

British Feel More Sadness Than

The Washington Post Foreign Service

LONDON, Feb. 19—Britain reacted more in sadness than in anger today at the formal end of U.S. aid in retaliation for trade with Cuba.

For the British, it was only a matter of \$7400 and officials went out of their way to acknowledge that the U.S. Government had no choice because of legislation.

But there were warnings of a serious Anglo-American quarrel if suggestions for an unofficial American boycott of British goods are carried out.

There are no differences of opinion on the subject here. The most anyone has had to say for the American decision came from Prime Minister Douglas-Home, who pointed out it was not President Johnson's doing and that he also was not responsible for the Maritime Union's stand on shipping.

On the aid cut, the Daily Telegraph sounded the dominant tone, saying that for Britain "the move amounted to no more than a rather undignified end to one of the historic post-war arrangements between the two countries."

It recalled that in the early post-war years, Britain received nearly \$10 billion of economic and military aid from the United States.

The Times of London pointed out that President Kennedy had opposed the legislation requiring the aid cut-off, and said the Administration "is leaning over backwards to lessen any harm the new measures may do."

Sir William Black, chairman of Leyland Motors which has the contract for selling buses to Cuba, told a news conference that "we hope the well-informed public opinion in America will be sensible and broad-minded enough to

take this at its true value. I think the American people will show a sense of proportion in this."

Elsewhere there were angry comments about Secretary of State Dean Rusk's statement that the public might boycott Leyland's Triumph cars. Rusk's remarks were taken as an official hint to U.S. consumers, not as a warning.

"If America has a surplus of wheat," said Black, "we have a surplus of buses," adding that Leyland's will fulfill the option to sell another 1000 buses to Cuba if Havana takes it up.

The chairman of the company went on to say that Japan, France, Germany, Italy, Spain and Czechoslovakia had also bid for the bus contract which Leyland won.

"Why is it worse for us to tender and be successful than for the others to tender and be unsuccessful?" he said.

The sharpest public comment against the U.S. move came from the Guardian. In an editorial headed "Petty Spite in the Family," it said "it should be a prime task of British diplomacy to convince Washington that boycotts of third parties in international trade are objectionable in principle and likely to be futile in practise."

"The Americans merely contrive to hurt their friends without hurting Castro," it said.

In sum, Britain is not crying "Fool" at the U.S. stand, but it is loudly shouting "Foolish."

French See America Hurt Most by Action

The Washington Post Foreign Service

PARIS, Feb. 14—American suppression of aid to countries whose ships or planes

call in Cuba wasn't really meant to hurt anybody, France editorialists seem to have agreed tonight, but as a result of European resentment at the gesture, the one hurt may be America herself.

This country's most esteemed pair of radio commentators, Georges Altschuler and Georges Leroy, of Europe Number One, agreed that on the practical plane no very important results were to be expected from an act which in an election year "is

designed to impress American voters with the firmness of their President."

They pointed out how carefully the wind was being tempered to the shorn lamb by applying the measure only where it would cause no real damage, as in exempting agricultural aid to Yugoslavia.

But they predicted that Europe would not relish the decision's arrogant attitude.

Anger at Aid Cut

THE WASHINGTON POST Thursday, Feb. 20, 1964 A 15

of, "I pay, so I command." It is possible that the United States will receive her answer in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The Catholic daily La Croix predicts that the reaction may wreck completely the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations, due to open soon in Geneva.

"At a time when the United States is developing her trade

with the countries of the East," Le Monde writes, "such reprisals provoke sharp reactions. . . . We knew that American aid was not always disinterested. . . . This has just been confirmed."

Yugoslavs Condemn Action as Anachronism

Reuters

BELGRADE, Feb. 19—A Yu-

goslav foreign ministry spokesman today condemned as an anachronism and a "measure of discrimination" the United States decision to cut off its small military aid program to Yugoslavia because the country's ships trade with Cuba.

The spokesman said the U.S. action was not in harmony with the principle of freedom of trade and navigation in international relations "because it represents a uni-

lateral action and a measure of discrimination."

He added: "Retaliation because of trade with third countries today represents an anachronism which acts negatively on the process of lessening world tension and developing friendly relations in the spirit of peaceful coexistence."

[In Madrid, official Spanish sources denied that Spain's relations with Cuba violated agreements with the United States.]