

APR 27 1963

Sanitized - Approved For Release :
Morse Calls Refugees

'Real Enemies' to U.S.

Already it is not the Communists who are our enemies, but the anti-Castro and anti-Communist refugees. Senator Wayne Morse tells them off in a brisk speech urging them to remember that it is not for them to make American foreign policy and that they "are not in the United States with any rights, legally or morally, to use the territory of the United States for activities aimed at implicating American foreign policy in situations that might well lead to war"—or, more plausibly, to a Soviet retreat from this hemisphere, which we are supposed to want.

Besides the refugee nuisance, there is the Goldwater-Keating nuisance which, according to 1984 logic, is tossing away the great "victory" of the missile withdrawal. It takes a bit of doing to figure this one, but Phillip J. Graham, publisher of the *Washington Post et al* rose to the task. It seems that "by refusing to bring Castro down by the brute force of Yankee arms, Mr. Kennedy has restored faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing US policy." This victory, according to Mr. Graham, is "being recklessly squandered by the partisan brawling over Cuba.

In building his argument, Mr. Graham comes out with the most remarkable 1984-ism I have encountered yet. Castro, it appears, "occupies the place of Syngman Rhee or Diem—an unpopular leader propped by massive support of a major power . . . The responsibility for the final downfall of Castro lies with the people of Cuba." They, with tactics "imitative of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh" are "poised to fight the only kind of 'war of liberation' that the free world can countenance."

It sounds like a war of liberation that is unlikely to liberate anybody—especially since we are determined to clap into jail any Cubans who might like to enlist in it!

The trouble is that, when you are living in the Orwellian Age, men who



MAO

CPYRGHT

FOIAb3b

CPYRGHT

attempt to suggest that there is something screwy about it run the risk of being brushed aside as nuts. In the Kingdom of the Blind, the man with 20/20 vision is under a serious handicap. Thus I confess I haven't observed any serious dissent from the view that it is "irresponsible" to take the Soviet occupation seriously. Few complain of the effort to associate them with some mythical war mongers who demand immediate invasion of Cuba.

Inaction on Cuba Called 'Understanding'

Mr. Graham insists that the real Cuban revolution must not be given "the sort of support that would make them American satellites," because the revolution is one "which will never be understood by CIA officers who ask for promises about the future rate of the King Ranch or other US investments in Cuba." A pre-1984 mind would entertain the possibility that the restoration of freedom to Cuba might not be inconsistent with a responsible attitude toward US property there, and in any case that such matters can be settled later, when the Communist base at our doorstep has been phased out. But I suppose that is negative thinking.

All in all, I enjoyed 1984 more when it was fiction!

1963

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP75-00
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - APPENDIX

some gulle, is required to sort out the truth from the facts. But certainly the celebration of St. Patrick's Day is centuries old in America. It began before the Revolution; it has never ceased; may it never do so. It has taken root among us because it is an occasion dedicated to freedom; to national freedom and religious freedom, and to the great St. Patrick.

There was never a better cause. We stand in the mighty succession of those who first proclaimed it, and those who brought it to fulfillment in our land. It is our cause to defend and ours to advance. In that conviction, I send you the greetings of this day.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuba Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, all Americans should deplore the "unfortunate political charges that have been made recently concerning Cuba.

The petty bickering which has been taking place can only give aid and comfort to the enemy.

In last Sunday's Washington Post, I feel that a penetrating analysis of the foibles of such a discussion at this time is made in an editorial by Philip L. Graham. This editorial entitled "Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuba Triumph," is certainly an excellent account of where we stand now on the Cuban matter.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to incorporate this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PARTISAN BRAWLING SQUANDERS FRUITS OF
CUBA TRIUMPH

(By Philip L. Graham)

SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO.—The fruits of America's greatest cold war triumph are being recklessly squandered by the partisan brawling over Cuba.

The triumph came on Sunday morning, last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. Considering Khrushchev's usual prose style, the announcement was an epic of unambiguous brevity. The missile systems would be taken down and this would be certified by the U.N.

This came less than 6 days after the President's tough TV speech. Thus Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviet Union to agree to "disarmament with inspection," a reversal of years and years of obstinate Soviet rhetoric.

The ensuing reaction is enough to drive toward near despair any observer of our two-party system. Here was an indisputable example of the U.S. Government working soundly, sensibly, sagely under crisis conditions. The President turned his back alike on proponents of armed invasion and proponents of near appeasement.

The United States speedily gathered around Miami an array of armed power that could have bounced Castro all the way to the South Pole. While this "big stick" was being created, the President practiced the sort of intensively skilled diplomacy that alone can find an option different from nuclear warfare or surrender.

A single instance showed the value of instructed and informed reflex action. That was the President's peremptory refusal to consider any trade involving our Turkish bases—and this despite a widespread affliction of weak-kneed jitters on the part of many in and out of Government.

A THROWBACK TO KIPLING

One who visits the Caribbean area, even briefly, cannot help being appalled by the cacophony of abuse and jingoism that has come out of the United States on the heels of the President's success.

First came a caterwauling over the relatively ineffective Soviet bomber contingent, that remained briefly in Cuba. Next came a blather of criticisms of the U.S. intelligence system—either naively amateur in nature or viciously reckless of U.S. security if the sources happened to hold any responsible positions in our security organization.

Finally, there have come the trumpeting swivel-chair warriors, stirred by blurred recollections of Kipling's days, who demand such belligerent acts as blockades. It is surprising that Mr. Nixon could so quickly parole himself from his self-announced sentence of long-term silence. It is appropriate, however, that he selected the setting of Mr. Jack Paar's program for the announcement of what in other circumstances would have constituted a grave demand for acts of war.

Seen from the Caribbean area, Mr. Kennedy's victory over the Cuban missiles is not diluted by these strangely motivated domestic attacks. The Kennedy policy has established, for the last Latin doubter, Castro's suppliant role as a Communist satellite. And by refusing to bring Castro down by the brute force of Yankee arms, Mr. Kennedy has restored faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy.

RESCUE IS NOT THE ANSWER

The Cuban exiles in the Caribbean area have fairly easy and constant communications with Cuba. They know that dissatisfaction with Castro is constantly growing. But they also know that within Cuba there is little desire to be rescued from Castro by Yankee arms, only to be returned to the chaos of corruption existing before Castro's tyranny.

"The people of Cuba," a leading exile said, "have done more fundamental political thinking in the past 4 years than in the preceding 50 years." And the Cuban people are reported as wanting not merely an overthrow of Castro, but the creation of a new governmental system that will permit Cubans, by themselves, to find a democratic destiny.

Cubans of this school of thought are horrified by the bellicosity of a Nixon. They are depressed by the partisan speeches in the United States which indicate that we should reassume a benevolent guardianship over Cuba.

Those Cubans who engaged in the early planning of the Bay of Pigs fiasco still remember the callous ideas of superiority held by CIA officials. "The first thing I was asked by the CIA officer in charge," says a leading Cuban exile, "was to state my attitude toward restoration of the King Ranch properties."

These exiles—predominantly young professional men of moderately liberal and democratic leanings—are determined that Castro will be overthrown from within Cuba. They have no interest in a Guatemala type coup d'etat directed by the CIA—or any other outside organization.

They are seeking financial support without strings. And support is just beginning to come, in trickles, from among the exiles themselves and from other Caribbean democratic forces. This is aid without any strings, without any commitments aside from the moral assurance of these men that

Cuba shall be freed of communism and freed of corruption.

TOPSY-TURVY SETTING

From the United States, these exiles and their working colleagues now in Cuba will welcome only a form of support for which we have little governmental experience. They do not want the large-scale, massively supervised support that has been America's method in South Korea and South Vietnam.

For in Cuba the tables are turned about topsy-turvy from the usual cold war setting. Here Castro occupies the place of Syngman Rhee or Diem—an unpopular leader propped by massive support of a major power. And in Cuba it is the Communist bloc, for once, that is trying to prop an unpopular government with an expensive supply line running across thousands of oceanic miles.

The anti-Castro resistance that is already a-building takes heart from the lessons of other areas. These Cubans know that 500,000 French soldiers, including the ruthless professionals of the Foreign Legion, could not conquer the relatively weak bands of native Algerian rebels. They know how large a threat to massive U.S. efforts a few thousand well-trained and dedicated Viet-Cong Communists have become. They know that ours is an age when force can impose an unpopular dictatorship only when it is as totally overwhelming as the Soviet divisions in East Germany.

The greatest U.S. aid to the free Cuban movement will not come from military action against Castro. The sort of action recommended by Mr. Nixon smacks so much of Yankee imperialism that in the final analysis it could only help Castro.

The major things needed from U.S. policy are already coming forth under President Kennedy. His firm and courageous elimination of the Soviet missiles, and his subsequent actions, have prevented the Communists from turning Cuba into a satellite firmly held by Soviet might.

CLASSIC REVOLUTIONARIES

The responsibility for the final downfall of Castro lies with the people of Cuba. They are now just beginning the gathering of their forces, inside Cuba and among the exiles in the Caribbean area and on the U.S. mainland.

The young men who today are forming these revolutionary forces of freedom are not prominent on our TV screens or in our press photographs. And they are revolutionaries—in the classic sense—not merely opponents of Castro but opponents of his betrayal of the revolution which Cuba under Batista and his predecessors had so long needed.

They are gathering now, and have been for 15 months since their morale began recovering from the almost fatal defeat of the Bay of Pigs. They are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans. They are not merely wary of, but in fact openly hostile toward, the sort of U.S. support that would make them American satellites.

This is the dominant characteristic of the new Cuban democratic revolutionary movement. It is a characteristic which will never be understood by CIA officers who ask for promises about the future fate of the King Ranch or other U.S. investments in Cuba.

In the final analysis, these Cuban freedom forces are poised to fight the only kind of war of liberation that the free world can countenance. Their guerrilla tactics will be frankly imitative of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. But their political strategy will be drawn from the experience of Washington and Franklin and Jefferson. For their war will not be aimed to establish a U.S. hegemony but rather to create a new free land.

SUCCOR THAT FAILED

The extent of the determination of the Cuban liberation movement can be shown by a recent poignant example.