

# Senate Policy Role Urged by Fulbright

By Bryce Nelson  
Washington Post Staff Writer

Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) said last night that the United States Senate must regain its right to give advice and consent in major foreign policy decisions.

The Senate, he said, "should undertake to revive and strengthen the deliberation function" which it has let atrophy during the last 25 years.

He cited two examples from President Johnson's Administration—the 1964 Tonkin Gulf resolution and the 1965 Dominican Republic intervention—as illustrations of inadequate presidential consultation with Congress.

Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said that it was the duty of Senators to "infiltrate" into high policy councils if they were not invited by the President.

The Senator spoke to a packed auditorium at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies here in the first of three Christian A. Herter lectures.

Fulbright said the theme of his lectures would be whether "the United States can overcome that arrogance of power which has afflicted, weakened, and in some cases destroyed great nations in the past." At present, he said, the United States is "gradually but unmistakably . . . succumbing to the arrogance of power."

Last night's lecture was entitled "The Higher patriotism," which Fulbright defined as the duty to criticize one's country even during times of conflict. "In a democracy," he said "Dissent is an act of faith."

Fulbright attacked the idea of a national consensus as "pernicious and undemocratic" if it meant only "unquestioning support of existing policies."

"It is only when the Congress fails to challenge the Executive, when the opposition fails to oppose, when politicians join in a spurious consensus behind controversial policies, that the campuses and streets and public square of America are likely to become the forums of a direct and disorderly democracy," Fulbright said.

The current Vietnam de-

bate is taking place in a "relatively healthy atmosphere," Fulbright said. But he warned that "it is by no means certain" that this atmosphere "will not give way to a new era of McCarthyism."

To avert such a curtailment of dissent, Fulbright cautioned students to avoid demonstrations and draft-card burning. He said that it was "stupid and vindictive" to punish draft-card burning as a crime, but also termed it "a very unwise act because it is shocking rather than persuasive."

Fulbright termed the current student protest movement "a moral and intellectual improvement on the party raids of the fifties," but said that since the United States is an "essentially conservative society," that protest was better expressed in a conservative and orderly manner.

Fulbright defended the right of the protest movement to label the Vietnamese conflict as an unjust war. "Some of our super-patriots assume that any war the United States fights is a just war, if not indeed a holy crusade, but history does not sustain that view," he said. Fulbright labeled the War of 1812, the Civil War and the Spanish-American War as "unjust or unnecessary" conflicts. He termed Abraham Lincoln's anti-war speech at the time of the Mexican War as "worthy of Senator (Wayne) Morse."

Calling on Congress to play its constitutional role in airing and debating the great foreign policy problems, Fulbright charged that "the Senate's constitutional powers of advice and consent have atrophied into what is widely regarded — though never asserted — to be a duty to give prompt consent with a minimum of advice."

Fulbright included the Kennedy Administration Cuban missile confrontation in his list of crises in which Congress was told what was being done rather than consulted in advance by the White House.

Fulbright also attacked the American habit of "policy making by analogy." He said that the examples of Munich and Hitler's aggression against Poland were not particularly relevant to current U.S. policy in Vietnam.