

U.S. OFFICERS GET WARNING

Radical Speeches Offer Aid To Foe, Fulbright Says

By HOWARD NORTON

(Washington Bureau of The Sun)

Washington, Aug. 21—The officers, students and faculty at the National War College were told today that military men who make radical political speeches are playing into the hands of this nation's enemies.

This warning came from the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright (D., Ark.) in a blunt and forceful defense of recent orders limiting military speakers to non-political subjects.

The order was handed down by the Defense Department after Fulbright had sent that department a memorandum criticizing certain high-ranking officers for their espousal of radical political causes.

"Exploitation" Feared

Since then, Fulbright has been engaged in a running battle in the Senate with Senators Thurmond (D., S.C.) and Goldwater (R., Ariz.), who see the order as a "gag" to prevent the military men telling what they know about the Communist enemy.

Fulbright denied flatly, in his war college speech that he had any intention of muzzling the officers.

His memorandum, he said, was "directed solely at the impropriety of officers in the armed services permitting their prestige and official status to be exploited by persons with extreme views on highly controversial political issues."

He declared that in this modern age, when war has become a highly technical undertaking, it is proper that Government policy should be arrived at jointly by civilian and military leaders.

"Total Victory" Criticized

But the history of this country has shown, he added, that it is also proper for the military to remain under civilian control.

Fulbright took direct issue with the "total victory" theory of his critics in the Senate—a theory that the victory of democracy must be absolute and universal.

"The purpose of our foreign policy," he told the war college, "is the very gradual improvement of human life on earth. Our success is not guaranteed, and if our effort are to be coherent and sustained, we must deal realistically with security and strategy."

"Besides the patient and consistent effort to carry out the task a little of a sense of mission—and I emphasize 'little.'"

Warns Of False Hopes

"A consuming Messianism will surely lead us to false hopes and frustration, while action without purpose is action without meaning or hope."

"Our national purpose is a process to be advanced rather than a victory to be won."

"If we are to meet the challenge of our time we must reject the false and simple solutions of irresponsible extremists who cannot, or will not, accept the world as it is."

The Foreign Relations Committee chairman turned against the radicals the very charge of being "soft on communism" which they have leveled against the moderates.

Softness Is Charged

"It seems to me," he said, "that it is these extremists who are advocating the soft approach."

"Their oversimplifications and their baseless generalizations reflect the softness of those who cannot bear to face the burdens of a continuing struggle against a powerful and resourceful enemy."

"A truly tough approach in my judgment," the Senator added, "is one which accepts the challenge of communism with the courage and determination to meet it with every instrumentality of foreign policy—political and economic as well as military, and with the willingness to see the struggle through as far into the future as may be necessary."

Fulbright branded the contention that "the internal Communist menace is the primary problem of the cold war" as "astonishing and 'patently absurd'."

"First To Applaud"

"Those who contend our free society is permeated with corruption and subversion," he charged, "are in fact espousing a line that the Communists themselves would be the first to applaud."

The Senator declared that "the extremists of the right" who "call themselves 'conservative'" are "not conservative, but radical—radical because they fail to distinguish between Democratic and social progress and totalitarian communism—regarding the former as a step to and the latter."

"It is my belief," he asserted, "that all forms of radical extremism, in one form or another, are enemies to freedom and democracy."

Turning directly to the subject of military men in their official status, he said they are committing not only themselves but the prestige of the armed services when they permit their names to appear as sponsors of radical political causes.

Memorandum Explained

disserve both to the American people and to the armed services when they lend their support to any groups or organizations which espouse policies that run counter to those of the commander in chief of the armed forces, and which have the effect of generating distrust and suspicion among the people."

Fulbright explained to his war college audience that the memorandum which he submitted to the Secretary of Defense, and which caused all the current uproar

"was based upon my strong belief" in the Anglo-Saxon tradition of civilian control of the military establishment.

"Its purpose was certainly not to silence military officers who choose to express their own views in public and who are subject to the discipline of their superiors and their own sense of duty and propriety."

"Remains In Accord"

"The memorandum was directed solely at the impropriety of officers of the armed services permitting their prestige and official status to be exploited by persons with extreme views on highly controversial political issues," Fulbright declared.

Fulbright acknowledged that the American military "remains in accord with the basic values of our society," and that "the military profession is a fair representation of all of the major elements of American society."

"In most of the democratic societies, however," he added, "there are differences in spirit and mood between the professional soldier and the politician or statesman."

He explained that the "politician must move tentatively in an atmosphere in which goals and means often become blurred and excessive precision will only make movement difficult."

"Soldier Works Differently"

"The soldier," he added, "works differently. His objectives are defined clearly in advance; he will then state his requirements and

dispose his forces so as to gain the object."

"If considerations such as these be the wisdom and justification for our civilian supremacy and military professionalism."

"As long as democratic government is honest and efficient, and as long as the military adhere to non-political professionalism there can be no impairment of either democratic institutions or of the integrity of the military establishment."

STATINTL