

Rusk Cites 4 Ways For U. S. to Seek Peace With Soviet

By PETER KIHSS

Secretary of State Dean Rusk outlined last night four "possible areas of negotiation" with the Soviet Union where "the raw edges of our basic conflict in objectives may be to a degree dulled" and World War III averted.

They comprised arms control, even in limited steps; negotiations to resolve specific crises, the avoidance of future crises, and joint ventures in health, science, outer space and peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Speaking at an Academy of Political Science dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, Secretary Rusk also proposed the establishment of "suitable and effective international supervisory bodies which can identify indirect aggression when it occurs and rally the international community to defense of the intended victim."

Vietnam Threat Noted

Such indirect aggression, he said, includes attempts to overthrow governments through "armed infiltration, such as now threatens Vietnam." He also defined it as including "training, arming and support of guerrillas by one nation against another."

"All free nations—allied and uncommitted alike—should seek to enhance their capability for countering the use of guerrillas as a means of attack," Mr. Rusk said.

"Nations which are able to do so should assist them in this task. The United States is now providing training and equipment specifically for this purpose. It will continue to do so."

The eighty-one-year-old Academy of Political Science had earlier held an all-day meeting on foreign trade. In this Braj Kumar Nehru, India's Ambassador to the United States, suggested that one direct way to help under-developed countries, even without foreign grants or loans, would be to buy their exports in "one-way free trade."

Secretary Rusk told nearly 1,000 persons at the dinner that the United States was seeking "a world-wide system of freer

RUSK SEES 4 WAYS TO TRY FOR PEACE

Continued From Page 1, Col. 6

trade which will permit all of us to use our resources to maximum advantage." This is in addition to direct aid for developing countries, he said.

The United States, Mr. Rusk said, seeks adequate defenses against Chinese-Soviet efforts to "spread their coercive system into every continent." But he added it also believed that "the Soviets and ourselves have some common or overlapping interests" in preventing the struggle between their system and the free world from erupting into war.

"This suggests several possible areas of negotiation," the Secretary of State went on.

"First, arms control. Even very limited and piecemeal steps might be helpful in controlling some of the more immediate dangers of the arms race. Steps to reduce the risk of war by accident and miscalculation are clearly in the interest of both sides, in an era of thermonuclear conflict. Measures to inhibit the further spread of nuclear weapons should also commend themselves to prudent men in any country.

"Second, negotiations to resolve specific crises which have reached the point of clear and present danger. In such cases, as the President said at Seattle, 'if vital interests under duress can be preserved by peaceful means, negotiations will find that out. If our adversary will accept nothing less than a concession of our rights, negotiations will find that out.'

Preventive Talks Urged

"Third, negotiation to avoid future crises. Continuous communications between ourselves and the Communists can help us both to stay clear of hostile actions which would directly threaten each other's vital interests and thus precipitate such crises. We cannot afford to permit great powers to misjudge each other's intentions until it becomes too late to draw back.

"Fourth, there may be areas in which cooperative and affirmative action would serve the interests of both sides. Joint ventures in such fields as health and science, outer space, and peaceful uses of atomic energy fall into this category. Both the Communist nations and ourselves have found programs for exchange of persons and information to be of mutual advantage."

Secretary Rusk declared that Premier Khrushchev's "program

for an eventual total Communist victory does not exclude the use of force and threats—it seems to exclude only the great war which would destroy the Soviet Union."

"We must also be ready, as we are, to use whatever force is needed to defend freedom," Mr. Rusk said.

Huge Aid Held Needed

Earlier Ambassador Nehru had estimated that total foreign aid needed for developing countries might be \$8,000,000,000 or \$9,000,000,000 a year. This, he said, seems "immediately practicable" in view of projected Western income growth by \$500,000,000,000 a year over the next decade and the world's present arms spending of \$100,000,000,000.

India, he said, has been "quite impartial between capitalists and Communists" in generally rejecting advice on its development planning. From one side, he said, the advice is that of developed societies, while from the other, "the methods advocated could only be applied in a society without individual freedom of choice or of political expression."

The Indian envoy said underdeveloped countries should not get economic aid until they had made their own "maximum possible sacrifice." But he said their foreign-exchange earnings were held down by developed countries through tariff, quota and tax restrictions against their goods.

"The proper trade policy," Mr. Nehru said, "though few people have as yet had the courage to advocate it, is a policy of one-way free trade insofar as the exports of the underdeveloped countries are concerned."

In answer to audience questions, Mr. Nehru said India's "man in the street is aware" of foreign aid. But he added, "People understand it as charity, and it is distinctly embarrassing and unpopular." Multilateral administration, he said, would remove the charity aspect "to a considerable extent," but "the world, being what it is politically, that would be difficult."

While the formal speakers at yesterday's sessions all favored foreign aid, Prof. David B. Truman of Columbia University reported "strong, persistent and growing" opposition in the House of Representatives.

He described a study showing that Representatives persistently opposing foreign aid rose from 18 per cent in 1953 to 26 per cent in 1959 and 29 per cent this year. Four-fifths of these, he said, came from the South and Midwest, with the same districts producing opposition even when different men in different parties held the seats.

Nevertheless, Professor Truman said, Congress actually appears to support foreign aid more than the public at large. Public opinion, he said, consistently indicates that "the only genuinely unpopular item in our foreign policy is foreign aid," and "support for it has been declining fairly steadily."