

Rusk Defends U.S. Foreign Policy, Says It Is Understood, Respected

By Murrey Marder

Washington Post Staff Writer

Secretary of State Dean Rusk expressed confidence last night that the objectives of American foreign policy are "widely understood, respected and supported."

Rusk delivered what amounted to a general response to critics of Adminis-

tration policy after public opinion polls this week recorded a new drop in President Johnson's popularity. Most of the drop was attributed to the Vietnam crisis.

The Secretary spoke before the Council of Foreign Relations in New York, at a dinner honoring the late Edward R. Murrow, pre-eminent broad-

casting commentator and later chief of the United States Information Agency.

"I believe," said Rusk, "that a great majority of governments and peoples realize that we seek nothing for ourselves except the right to live in freedom."

While Rusk avoided personalities, he evidently was responding to warnings and criticisms by Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.), Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and by others.

Fulbright, a major critic of United States policy in Vietnam, has cautioned that the United States must beware of "arrogance" in employing its overwhelming power, or of im-

See RUSK, A17, Col. 4

posing the American version of progress and democracy on weaker nations.

Rusk implicitly rejected the need for any such warning. He said that "the abiding goal of American policy" is "the achievement of a peaceful world order."

Employing a favorite theme, Rusk said "the underlying crisis of our time" is the conflict "between those who would impose their blueprint on mankind and those who believe in self-determination," or the difference "between coercion and freedom of choice."

Rusk read off a list of American post-World War II efforts to build world order. He started with the United States' "lead in organizing the United Nations" and through two decades of expenditures of lives, money and effort.

Galbraith a Target

Rusk poked back a little sarcasm at another recently vocal critic of United States foreign policy, John Kenneth Galbraith, Harvard economist and former United States Ambassador to India.

In a goading critique last month before the annual convention of Americans for Democratic Action, Galbraith pleaded for "a somewhat less paranoiac view of our mission in the world." He giped at "the New York foreign policy syndicate" and what he called its "more impeccably traditional members of the permanent foreign policy establishment." Most of Galbraith's targets were at the Waldorf-Astoria last night to hear Rusk.

The Secretary of State, in a diplomatic parry, began his speech by saying, "By law I am a member of the Establishment of the Smithsonian In-

stitution. . . " Rusk said he "would disappoint the Establishment watchers" if he were to bring greetings from the Department of State.

"The eighth ighest officials in our business," he said, "were born in Iowa, Texas, Kansas, North Dakota, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Georgia — and their colleges were Northwestern, Baylor, Occidental, Nebraska, Pomona, MIT, Pittsburgh and Davidson."

Rusk, without directly referring to French President de Gaulle, warned that some nations "would try to recapture the glories of a vanished—and in part imagined—past rather than face squarely the realities of the present and the requirements of the future."

But his principal topic was Vietnam and his principal objective was to reemphasize the justifications often cited for the United States involvement in that struggle.

The "persistent efforts" by the United States "to bring the other side to the peace table . . . shall continue," said Rusk.

The Rusk Litany

"But I am confident," he said, "that the United States will also continue to do what may be necessary to assure that aggression in Southeast Asia does not succeed."

"When the other side becomes convinced that it cannot achieve its purpose by force," he repeated, in what literally has become a litany by Rusk, "peace will come."

Rusk rejected, as he has done in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the arguments raised by Administration critics.

THE WASHINGTON POST Wednesday, May 25, 1966

A17

He again spurned the concept that spheres of influence operate in a nuclear age. He said "I am aware that (Communist China's) Mao and (North Vietnam's) Ho Chi Minh are not Hitler and Mus-

solini," but, said Rusk, "the clearest lesson of the Nineteen Thirties and Forties is that aggression feeds on aggression."

Rusk reiterated the Administration's contention that American "commitments" to

South Vietnam date back to President Truman's Administration. "The assertion that the Department of State only recently rediscovered the SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) Treaty is untrue," he said.