

DAVID LAWRENCE

Cuba: Lesson in Intervention

Evidence just furnished from an unexpected quarter proves to the world how the Soviet Union has deliberately and of her own initiative invaded the Western Hemisphere as a means of carrying on the "cold war" against the United States.

Fidel Castro was amazingly frank when, in answering the questions of visiting newsmen a few days ago, he incriminated the Moscow government. He had been asked about how his relations with the Communists had developed. He said:

"Facts and events forced Cuba into the Soviet sphere. When the first American aggressions started against Cuba and when the first agrarian reform began, Cuba did not have any diplomatic or commercial relations with the Soviet Union. But every time the United States attacked us, they (the Soviets) made offers and solutions and that is why we slowly began friendship and ties with the Soviet Union."

The Moscow regime has insisted right along that it came to the aid of Cuba only because the government in Havana requested it. This is a historic form of alibi for intervention but, in the case of Cuba, the world now knows that Russia took the initiative. Certainly the establishment of missile bases, fully equipped with weapons that could attack a large part of the territory of the United States, wasn't something dreamed up by Mr. Castro.

Unfortunately, the United States has been willing virtually to close the books on the episode ever since Premier Khrushchev in October, 1962, promised the late President Kennedy that the missile bases would be dismantled and Soviet troops would be withdrawn. But the fact is that the government of the Soviet Union continues today

to maintain a military force of its own in Cuba, and the missile bases can be reactivated at any time by the Russian "technicians" still on hand.

The Johnson administration has apparently decided to let matters drift, and to accept the assurances from Moscow that the troops gradually will be withdrawn. But nearly two years now have elapsed since the first promises were made, and they have not yet been completely fulfilled. It certainly shouldn't take two years to withdraw a few thousand troops.

While Soviet military personnel has been reduced, the UPI in a dispatch on Tuesday—attributed to administration officials here as the source—said:

"The Russians are believed still in complete charge of the control center near Havana. This gives them a veto on any possible Cuban use of the missiles contrary to Soviet interest. Soviet Premier Khrushchev is believed to be reluctant to give Premier Castro complete control of the anti-aircraft missile system."

But why should any European government be keeping any of its missiles or other military equipment in any country in this hemisphere and controlling their use—especially on an island only 90 miles away from the coast of the United States?

The Soviet government, of course, continues also to operate its apparatus for subversion and espionage in many Latin-American countries, including Mexico. It may be surprising to many people in the United States to learn that the Mexican government tolerates within its territory the presence of Communist plotters and agents. Within the last week Mexico refused to vote diplomatic and economic sanc-

tions against Cuba, even though a majority of the members of the Organization of American States did so.

The future of the Western Hemisphere is very much the concern of the Washington Government. Much publicity has been given in recent years to the Alliance for Progress concept. This, however, cannot succeed without money, and the people of this country are not likely to look with favor on the flow of funds to any Latin American country which tolerates Communist espionage and the meddling by a European power in the affairs of the nations of this hemisphere.

As for the policy of the United States toward the Soviet Union, revelations such as Fidel Castro now has made official do not augur well for the success of "disarmament" talks or any other negotiations with the Moscow regime. So long as mutual trust had not been established, any agreements that may be made are valueless.

Unhappily, there is a "peace-at-any-price" element in this country which believes in a soft policy toward Russia. This was emphasized recently by the reaction to the suggestion made by Senator Goldwater that the question of continuing diplomatic relations with Moscow should be re-examined and that, unless Moscow agrees to abstain from certain acts of hostility toward this country, severance of diplomatic relations should be considered.

But the Arizona Senator was jumped on by critics for even raising the subject. Presumably that's why Moscow feels confident it can continue unchecked its acts of aggression and the flouting of the Washington Government's policies in the hemisphere.