

# McNamara Talk Stirs Speculation

By Murrey Marder

Washington Post Staff Writer

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara set off speculation across Washington yesterday about the target of his warning that "military hardware" is not the answer to security in this turbulent age.

Underlining his speech, according to an authoritative source, was a fundamental conviction that he avoided specifying in his unusual comments.

It was a belief that much more long-range planning and intellectual effort must be applied to the complexities of policy-making in a very insecure world. In sum, McNamara was saying, a gun is not a substitute for a policy.

All appropriate official spokesmen yesterday swiftly denied that McNamara's remarks in Montreal on Wednesday were aimed at their bosses.

## Divergence Denied

They equally denied that McNamara's speech represented a split in the Administration, or any divergence from official policy lines.

But none of the official spokesmen, it was noticeable, enthusiastically embraced McNamara's philosophically phrased comments. The formal reaction was all in a defensive vein.

The White House said it had received a rough draft of the speech in advance, but to say specifically if President Johnson read it, or if so, what he thought of it. Presidential Press Secretary Bill D. Moy-

## News Analysis

ers was asked by newsmen: "Do you say this is not a definite change of Administration policy?" He replied, "Ab-

solutely."

State Department Press Officer Robert J. McClosky said: "It is fair to say that the speech in toto had the approval of the Department of State."

## Draft Was Softened

Other sources said Secretary of State Dean Rusk had examined the speech in detail before it was delivered. There definitely was some softening of the original McNamara phraseology, it was learned, as varying drafts of the speech circulated in the Administration.

McNamara himself was described by official sources as disavowing any intention to agree or disagree with congressional critics of Administration policy, although some of his phrases did in fact parallel some of the criticisms. Nor, these sources maintained, was it McNamara's intention to enunciate new directions in foreign or military policy.

But it was certainly McNamara's intention to shake up complacent thinking about the problem of meeting secur-

ity needs today. Inevitably, no one would specify if McNamara was talking about the need for "realism" in Congress or the Executive Branch of Government. The implication is that he meant both, along with the public and the allies of the United States too.

McNamara was far bolder than Rusk has been in saying that "we have no charter to rescue floundering regimes, who have brought violence on themselves by deliberately refusing to meet the legitimate expectations of their citizenry."

Also, McNamara was making a considerable departure from his own public record, and going beyond Rusk's in urging the building of "bridges" with Communist China, even if its "isolation is largely of its own making . . ."

## No Contradiction Seen

Less than three months ago, McNamara was a chief exponent of what is regarded as the "yellow peril" line of argumentation where Communist China is concerned. He is described, however, as seeing no contradiction, or shift of position, in his current view that Chinese expansion must continue to be contained militarily while efforts are made to "build bridges toward her."

To those who know McNamara, his Montreal speech came as less of a surprise than the public record would indicate. While some critics have labeled the Vietnamese conflict "McNamara's War," the Secretary in fact long has expressed private frustration, and total disagreement, with the argument that sheer power can produce any satisfactory outcome there.

McNamara is extremely proud of the military hardware, and military readiness, that he has produced as Secretary. But behind the scenes in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, McNamara often — but usually unsuccessfully — has opposed the thesis that military might can supplant diplomatic, economic or political ingenuity. Although it is a rare and bold thesis for a Defense Secretary to be arguing in public, that is what he was attempting in Montreal.