

MAR 27 1964

STATINTL

STATINTL

EDITORIAL PAGE

New York
Journal American

FRIDAY, MARCH 27, 1964 *

Fulbright 'Myths'

IN HIS extraordinary speech two days ago, urging a radical change in our foreign policy, Senator J. William Fulbright justified his views as consistent with new realities that had superseded old "myths."

But beneath the Senator's turgid prose, his new realities revealed themselves as approaching the old, discredited and disastrous philosophy of appeasement.

His repeated use of the word "myths" as applied to attitudes and policy toward the menace of international communism, is a snide distortion. "Myth" suggests something imagined, something not verifiable.

It is no myth that the objective of communism is to dominate the world. It is a hard, verifiable reality. The fact that the one-time monolithic nature of communism has changed and that there are now Communist nations with varying degrees of tyranny and self-interests, does not make the objective less real.

Nor is the danger of Castro's Cuba a myth. Mr. Fulbright argues that the continued existence of the Castro regime should be accepted "as a distasteful nuisance but not an intolerable danger."

It is extremely doubtful if former President Betancourt of Venezuela would accept the Castro regime as merely a nuisance. The

**'Intolerable
Danger'**

discovery of a large cache of Cuban weapons in Venezuela and battle plans for overthrowing the democratic Betancourt government were considerably more than a minor irritation. They were an "intolerable danger."

The importance of the Fulbright speech lies in the fact that he is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that he has been a close associate of President Johnson and is a member of the President's party.

For these reasons, something more definite is needed than the anonymous White House statement that found Senator Fulbright's views "very interesting" and said that, as concerns Cuba and Panama, the views did not represent the policy of the Administration.

Does the Administration, for instance, agree with the Fulbright theory of "myths" versus "new realities"? And to what extent, if any, do the "new realities" mirror emerging policies?

It seems to us an important enough matter for the President himself to make clear.