

Castroitis

JAMES A. WECHSLER

There is the prospect that the malady of Castroitis which seemed to be afflicting so large a section of the U. S. may abruptly pass. Indeed, impressive evidence now emerges that this strange fever may have been largely confined all along to numerous politicians, many newspaper magnates and some commentators, with only a small fragment of the public succumbing despite a concerted effort to spread the contagion.

It can be reliably reported that President Kennedy studied with satisfaction the results of the latest Gallup survey showing massive public resistance to an American invasion of Cuba that might merely serve the disastrously historic purpose of triggering a Soviet assault on West Berlin.

In fact the findings confirmed private surveys which the President had ordered earlier as numerous Democratic politicians bombarded him with warnings that only some form of all-out anti-Castro frenzy could appease the electorate.

This is not to suggest that Mr. Kennedy was prepared to blow up Cuba, if a survey told him that was what the polls dictated, as a political coup. He is a deeply political man; but he is not a man who will risk long-range democratic survival for a Democratic mid-term victory. He was, however, unquestionably disturbed by the reports of national hysteria which came to him from so many alleged political wise men.

The reports of his private surveys, fortified by the Gallup document, gave Mr. Kennedy relief and reassurance about the condition of the country. They evoked similar emotions among U. S. personnel at the United Nations, where the apparent American obsession with Cuba was placing Adlai Stevenson in an increasingly defensive posture. Even the friendliest delegations were beginning to murmur laments about the frenetic fright of a great power; there were derisive remarks about America's seemingly self-righteous unilateralism. The Communist operatives were having a field day. The real battle for Latin America was being obscured and distorted.

It was against this background that both the private and public polls reached the President. No doubt they partially explain the aggressive self-confidence of his attack on "self-appointed generals and admirals" in his Indianapolis foray against Sen. Capehart (R-Ind.), who had clamored loudly for a Cuban in-

vasion.

There will be many casualties of these new revelations. One of the most immediate victims is Sen. Goldwater (D-Ariz.).

In an interview with David Lawrence's U. S. News and World Report that arrived in newspaper offices yesterday morning, the Arizona sage engaged in this memorable exchange:

Q. What do people want to know?

A. It isn't what they want to know; it's what they want to do. If you left it up to the American people tonight, we'd be in Cuba tomorrow.

Alas for Mr. Goldwater, Dr. Gallup's poll had just reported that 65 per cent of those interviewed flatly oppose the sending of U. S. forces in Cuba. Only 24 per cent favor such a course; the remaining 13 per cent have "no opinion." Despite the fury of the Hearst press and various political dignitaries, there has been only a two per cent rise in invasion sentiment since April, 1961.

A more detailed breakdown shows a considerable but far from overwhelming sentiment for some measures "short of war."

Within certain close ranges, polls are obviously fallible. But the percentages on invasion are too conclusive to be disputed.

In short, these inquiries explode the picture spread around the world of a nation hell-bent for war. They should curb the temptation of many candidates to run fearlessly against Castro, rather than to face complex problems. They sustain the President's pleas for sanity, which preceded the polls. They may even convince Sen. Javits that his "computer" machine on public concern, which gave Cuban action so high a priority, needs prompt re-inspection.

How was the American portrait so badly distorted?

All of us have heard, in many scattered places, the reckless, bellicose anti-Castroism of some vocal citizens. It is my own experience that such truculence reaches its peak in saloons; only last week, at an airport tavern in Boston, I heard Castro verbally routed by many fiery figures. Perhaps journalists spend too much time in such places. But surely Barry Goldwater doesn't. Did he read too much?

I do not view the poll arithmetic as proof that Americans do not care. Many do care about the sound of firing-squads anywhere; many are frustrated and baffled. I do read the disclosures as a sign that, mingled with the usual apathy of a section of any citizenry, there is a wide, intuitive wisdom; the coalition of these two forces is too often underestimated. It often astonishes those who claim, as Mr. Goldwater did at so untimely a moment, to speak for "the people." Once again he confused the sound of his own voice with the roar of multitudes. It is a common error.

N Y HERALD TRIBUNE 17 OCTOBER 1962

Today in World Affairs

Monroe Doctrine Retreat Seen in Cuba Situation

By David Lawrence

WASHINGTON.

What really is the policy of the Kennedy administration in relation to the Communist occupation of Cuba?

The President has not made it clear on the stump. Nor has the State Department made it clear in its public statements.

But the Soviet government, on its part, has made very clear what has happened to America's historic policy known as the Monroe Doctrine. Here is a news dispatch by United Press International a few days ago from Moscow:

"The Kremlin Sunday listed Premier Fidel Castro's Cuba among the Communist nations for the first time and gave it precedence over Yugoslavia and Communist China in listing the traditional slogans for the 45th anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution on Nov. 7."

For all practical purposes, the Soviet government has set up its system in Cuba and transformed that country into a Communist colony.

President Kennedy has made no public protest to Moscow. Nor has Congress

done so. The resolution adopted by both Houses merely cautions the Communists not to carry out any armed attack or military offensive against any other nation in this hemisphere. It's apparently all right for them to keep on doing what they have been doing in Cuba. No steps are indicated to prevent the Communists from carrying on their activi-

ties in other parts of Latin America unless they try to use armed force to achieve their ends.

Doctrine Scuttled

Thus has the Monroe Doctrine been scuttled. Communist activity—and even the Communist takeover of any other Latin-American country—is, in effect, sanctioned today by U. S. policy. Only it must not be done by military means. Actually, the Soviets didn't openly assist in the military operations that set up the Castro regime in Cuba in the first place, but now they have supplied 5,000 military men to help Castro maintain himself in power.

As late as April, 1961, the Kennedy administration was willing to help by military means the Cubans who tried to liberate their homeland. But after the expedition was bungled and the President, at a crucial moment, withheld military air support, the Administration retreated still further by declaring publicly it will intervene only if Cuba attacks some other country. The Communist occupation of Cuba, is, therefore, accepted by the State Department just as the Berlin

"Wall" was accepted.

Appeasement Talk

There is, of course, an appeasement faction in this country which has a considerable influence with President Kennedy. This school of thought insists that the Monroe Doctrine isn't "international law," or that it has become outmoded because the United States has, from time to time, stationed troops in Southeast Asia and in Western Europe and in Korea.

But in each case, the United States had taken the measures of military defense at the request of the existing governments or by an agreement of allies. The Soviet Union can contend that it is doing the same thing in Cuba. While this may satisfy Moscow's policy makers, it doesn't diminish or modify the responsibility of the United States under the Monroe Doctrine. This doctrine was recognized explicitly in the covenant of the League of Nations as international law by agreement. The covenant was ratified by most of the nations of the world, including the

Continued Page 8 F