

Contrasting Speeches by Fulbright and Rostow Reflect A Great Debate . . .

Last May 15 Jim Lucas in a Scripps-Howard series from Fort Bragg, N.C. on the Army's so-called Special Forces for guerrilla warfare said its command "appears to have an open line to the desk of a top presidential assistant at the White House." The description seems to fit Kennedy aide W. W. Rostow who spoke June 28 at the graduation exercises of the U.S. Army Special Warfare School at Fort Bragg. His speech, of which we give excerpts on page 3, is worth close study, especially in connection with a thoughtful address made in the Senate next day by Senator Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee (see excerpts at the bottom of this page). Indeed on close reading of the two, I get the feeling of a debate within the Kennedy Administration.

New Adventures in North Viet-Nam?

Fulbright, the one top Administration figure who spoke out forcefully against the Cuban adventure, seems to be warning in his Senate speech against the possibility of similar new episodes and against the mentality behind them as expressed by Prof. Rostow. In this connection, there are signs of new war preparations against Cuba, either by exiles training here or collectively through the OAS, and of secret guerrilla projects elsewhere. The *Wall St. Journal* May 16 on "undercover warfare" plans in Washington said "Without going into secret details, indications can be reported that at least one such maneuver is being blueprinted at this moment for execution in a vital nation distant from Cuba." That may be North Viet-Nam.

For all his sophistication and scholarship, Prof. Rostow engages in self-delusion. He says "our central task in the underdeveloped areas is to protect the independence of the revolutionary process." He says we seek a world in which

The Press on The New Frontier

Before the Cuban invasion, exile forces were allowed to recruit and train in violation of neutrality laws and Florida newspapers suppressed the news until it leaked from other sources. The same process has begun again. Two groups of anti-Castro adventurers were identified by the Miami Herald June 27. It reported naively that their existence had been known by it for some days but that the Herald "feeling that the story is within the sensitive area of national policy, withheld publication until after the matter was aired in Washington." The Herald broke the story on the Tuesday after Senator George A. Smathers of Florida had disclosed the existence of one group on a Sunday night radio show.

The Herald's queasy phrases are disturbing. It is the job of a free press to report law violations, particularly when they may have the tacit support of government agencies. The CIA may be "sensitive" about such reporting but has that become a standard of self-censorship? These groups are operating openly; in fact neighbors complained to the police about them. The incident illustrates the way developments which are known in one city or State may be kept from public knowledge elsewhere. We are on a new frontier of government-press relations in which official agencies and nervous nellie editors can and do conspire to keep the public un- or mis-informed.

"each nation will be permitted to fashion . . . the kind of modern society it wants." Is this why we try to marshall the hemisphere against Castro? He speaks of "our 'religious and philosophical beliefs' about the 'uniqueness of each individual.'" How much concern is there for the individual in the present regimes of South Korea, South Viet-Nam, Taiwan, Pakistan and Iran which he names as the special objects

Fulbright Warns Against the New Vogue For "Dirty Tricks" in Our Foreign Policy

"My fear is that many Americans, including some whose judgment is generally good, are drawing the wrong conclusions. . . . The lesson of Cuba, they suggest, is that the objective was the correct one, but that the means employed were inadequate. And they further suggest that any means by which we can block Communist encroachment in our hemisphere garden is the proper course of action. . . .

"It is suggested with some frequency that U.S. policies would be improved by an infusion of the more mischievous tactics employed by the Communists; that with some application we could beat the Communists at their own game. This, I think, totally misses the real nature of the struggle. . . .

"It is not our affluence, or our plumbing, or our clogged freeways that grip the imagination of others. Rather it is the values upon which our system is built. These values imply our adherence not only to liberty and individual freedom, but also to international peace, law and order, and constructive social purpose. . . . If we are faithful to our own values, while following an intelligent courageous and consistent line or policy, we are likely to find a high measure of the support we seek abroad. But if we fail our own values and ideals, ultimately we shall have failed ourselves. . . .

"Some may object that, as a practical matter, the fire spread by communism can be fought effectively only with fire. I disagree. . . . The U.S. cannot guarantee the borders of a neutral country against infiltration, or its villages from subversion. But the U.S. can become a pivotal force in enabling well-intentioned governments to bring about the economic and social reforms that their

societies are understandably enough insisting upon. Given such reforms, subversion efforts fail. . . .

"Cuba, of course, for all intents and purposes, has been transformed into a Communist oriented, totalitarian state. It is idle to expect the present Cuban regime to reform, to collapse, or to be overthrown by its exiles. And I submit that to overthrow it by American force, or by some combination including American force, would be self-defeating and would create more problems than would be solved. We often hear that the existence of a Communist regime in Cuba is intolerable to the United States. But is that really the case? I know it is embarrassing and annoying and potentially dangerous, but is it really intolerable?

"The possibility of Soviet missile bases and jet aircraft bases in Cuba is frequently noted. I suppose we would all be less comfortable if the Soviets did install missile bases in Cuba, but I am not sure that our national existence would be in substantially greater danger than is the case today. Nor do I think that such bases would substantially alter the balance of power in the world.

"What would substantially alter the balance of power in the world would be precipitate action by the U.S. resulting in the alienation of most of Latin America, Asia and Africa. . . . In Latin America, as in much of the rest of the world, the question is being posed: Can social and economic progress proceed apart from totalitarian discipline? It is our duty to provide a credible case for the affirmative side of this debate. Our economic and philosophical resources, if wisely used, should enable us to succeed."—Fulbright's Speech to the U.S. Senate June 29

... Now Being Waged In The Upper Levels of the Kennedy Administration

of our solicitude? The equanimity with which we watch the rise of new military dictatorships as in Korea and the complacency with which we gloss over the Fascist character of such regimes as Diem's in South Viet-Nam contrast too strongly with our implacable hostility to revolutionary governments like Castro's which have dared to expropriate American properties.

No Guerrillas in the Congo

Prof. Rostow lumps together Cuba, the Congo, Laos and Viet-Nam as similar examples of what he calls the "international disease" of "guerilla war designed, initiated, supplied and led from outside an independent nation." But these are very different situations. There was no guerrilla warfare in the Congo; there our CIA connived with the Belgians to get rid of Lumumba because he would not knuckle under to Western capital. Castro's movement in its guerrilla phase was opposed by the Communists until his victory was imminent. In Laos, it was we who upset a neutral government and provoked a civil war. As for divided Viet-Nam, we blocked the elections for reunification pledged by the Geneva accords of 1954. We opposed elections in Viet-Nam for the same reason Moscow opposes it in Germany—neither power favors elections where it is sure to lose them.

Any intellectual in the underdeveloped areas reading this speech against the backdrop of recent events is apt to conclude that our policy is much like that of Moscow's. Both sides believe the end justifies the means; *they* want a world safe for communism, we want a world safe for capitalism. Where the sanctity of investments is honored, we overlook any assault on the rights of the individual. Behind the

How High Officials Can Be Carried Away By Their Own Hot Air

"We seek two results: first, that truly independent nations shall emerge on the world scene; and, second, that each nation will be permitted to fashion, out of its own culture and its own ambitions, the kind of modern society it wants. The same religious and philosophical beliefs which decree that we respect the uniqueness of each individual, make it natural that we respect the uniqueness of each national society."

—Rostow at Fort Bragg June 28 (see box below)

"The U.S. has lifted its last restrictions on Dominican exiles who wish to return to the Dominican Republic. A ban was first imposed after the assassination May 30 of the Dominican dictator, Trujillo. Alfonso Canto, coordinator of the Dominican Liberation Movement, had charged that the original order preventing all Dominicans from returning home was amended to a list of 109, blocking primarily his group.

"Senor Canto said the U.S. has permitted travel by persons approved by the CIA and was trying 'to establish a puppet government.' In Washington, State and Justice Dept. officials said yesterday only that the travel had been curbed 'in the best interests of the United States.' . . . The Dominican Liberation Movement has been critical of U.S. support for the invasion of Cuba in April."

—New York Times (City Edition) July 4

gilded rhetoric of a Prof. Rostow are the cynical brutalities of military and intelligence agencies operating on the basis of anti-communist oversimplifications and as arrogantly bipolar a view of the world as Moscow's. It is Senator Fulbright who speaks for our better selves.

Rostow Salutes U.S. Guerrilla Fighters As He Would "Doctors, Teachers . . ."

"When this Administration came to responsibility it faced four major crises: Cuba, the Congo, Laos and Viet-Nam. Each represented a successful Communist breaching—over the previous two years—of the Cold War truce lines which had emerged from the Second World War and its aftermath. In different ways each had arisen from the efforts of the international Communist movement to exploit the inherent instabilities of the underdeveloped areas of the non-Communist world, and each had a guerilla warfare component. Cuba, of course, differed from the other cases. The Cuban revolution against Batista was a broad-based national insurrection. But that revolution was tragically captured from within by the Communist apparatus; and now Latin America faces the danger of Cuba's being used as the base for training, supply and direction of guerrilla warfare in the Hemisphere.

"More than that, Mr. Khrushchov, in his report to the Moscow conference of Communist parties (January 6, 1961) had explained at great length that the Communists fully support what he called wars of national liberation and would march in the front rank with the peoples waging such struggles. The military aim of Mr. Khrushchov's January 1961 doctrine is, clearly, guerrilla warfare. . . .

"Our central task in the underdeveloped areas, as we see it, is to protect the independence of the revolutionary process now going forward. . . . We are committed by the nature of our system, to support the cause of national independence. . . . The victory we seek . . . will not be a victory of the United States over the Soviet Union. It will not be a victory of capitalism over socialism. It will be a victory of men and nations which aim to stand up

straight, over the forces which wish to entrap and exploit their revolutionary aspirations. . . .

"To make this vision come true places a great burden on the U.S. at this phase of history. The preservation of independence has many dimensions. The U.S. has the primary responsibility for deterring the use of nuclear weapons in the pursuit of Communist ambitions. The U.S. has a major responsibility to deter the kind of overt aggression with conventional forces, which was launched in June 1950 in Korea. The U.S. has the primary responsibility for assisting the economies of those hard pressed states on the periphery of the Communist bloc . . . for example, South Korea, Viet-Nam, Taiwan, Pakistan, Iran. The U.S. has a special responsibility of leadership in bringing not merely its own resources but resources of all the Free World to bear in aiding the long-run development of those nations which are serious about modernizing their economy and their social life. . . .

"Finally the U.S. has a role to play—symbolized by your presence here and mine—in learning to deter guerrilla warfare, if possible, and to deal with it, if necessary. . . . We are determined to help destroy this international disease; that is, guerrilla war designed, initiated, supplied and led from outside an independent nation. . . . This requires, of course, not merely a proper military program of deterrence, but programs of village development, communications and indoctrination. . . .

"I salute you as I would a group of doctors, teachers, economic planners, agricultural experts, civil servants, or those others who are now leading the way in the whole southern half of the globe in fashioning new nations. . . ."

—W. W. Rostow at the U.S. Army Special Warfare School, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, June 28.