bolivian economic groups have not commented, it says, indicating that they are waiting to see if any of its objectives are carried out. Leaders of the Bolivian Socialist Falange and the Christian Democratic Party jointly declared that the message "does not offer any concrete solutions and seems to be a document of prose and demagoguery," IPS reports.

VENEZUELA Venezuelan President Caldera, at his 19 February press conference carried by the Caracas radio, saw a "series of favorable aspects" in President Nixon's references to Latin America. Caldera specified the concept of multilateral aid, the importance of liberalizing international credits for development, and creation of a permanent consultative system on economic decisions which may influence U.S. trade with Latin America. "We maintain that these are the most important items in President Nixon's report."

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC A typically partisan commentary on Santo Domingo's Radio Sensacional manages to tie in the President's policy statement on Latin America with an attack on the Balaguer forces, but does see in it facets "highly significant" for the Dominican Republic--notably, the "Nixon criterion that the inter-American community must determine how to evaluate the internal political instabilities and the extralegal changes in our governments." This means, according to the commentary, that the President will be guided by the 1965 Rio de Janeiro foreign ministers' conference resolution on recognition of de facto regimes as well as by the OAS charter. "During the next few months" Dominicans will be able to see if the Inter-American Charter is being observed and "if Nixon's words are kept or not."

PANAMA A Panama City Televisora Nacional commentator says the President's report had a "certain philosophical tenor" reminiscent of the speeches of President Kennedy. The commentary, devoted to East-West relations, observes that in effect the report "ends U.S. postwar policy," since it proposes a new era of negotiations with the USSR and "mutual moderation" in the practice of power by both nations throughout the world.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 16 -

II. COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

THE USSR

Soviet comment on the report--accounting for a substantial three percent of Moscow's total comment on all subjects during the week ending 22 February--is virtually uniform in the conclusion that the President offered "nothing new." The initial TASS report on the 18th, reprinted the next day in various central newspapers, says that while the document points to the need for a revision of some "old positions and for a 'new approach' to the problems of peace, the main aims and tasks of U.S. policy remain unchanged." In the same vein, a domestic service commentary on the 19th says the document makes clear that Washington, "as in former times, intends to pursue the same policy of scraping military blocs together, of the arms race, and of military invasion."

Also on the 19th, Radio Moscow lists for North American listeners Vietnam, the Middle East, Europe, and the arms race as "key problems" for peace and concludes that "the Republican Administration fails to show any new constructive approach" to any of them. Complaining that the President tried "to put the blame on the Soviet Union for certain dangerous developments in the world," this commentary says defensively that in aiding the Vietnamese and the Arabs, the USSR "is only siding with the victims of aggression."

The negative assessment of the report is echoed in available press comment, the most authoritative to date being articles by Matveyev in IZVESTIYA and Mayevskiy in PRAVDA. Matveyev on the 20th calls the report an attempt to "calm" the American people by suggesting that the Administration wants "to alter course and pass from the 'cold war' to the era of negotiations." But policy, the commentator concludes, is judged by actions, and "even the most euphonious words in favor of peace and international mutual understanding cannot serve as a substitute for practical deeds."

In an International Review article in PRAVDA on the 22d, Mayevskiy says that despite the "eulogistic salute of the monopolies' propaganda artillery," sober political observers have concluded that Washington's foreign policy "remains as before." Welcoming the President's remarks on the need to abandon the cold war and to negotiate on the ways to create a lasting peace, Mayevskiy says that these phrases are unfortunately "accompanied by attacks on the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, by a repetition of worn-out anticommunist fabrications, and by an open striving to lay the blame on someone else."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 17 -

Soviet commentators devote primary attention to Vietnam and the Middle East. At the same time, there is considerable tailoring of material, both over Radio Moscow and over the purportedly unofficial "Radio Peace and Progress," for audiences in Africa and Latin America. Typically, a Radio Moscow English-language broadcast to Africa on the 20th questions the sincerity of the President's remarks on "white minority" regimes, concluding that they represent little more than "flowery but hypocritical and hollow" phrases. And a broadcast in Portuguese to Brazil on the 22d says Washington's attitude toward Latin America is "aimed at maintaining and consolidating the positions of U.S. monopolies on the continent under the guise of partnership."

MIDDLE EAST Moscow sees nothing to inspire hope in the passages on the Middle East, noting that the President again calls for "mutual concessions," fails to condemn Israel's "annexationist and predatory" policy and military actions, and identifies U.S. policy in the area as balanced and impartial, while stating the American intention to continue supplying arms "to what is described as friendly nations." A foreign-language commentary by Shakhov on the 19th finds the impartial policy "a strange kind of balancing, to say the least," and concludes that the United States still regards military strength as the cornerstone of its foreign policy.

Referring to the President's "attempt to cast aspersions" on Soviet policy, commentators repeat Moscow's support for implementation of the November 1967 Security Council resolution and for a political settlement, promising that the USSR will continue to help those "fighting for their legitimate rights." Mayevskiy, in the 22 February PRAVDA, is "amazed" by statements "to the effect that the Soviet Union is not showing, they say, 'constructive flexibility' in talks on the Near East and that 'it is striving for 'preferential influence' there, and so forth." Reiterating that the USSR is seeking a peaceful settlement, Mayevskiy says the Soviet position is clearly set forth in the Kosygin letters to the leaders of the United States, Britain, and France, and in the 16 February TASS statement on the Middle East. Mayevskiy does not allude to the President's remarks on increased Soviet activity in the Middle East and the Mediterranean, but he charges that the U.S. plans in the Middle East are "indissolubly linked with the NATO plans" in the Mediterranean, and he sees Secretary Rogers' African trip as having a "direct bearing" on American strategy in the Mediterranean.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 18 -

While recent propaganda has been generally reticent on the issues of arms limitation and the cease-fire, a panelist in the Moscow domestic service commentators' roundtable on the 22d objects to the fact that the presidential message, giving precedence to the cease-fire question, treats the problem "in isolation from the general settlement" of the conflict. To examine the cease-fire question without settling the issue of Israeli withdrawal is to give Israel freedom to continue occupying and even to assimilate these territories, as it is now attempting to do, he says.

The roundtable panelist goes on to examine in more detail than other commentators the U.S. positions on a settlement outlined in the report, observing that it contains "practically nothing new." He again rejects the idea of direct Arab-Israeli talks, saying that this "old and familiar position" places the "aggressor" and his victim on the same plane. And he adds that there is no sign anywhere of a desire to settle the "main question" of Israeli withdrawal. The President declared, he says, that the Americans did not achieve as much as they had hoped for in the bilateral talks with the Soviet Union, but that the United States intends to continue the dialog. The reason why this dialog has so far been unsuccessful, the commentator adds, is that in their proposals the Americans "leave open all points favorable to the Arabs while they try to get everything favorable to Israel firmly down on paper."

The commentator misrepresents the President's statement that the time has passed when the powerful countries can or should dictate the future to less powerful nations; asserting that the report says "the time has come" when the powerful states must dictate the future, he calls this an application of the policy "from a position of strength," and he argues that they must not dictate but must find a just settlement which will prevent the "aggressor" from gaining any advantages from his actions.

Moscow buttresses its own assessments by pointing to Israeli "satisfaction" with the report and to the UAR's view that the President has expressed full agreement with Israel's policy. PRAVDA correspondent Yuriy Glukhov reports under a Cairo dateline on 21 February that the Arab press and public are sharply critical of the report and believe that "at the heart of the so-called 'new American peace strategy' is an arms race."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 19 -

VIETNAM Moscow deals with the Vietnam section of the report in stock generalities and acknowledges little of its substance. The initial TASS account as well as subsequent radio commentaries and a news report printed in IZVESTIYA on the 20th complain that the President, while "admitting that the Vietnam war has already divided American society," reaffirmed the "old policy" of Vietnamization which means continuation of the war by the Saigon "puppets." Matveyev, in IZVESTIYA on the 20th, finds "absolutely nothing new" on Vietnam in the report.

A participant in the 22 February domestic service roundtable discussion, commenting on antiwar sentiment in the United States, says that the "mass movement" for ending the war continues "unabated" but that the President has succeeded in calming "a part, however insignificant," of his critics with talk about his "alleged" intention to withdraw troops from Vietnam. The roundtable panelist, like other Moscow commentators, complains in routine fashion that the withdrawal is proceeding at an "insignificant rate" and that a deadline for withdrawal of all troops has never been announced. He adds that Vietnamization boils down to the creation of a situation that is a "repetition, in some form or other, of South Korea." Commentator Soltan, addressing foreign radio audiences on the 19th, registers the standard Soviet complaint that the President expressed "readiness" to withdraw troops on "condition" that the liberation forces refrain from struggle and that the Saigon government and army be strengthened to protect U.S. interests--"conditions" which amount to "unconditional surrender" to U.S. demands.

Other Moscow comment pegged to the report repeats charges that despite promises to end the war when the Administration took office, the war is not only not over but is spreading into Laos and Cambodia. One commentary on the 18th says the President "threatened the North, blaming it for the lack of progress at the talks in Paris," while other comment repeats charges that the United States is to blame. A roundtable panelist, commenting on the report's "attempt to transfer responsibility" at the Paris talks to the DRV and South Vietnamese "patriots," says it is the United States which has for a "considerable" period "practically conducted no serious talks." Aleksey Leontyev, in a broadcast to North America on the 21st, asserts that Washington has "snubbed" the PRG's "realistic" 10-point program for a settlement, "deliberately sabotaging the Paris talks" in favor of a "military solution" and placing its hopes in Vietnamization.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 20 -

Some commentators, referring to the report's statement that pacification will be extended, call the pacification program "bloody terror" and "mass annihilation" and cite the example of Son My. Leontyev, in his commentary for North America, says in this connection that Son My and other "massacres" have gained "nothing" and that American forces will have to remain for "years and years" before the South Vietnamese population can be pacified.

Mayevskiy in PRAVDA on 22 February, commenting on responsibility for the continuation of the war, says that the authors of the presidential report are "wasting their ink" when they try to lay responsibility on "the Soviet Union because it is helping the Vietnamese people"--an allusion to the expression of regret, in the section of the report on relations with the Soviet Union, that the USSR bears a heavy responsibility for continuation of the war because it gives the DRV the overwhelming majority of its war materials. Mayevskiy ignores the statement that the Soviet Union has "failed to exert a helpful influence" over the North Vietnamese at Paris.

ASIA AND PACIFIC Moscow comment on the section of the report on policy toward Asia and the Pacific and the Guam doctrine notes that the President said the United States wants to turn from dominance toward partnership with its allies and asserts that this signifies a desire to extend the Guam doctrine to areas other than Asia. A foreign-language talk by Glazunov on the 20th comments that while the Guam doctrine was at first presented as applying only to Asia, it is now being treated as "a doctrine of global implications." A participant in the 22 February domestic service roundtable says that the report repeats the "old American policy based on a position of strength and calls it a new Nixon Doctrine." The "so-called partnership thesis," the panelist says, "is nothing more than a return to the policy of Dulles," who also "demanded that Asians fight Asians." A domestic service broadcast on the 19th, noting that the document pledges continued fulfillment of U.S. "so-called obligations" in the Pacific, comments that "the message does not exclude the possibility of direct armed actions by the United States" in that area.

A broadcast in English to South Asia on the 22d says that despite the report's "high-flown phrases" about America's peaceful intentions, U.S. strategy in Asia apparently remains the same: The United States continues to widen the war in Indochina, intends to build still more bases in the Philippines and Thailand and to take over some British bases in Malaysia and Singapore, and continues to support "aggressive military blocs" like SEATO. A broadcast in Japanese on the 20th observes that the report assigns Japan a "leading role" under the Guam

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 21 -

doctrine, stating that the partnership between the United States and Japan is a "key" to the doctrine's success in Asia. The commentary adds that the presidential message "seriously viewed" the return of Okinawa, but that this issue is being used to draw Japan deeper into the U.S. strategic system in the Far East, with the United States "plotting" to maintain its military bases on Okinawa.

U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS,
MILITARY BALANCE

The President's remarks on U.S.-Soviet relations are acknowledged in the initial TASS report, which notes that he said "a good start" was made in these relations in 1969 although overall they remained "far from satisfactory." TASS says the report shows that the Administration "continues to lay the accent on military force as the basis of foreign policy." Matveyev comments in IZVESTIYA that the section on U.S. military policy "will undoubtedly satisfy the militarist circles," containing as it does "the pet hackneyed propagandist hobby-horse of those circles--interested in accelerating armament--about a notorious 'Soviet threat.'" This in no way accords, Matveyev adds, "with the phrases in the message which speak of the importance of developing the United States' and the USSR's relations for the cause of universal peace and security."

A participant in the commentators' radio roundtable on the 22d says one cannot take exception to the President's suggestion that the United States and the USSR must hold talks on the questions which divide them, but concludes that the report reveals no concrete proposals or measures aimed at normalizing relations between the two countries. The commentator further voices displeasure over what he sees as the President's attempt to lay the blame for the "unsatisfactory" relations at the feet of the USSR.

The TASS account of the report and some followup commentaries take note of the President's reaffirmation of intent to move ahead with the second phase of the Safeguard ABM system, but no monitored Soviet propaganda to date has mentioned his remarks on the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT) scheduled to open in Vienna on 16 April.

Moscow has only belatedly picked up the President's observations on comparative U.S. and Soviet nuclear strength. On the 22d, a participant in the domestic service roundtable says that the President now "admits that the Soviet Union, and I quote him, has at its disposal a powerful and perfect strategic force which surpasses [preobladat nad] that of the United States. Due to this circumstance, says Nixon, the United States has tried to formulate a rational and coordinated strategy and defense requirements for 1970 and the following five years." Unfortunately, the commentator adds, the United States has not abandoned "the notorious policy of strength."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 22 -

A domestic service commentary by Yukhananov on the 23d offers an atypically positive assessment of the President's report, noting that its text "permits the assertion that America's present leaders have begun to think seriously about the limits and possibilities of their global policy." This commentary reviews the factors listed by the President as underlying the new approach to foreign policy, including the "new balance of military power"--the "new correlation of U.S. and Soviet strategic forces." Yukhananov says the President observed that both the United States and the USSR "have acquired the capability of inflicting on each other unacceptable damage, regardless of who strikes first. The power which provokes an exchange of thermonuclear strikes will gain no advantage and certainly win no victory." This "realistic admission" by the President, the commentator says, is explained "by the fact that the Soviet Union possesses powerful and advanced strategic forces."

EUROPEAN
SECURITY

Soviet propaganda touches briefly on the President's observations on the need to preserve NATO and his "reservations" about a European security conference--for which Moscow has been pressing. Matveyev says in IZVESTIYA that "not a very able attempt was made in the presidential message to throw a shadow over the idea of an all-European conference." A 21 February commentary for North American listeners says the President has questioned the feasibility of a conference, "though leading West European nations back the idea," and his objections "make you doubt the sincerity of his statement about the desire to settle outstanding issues through negotiation." The commentary is notable for the statement that the United States could attend a European security conference, a point virtually ignored in Moscow propaganda since Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Zamyatin, at a 13 January press conference, reported that the USSR had informed Washington "of its favorable attitude" toward U.S. participation.

U.S.-CHINESE
RELATIONS

President Nixon's remarks on Washington's relations with Communist China are brought up briefly in news accounts, but so far they have drawn no Soviet comment. TASS reports that the President said "it is in the interests of the United States to improve its practical relations with Peking" and that "steps in this direction have already been taken." The 23 February Yukhananov domestic service commentary, in its rundown of factors underlying the President's new approach to foreign policy, notes briefly that Washington is counting on "tense Sino-Soviet relations." From this, Yukhananov says, the United States "draws far-reaching conclusions which are applied in external strategy."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 23 -

EAST EUROPE

East European reaction to the President's message, except for Romania's, is generally negative in perceiving no new initiatives or solutions to international problems. Although the United States is repeatedly said to be modifying its tactics because of domestic pressures, the media variously cite U.S. policy in Vietnam and the Middle East as evidence that Washington's "imperialist" goals have not changed.

As in the past, East European treatment of U.S. policy is also marked by a diversity that points up the individual countries' special political concerns. East Germany, anxious to achieve wider recognition, is especially critical of what it conceives to be U.S. efforts to "thwart" a European security conference. Hungary, pressing for increased trade with the West, complains of continuing U.S. "discriminatory measures" which run counter to normalization of relations in Eastern Europe. The now orthodox Czechoslovaks accuse the United States of "launching divisive sallies" against the East European countries, while the maverick Romanians highlight the President's recollections of his visit to Bucharest and his hope that similar relations can be established with the rest of Eastern Europe.

Albania, apparently concerned over the possibility of improved U.S.-Peking relations, underlines the theme that new U.S. tactics call for a stronger U.S.-Soviet "alliance" and strengthened imperialist pacts directed mainly at the PRC.

The Yugoslavs, intent on organizing a new nonaligned meeting, are notably critical in reading the message as a reaffirmation of "bloc" policy.

The Budapest MTI is the only monitored source to mention the President's statement that he does not accept any doctrine which curtails the right of East European countries to improve relations with the United States and other countries. Except for Bucharest, no East European source refers to the President's comments on Romania.

THE GDR East Berlin media characteristically outdo Moscow in denouncing the presidential report as a forecast of no change in U.S. "interventionist" policy but display some sensitivity to the U.S. stand on a European security conference. The party organ NEUES DEUTSCHLAND comments in articles on 19 and 20 February which stress that U.S. "hegemony in Europe remains the U.S. goal." In a report headlined "Nixon Stresses the War Course, Bonn's New Eastern Policy Supported as Part of U.S. Concept," the paper says on the 19th

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 24 -

that the President "reaffirmed" that "U.S. troops stationed in West Europe will not be reduced" and "made it understood that the United States also wants to thwart the European security conference." The East German news agency ADN on the 18th had similarly interpreted the President's "warning against a single big conference" as an indication that "the United States intends to prevent a European security conference."

Both articles in NEUES DEUTSCHLAND see the President supporting Bonn's "nuclear ambitions" as "a prize for good conduct" and point to a U.S. intention to extend "planning for use of 'tactical nuclear weapons'" to the "aggressive NATO bloc."

BULGARIA All the main Sofia dailies carry lengthy commentaries on the President's report, noting--as GDR comment does--"stipulations" in the document that are allegedly aimed at sabotaging efforts to convene a European security conference. An article in RABOTNICHESKO DELO on the 20th accuses the President of raising a "smokescreen" about a "nonexistent 'Soviet threat' so as to justify monstrous expenditures for military purposes." The report, it adds, "gives no hope when it comes to the peace-loving assurances of the President," since "past policies of maintaining tension in the Near East through military aid for Israel" are "confirmed." A Sofia radio commentary on the same day observes that although the President speaks of normalizing relations in Europe, "a number of stipulations are made which aim at "thwarting the efforts to convene an all-European security conference."

The President's call for "partnership," says VECHERNI NOVINI, in a broadly held Bulgarian view, is "mainly a striving by the United States to impose the so-called 'Guam doctrine' in all parts of the world." While trying to give the "impression" that this is something new, the paper asserts, "in fact it does not advance a single concrete solution for a single one of the problems of our time."

POLAND The party organ TRYBUNA LUDU, in a dispatch from Washington correspondent Berezowski on the 19th, calls the report a recapitulation of principles, formulas, and intentions "supplemented with a large dose of rhetoric." Berezowski observes that while the report fails to "detail" how the United States is to "gradually normalize" its relations with the socialist states, the "policy of 'softening up' has not been struck off the American program," as indicated by the President's statement that the United States no longer regards the East European countries as a monolith. The paper carries no further mention of the report in issues through 23 February.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT

26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 25 -

An article in the government organ ZYCIE WARSZAWY on the 21st, as reviewed by PAP, describes the report as "new wrapping" of "more digestible formulations" to continue the policies of President Nixon's "unfortunate predecessor"; the "generalities" do "not veil the substance" of the President's message, "which does not serve the cause of peace and coexistence."

In its editorial on 20 February, the semiofficial Catholic organ SLOWO POWSZECHNE describes as "equivocal" the President's assurance that the question of Soviet military security in East Europe will be respected "because, aside from the purely military problem, there is a whole range of actions which can harm the socialist camp and its cohesion, and Nixon has not renounced them." The "conditions" which the President lists for negotiations with the socialist countries, the paper adds, lack "a broader approach to and understanding of the specific nature of modern coexistence and its requirements"--something "President Kennedy demonstrated to a great extent."

HUNGARY Initial Hungarian reportage of the message was notable for a generally objective presentation of the President's report and for references to U.S. willingness to negotiate. Authoritative press comment, however, has been much more critical of the President's new foreign policy strategy, dismissing it as a smoke-screen for "the old policy of U.S. hegemony." The party organ NEPSZABADSAG, in a report headlined "It is Not a Strategy for Peace," while conceding that the call for negotiations is "worthy of respect," objects to the "contradiction" between the acknowledgment of present limitations on U.S. "military might" and the continued desire to lead "the military alinement systems created in the years of the cold war." Turning to the section on relations with the socialist countries, it adds: "The message stresses a willingness to normalize relations with the rest of the socialist countries, although it fails to explain why the U.S. Administration maintains discriminatory measures that serve anything but normalization."

An article in MAGYAR HIRLAP on the 22d says: "One would welcome without reservations the statement that we should normalize our relations" were it not for "the suspicion that the President's remark that he does not want to negotiate with a 'monolith' means not an aspiration to correct relations but more a continuation of the loosening-up attempts." Another commentary in MAGYAR NEMZET on the 20th complains that the President did not devote "a single word to the idea of establishing a European security system or the proposed security conference."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 26 -

CZECHOSLOVAKIA In line with the increasing implementation of the "normalization" process in Czechoslovakia, Prague media, with a few cautious exceptions, hew closely to the Soviet line that the report signals no real changes in U.S. foreign policy. An article in the Bratislava PRAVDA on the 20th, charging that "the U.S. strategy has not altered," accuses the President of "launching divisive sallies" against the East European socialist countries while at the same time expressing an interest in "normalizing" relations.

Prague television commentator Petr Krul sees the report as primarily a ploy with an eye to the coming congressional campaign and the 1972 presidential race. He derides the President's formulations on the preservation of peace, asserting that "for Nixon, peace is a product of the balance of fear . . . and a policy from the position of strength."

A more tolerant tone is adopted by MLADA FRONTA commentator Arnost Prazak, who sees "several aspects that sound positive" in the words about "the end of the cold war era" and the "forthcoming 'period of great negotiations with the communists.'" Prazak, however, perhaps with some chagrin, notes that the United States "respects Soviet security interests in Eastern Europe" and quotes the report to the effect that Washington "will regard its communist opponents in the first place as nations pursuing their own interests as they understand them"

ROMANIA The Bucharest radio remained silent on the President's report until 21 February--an indication that the document was given careful consideration--when it supplied a lengthy review notable for its focus on U.S. relations with the socialist states. No comment was carried in any of the major Bucharest dailies through 23 February; coverage of the report by the Romanian news agency AGERPRES was published in SCINTEIA and other papers.

Although the Bucharest radio account is critical of U.S. Vietnam policy (a routine demonstration of socialist credentials) and of Washington's assumption of the "right to play a role in the affairs of other countries" (a sensitive issue to Bucharest), it approvingly notes President Nixon's recollection of his visit to Romania and his support for the establishment of "similar relations" with other socialist countries "as sovereign states." This is as close as the radio comes to reporting the President's rejection of the limited sovereignty doctrine. It goes on to cite the President's support for an end to European division and a peace "in which the legitimate interests of each are respected and the interests of all are safeguarded."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 27 -

The focus on U.S. willingness to normalize relations with Eastern Europe and promote European detente appears to accord with present Romanian efforts to counter Soviet bloc propaganda on the dangers of Western bridgebuilding. Moscow continues to use the spectre of an increasing Western "threat" to justify greater CEMA and Warsaw Pact integration, which is vigorously opposed by the Romanians.

YUGOSLAVIA Limited Belgrade reaction stresses the theme that President Nixon's new peace strategy for the seventies is based on "bloc positions." A Sarajevo daily OSLOBODJENJE article on the 20th, reported by TANYUG, says: "The essential American orientation . . . starts from bloc positions" and "endeavors to solve world problems in accord with agreements with the Soviet Union, while other peoples and states are grouped in the category of second-rate partners." In a similar vein, VJESNIK's New York correspondent remarks on the same day that the President did not "anticipate even a desirability for disbanding the blocs; on the contrary, he sees the restoration of peace between the two blocs as a first step toward a final division of the globe between super-powers."

Radio Belgrade's station editor Bozidar Kicevic, in a commentary on the 20th, hails the President's call for negotiations and "the solving of acute world problems through peaceful means," but adds that "the platform proffered is not adequate for such aspirations." He goes on to criticize the U.S. Middle East stand and "the policy of spheres of influence which stands out in Nixon's statements on the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China."

The Belgrade daily BORBA, in issues through 23 February, carries no original comment on the message, limiting its coverage to publication of TANYUG dispatches from Washington and a TANYUG roundup of world press reaction.

Belgrade's generally negative reaction to the message as a confirmation of U.S. adherence to "bloc" policies comes against the background of President Tito's current African tour and his efforts to line up support for a new nonaligned conference. It may also be read as an expression of pique that Yugoslavia was not mentioned in the portion of the President's message dealing with East European-U.S. relations.

ALBANIA Playing its customary theme that the United States is in an advanced state of domestic crisis, Tirana suggests that the report reflects a change in tactics, but that Washington retains its "imperialist" aims. A lengthy article in the party organ

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 28 -

ZERI I POPULLIT on the 25th suggests that because of Vietnam and U.S. domestic unrest, the United States is "trying to find other forms and means to continue the old road, to realize the old counter-revolutionary imperialist objectives." Part of the new plan is to "further develop the counterrevolutionary alliance with the Brezhnev-Kosygin clique" while at the same time seeking to rely on the forces of "puppet regimes" to support the war in Vietnam, the paper says.

Predictably failing to acknowledge the President's stated desire for improved U.S. relations with Peking, the ZERI I POPULLIT article pointedly argues that the message confirms that the United States is trying to strengthen its control over "aggressive alliances to suppress the national liberation movement" and "to oppose and fight against the great socialist China, other revolutionary peoples, socialism and revolution." Perhaps registering concern over any Sino-U.S. rapprochement, Tirana has still not acknowledged the resumption of the U.S.-PRC talks in Warsaw.

VIETNAMESE COMMUNIST MEDIA

Hanoi media carry fairly widespread comment on the President's report, with the first available reaction appearing in a domestic broadcast on the 19th. There is additional comment in a broadcast on the 20th--excerpted by VNA on the 21st. On the 22d commentaries are published in the party paper NHAN DAN and the army paper QUAN DOI NHAN DAN, and a VNA commentary is publicized by the press and radio. The 22 February NHAN DAN comment, noted in the Hanoi radio press review, has not been disseminated by the radio or VNA; but on 26 February VNA carries an account of another NHAN DAN commentary of the 26th. In addition to its own comment, Hanoi radio has broadcast foreign criticism of the report.

The initial domestic radio commentary on 19 February outlines Hanoi's view of the report's section on Vietnam--a view reiterated in similar terms in later comment. The radio says that the report exposed Mr. Nixon's "very stubborn stand" and that it "rehashed" positions advanced in previous speeches. Noting the reference to President Thieu's 11 July 1969 elections proposal, it dismisses the proposals as advocating elections organized "by the puppets under the cannon muzzle of the puppet and U.S. occupation troops." The broadcast routinely scores the report's comments on the Paris talks, blames the United States for stalemating the talks, and charges that the report demonstrates that the Administration refuses to seek a negotiated solution to the war and "only wants to score successes by means of force."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 29 -

The radio commentary mentions the establishment of the Vietnam Special Studies Group to monitor the Vietnamization program, commenting that it is a measure of the Administration's "embarrassed and distrustful state of mind" that the presidential report poses relevant questions for the study group but does not suggest answers. One such major question, the radio says, is whether Vietnamization will succeed.

The Hanoi radio commentary on the 20th repeats the comment in the previous day's broadcast and goes on to assail U.S. global policies reflected in the presidential report. It also responds to President Nixon's warning of "strong measures" in the event of increased enemy activity, a point mentioned only briefly in the commentary on the 19th: Ridiculing the President for "still talking big," this commentary adds that it is "futile" to attempt to "intimidate our people."

In line with earlier comment, the QUAN DOI NHAN DAN commentary on 22 February, publicized by VNA on the 22d and broadcast by Hanoi radio on the 25th, says the report clearly reveals the U.S. "scheme" to prolong the war through Vietnamization and charges that the President has "used negotiations as a smokescreen" for his scheme. The army paper observes that the report "clamored" about progress in Vietnamization, but that the President could not conceal his "anxiety" over the program's "very gloomy" prospects.

The 22 February VNA commentary, available only from Hanoi radio, provides typical Hanoi comment on the global policies outlined in the President's report. It maintains that the U.S. position in the world is basically "weakened and defeated" but that the Nixon Administration continues to pursue an "expansionist and aggressive foreign policy" seeking to oppose "revolutionary movements," in order to realize a "plot to police the world through neocolonialism" and to "camouflage maneuvers with more flowery and deceitful words." Commenting on the Nixon Doctrine, the 22 February QUAN DOI NHAN DAN typically describes it as one of the many "cunning and perfidious measures and methods" used by the United States in attempting to "save U.S. colonialism and retrieve the positions it has lost."

THE FRONT The first South Vietnamese communist reaction was a brief derisive comment by PRG delegate Mme. Binh at the 19 February Paris session. There is a LIBERATION PRESS AGENCY (LPA) commentary publicized on the 22d and a Liberation radio commentary on the 23d.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 30 -

Liberation Radio quotes Mme. Binh as stating in Paris on the 19th, characteristically, that President Nixon "once again tried to deceive public opinion by asserting that he invariably continues the 'search for a just peace' in South Vietnam. But prolonging the aggression, carrying on the massacre of the South Vietnamese people with all kinds of weapons, including chemical ones . . . is this the way Mr. Nixon 'searches for peace?'"

Liberation Radio on the 22d provides the fullest available account of the LPA commentary on the President's report; the commentary was also publicized by the Hanoi press. LPA says that the section of the report dealing with Vietnam is merely a "rewrite" of the President's principal addresses on Vietnam in 1969, all of which were "repeatedly rejected by the Vietnamese people." LPA charges that the report demonstrated the President's intention to prolong the war and that the President revealed his "evil colonialist design to firmly cling to the Thieu-Ky-Khiem clique" when he stated that a great power cannot renege on its pledges. Commenting on the report's statement that U.S. acceptance of the DRV-PRG position would leave nothing to negotiate, LPA says: "The South Vietnamese people must plainly tell Nixon that the Vietnamese people's basic national rights and self-determination are not merchandise for trade or negotiations."

The 23 February Liberation Radio commentary takes up other aspects of the President's report, in addition to Vietnam, charging that the foreign policy described in the document essentially reflects "an ambition to become master of the world by means of neocolonialism." Addressing itself to the two-part Vietnam policy of negotiations and Vietnamization, the commentary takes the President to task for holding firmly to his "reactionary" and "rejected" eight-point stand and for "advertising" President Thieu's 11 July 1969 election proposals. It denounces Vietnamization in a standard fashion and cites remarks by Senators McCarthy and Fulbright on the 19th to support its attack.

NORTH KOREA

Pyongyang's reaction is couched in typically vitriolic language, built around North Korea's customary propaganda portrayal of a villainous, predatory "U.S. imperialism" out to increase American domination by using "puppets and satellites" as "bullet shields against the Asian people" and to provoke "a new war in Korea."

Pyongyang's first reaction--a domestic service commentary on 19 February, carried in a shorter version by KCNA the next day--acknowledges that the report calls for negotiations in a new era replacing the era of

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 31 -

confrontation but declares that this "long, transparent harangue, full of hypocrisy and empty talk," simply means the United States is using the "cloak of peace" to mask an unchanged policy of "aggression and war." The report's reference to the Guam doctrine, says the commentary, makes clear President Nixon's intention to "step up colonial policies" and to "beef up local mercenaries." All this, it says, is closely related to U.S. "preparations for a war of aggression in Korea."

Pyongyang's KCNA, rounding up the North Korean press on 21 February, summarizes comment in a similar vein in Pyongyang dailies on the report "made public by Nixon the rascal, the boss of the U.S. imperialist war maniacs." The party daily NODONG SINMUN is quoted as calling the report "the sophistry of a wolf in sheep's clothing," and MINJU CHOSON is quoted as calling the document a program for adapting "all the former policies of aggression of the U.S. imperialists to the trend of the times under the cloak of the 'Nixon Doctrine.'" MINJU CHOSON decries the President's "sugar-coated words" about Japan's role in Asia as confirmation that the United States intends to use its Japanese militarist "stooges" as a shock brigade in Asian aggression. The President did not conceal "the brigandish design of the U.S. imperialists to perpetuate their occupation of South Korea and unleash a new war in Korea," MINJU CHOSON adds.

CUBA

Havana media carry a moderate volume of uniformly hostile comment, criticizing especially the President's emphasis on "partnership," which it calls a facade behind which the United States will continue traditional "imperialist" policies of economic exploitation and military aggression. Havana comment dwells at length on rebuttals to the Western Hemisphere section of the report, which it stresses contains "nothing new." The comment is relatively free of personal invective against the President, however, like most previous Cuban comment on the Nixon Administration.

The tenor of the Cuban reaction is exemplified by a 19 February Radio Havana commentary which observes that while the President "talks about association, about not imposing Yankee domination, . . . the entire message reflects the policy of imposition that is typical of imperialism." It charges that the United States "imposes on its allies" the continuation of the Vietnam war and the Middle East crisis, "encouraging Israel by sending more weapons." It calls the report as a whole a restatement of "the same policy pursued by Yankee presidents and their philosophy of world domination ever since the United States was created." The commentary concludes

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FBIS REACTION REPORT
26 FEBRUARY 1970

- 32 -

that the President "cloaks his imperialist ambition in the same hypocritical phrases used by his predecessors" and attempts to conceal a traditionally aggressive policy "behind the mask of the 'partnership policy.'"

Cuban comment on the Western Hemisphere section of the report assails it for failing to accept Latin American demands for a better policy on exports to the United States, for its reference to "misguided nationalism" in describing Latin American attitudes toward foreign investment, and for mentioning the need to attract investment capital for economic development. A Havana TV commentator criticizes the President for offering Latin America "the same private investments" that were "just refused" at the Inter-American Economic and Social Council meeting earlier this month in Caracas, for failing to offer "a regional system of preferred custom tariffs" to open the U.S. market to Latin American products, and for failing to suggest any remedy for the increasingly "lopsided" terms of U.S.-Latin American trade.

A Havana radio commentary beamed to the Americas on 22 February chastises the President for considering U.S. investments as part of foreign aid to Latin America when in reality they have resulted in "the siphoning away of thousands of millions of dollars that wind up in the bank accounts of the Yankee monopolies," so that Latin America in effect "finances the development of the United States."

In Havana's only reaction so far to the President's statements on U.S.-Soviet relations, a TV commentary on the 19th charges that while the President acknowledged these relations to be unsatisfactory he did not accept "U.S. responsibility for this state of affairs," instead blaming the Vietnam war and the Middle East conflict. The commentary observes that he did not propose "any formula" to improve these relations, but announced that his Administration would "not seek any new ways to solve the Israeli-Arab conflict," would continue "the Vietnam aggression and the Vietnamization policy," and intended to go on "squandering millions on the Safeguard ABM program."

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY