

BALTIMORE SUN

MAY 5 1964

## Fulbright and Latin America

By DANIEL JAMES

Mexico, D.F. — Senator Fulbright's famous speech criticizing the lack of realism in our foreign policy, particularly on such issues as Cuba and Panama, has precipitated a spirited discussion south of the border as well as north of it. Indeed, hardly a day passes without some Latin American figure making some comment, pro or con, on the Fulbright utterance.

A sampling of the comment, thus far, indicates that the Marxist left in Latin America is generally in favor of Fulbright's basic propositions, while other political shades of opinion ranging from the democratic left to the far right, are opposed. The Marxists (of various nuances) usually praise the Senator for being "realistic" (his own stated aim) in advocating "peaceful co-existence" with Castro, and similar "flexible" policies toward the Communist nations.

Those Latin Americans who disagree with the Senator maintain that, withstanding his plea for "realism," he does not have a realistic grasp of the situation here, and that his ideas are sowing confusion among our Western-oriented neighbors and playing into Communist hands.

Although Fulbright said that the Communist power to fear today is Red China, not the Soviet Union, his co-existence-with-Castro line is supported by Latin America's "Moscow" and "Peking" Communist factions alike. Both, in spite of the rising bitterness of the Sino-Soviet dispute, express the hope that the Senator's "realism" on Cuba will ultimately be extended to Red China.

After all, editorializes the Mexican Marxist daily *El Dia*, if Communist Cuba is "a disagreeable reality" (Fulbright's words) for us but a reality all the same, isn't it, in essence, the same in the case of China? It continues: "Hasn't it been a stubborn disregard for reality to have denied for fifteen years that there is only one China, mainland China?" (The quoted phrase is from Fulbright.)

A critic on the democratic left, Enrique Castro Delgado, a former Spanish Communist leader who now lives in Latin America, attacks Fulbright on fundamentals. He charges that Fulbright is, in effect, making distinctions between "good" and "bad" Communists when he regards Khrushchev as benign and Mao Tze-tung as the real threat, and that that is dangerous.

It is true, argues Castro Delgado, that the ideological crisis of communism has put Marx under interdiction, "but it has not done away with Lenin"—both sides in the quarrel claiming to be the true Leninists. "What Senator Fulbright seems not to have understood is that Communist doctrine (Marxism) has been replaced by "a technique for the conquest of power and the maintenance of it" (Leninism).

The means used by the Communists to take power may vary—Castro Delgado cites the different roads taken in Russia, Czechoslovakia and Cuba—but the final goal is always the same. What he fears, above all, is that Fulbright's "realistic flexibility" spells our ultimate capitulation to the Communists as in the case of Yalta. (Castro Delgado lived in the U.S.S.R. from the end of the Spanish Civil War through 1944 and studied Stalin's wartime policies at first hand.)

The central criticism of the Fulbright speech in Latin America is that his plea for "realism" ignores the harshest reality south of the border, and the one that most impedes the effort being made to effect a "peaceful revolution" through the Alliance for Progress and similar programs: the ruthless campaign sponsored by Castro's Cuba to foment violent revolution everywhere in the area.

Thus, Antonio Uroz, the important columnist of the Mexico City daily *El Universal*, calls the Fulbright speech "a violent blow at his own State Department and a denial of all that is happening in our America precisely due to the agitation provoked by Fidel Castro."

Uroz and other Latin American critics feel that Fulbright is wrong if he thinks that Castro is "not a grave threat to the United States," but "does pose a grave threat" to Latin America. They ask: "Is not a threat to Latin America also a threat to the United States? Hasn't the Senator himself said that 'some Communist regimes pose a threat to the free world'? Is not Latin America part of the free world, and if Castro threatens it then doesn't his regime fall into the above category established by the Senator?"

Uroz draws up an impressive list of Latin republics where Castro-sponsored guerrilla activities and acts of violent subversion are going on at this moment. It includes Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Panama, Peru, Venezuela and Uruguay. Even in Brazil, notwithstanding its recent anti-Communist revolution, the Castro-Communist threat has not been completely removed. One might add to Uroz's list these countries where it also exists: Dominican Republic, Guatemala and Honduras. Finally, there is the increasing Cuban-backed violence in the colony of British Guiana.

On the very day that Fulbright spoke, the Argentine Government claimed to have proof that a band of Communist guerrillas operating in the north were under leaders who had been trained in Cuba, and that it as with similar terrorist groups in Bolivia, Brazil and Venezuela. The band is only one of many uncovered in recent weeks by the Argentine authorities, in various parts of the country. In almost every case, they found large quantities of modern arms, Cuban propaganda, and the guerrilla writings of Mao Tze-tung and "Che" Guevara, in the raids. At least one Cuban guerrilla instructor was apprehended, at a camp in the province of Salta.

Continued

More disturbing, in a sense, is the case of Peru, where a left-of-center Government trying to carry out Senator Fulbright's prescription for a "peaceful revolution" is impeded by persistent violence in the countryside provoked by Castro-backed Communist-led peasants. In February, thousands of Communist-led peasants in Cuzco carried out a series of land invasions, resulting in many casualties, which the Government charged "formed part of a plan perfectly structured and directed by extremist Communist elements designed to subvert order and create chaos" throughout Peru.

Again, as in Argentina's case, the Peruvian authorities have frequently come across Red terrorist encampments containing varying quantities of arms and propaganda. Since the beginning of this year, there has been a noticeable increase in Castro-Communist subversion and violence in Peru.

In Venezuela, though the Castro-backed Communist terrorists received two body blows with the conduct of a peaceful inauguration of a new President in March, fresh acts of violence are being committed almost daily. Moreover, the Communists' guerrilla arm, the so-called Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN), remains intact, as do most if not all of its encampments.

The Venezuelans, of course, have proved beyond the slightest doubt, and

an Organization of American States investigating commission has corroborated the proof, that Castro is guilty of supplying arms to the FALN and of sending in money and propaganda all designed to overthrow the democratic government. Neither Castro nor the FALN, despite the fact that it is an abhorred tiny minority, has given up that aim. Yet in Venezuela, as in neighboring Peru, a left-of-center government is in power and is trying to make a "peaceful revolution."

There is so much detailed evidence of Castro-backed guerrilla activities and other forms of violence throughout Latin America that one could literally write volumes on the subject. As *La Nacion* of Buenos Aires noted, just one day after the Fulbright speech:

"There isn't a Latin American republic which, in the last three years, has not confirmed within its own territory something of that which Venezuela has revealed in its totality. Those governments most complacent about the Cuban regime have not been excluded from *Castrista* aggression."

Senator Fulbright would doubtless not argue with the facts of "*Castrista* aggression" presented by Uroz and other Latin Americans. His answer, as contained in his speech, is that it is up to the Latin Americans themselves to deal with it, through the OAS. The Latin reply to that, however, is that OAS action—for example, on Venezuela's proposals for action against Castro—is impossible unless the United States takes the leadership in pressing for it.

Practically speaking, there is now probably a better chance to get strong OAS approval for the Venezuelan proposals, with Brazil apparently ready to line up solidly with the anti-Castro forces. But the Latin Americans, including possibly the Brazilians as well, would still expect the United States to take the lead—or, better put, to seriously follow Venezuela's leadership.

That is all the more true since the Fulbright speech, which has given Latin America the impression that its great northern neighbor is divided and confused with regard to the Hemisphere's most aggravating problem.

MAY 5 1964