

# WILL NIXON RAID CUBA ?

PAUL EBERLE

There is an organization called "U.S. Citizens For A Free Cuba," with offices in Miami and Washington, D.C. If you write to them, they will send you their newsletter, a long, tedious diatribe calling for "direct intervention" to get rid of the present regime in Cuba. While "direct intervention" is advocated only in the event of an internal crisis, it goes on to advocate economic sanctions designed to create that crisis, and proposes that this country, meanwhile, should "...train, aid, and support freedom fighters in exile."

While the newsletter appears to be nothing more than another typical piece of right-wing literature from some fanatical splinter group, a list of its officers and members, printed at the bottom of the last page, draws a very different picture.

The membership includes such solid citizens as Clare Booth Luce, Victor Riesel, Dr. Edward Teller, John Dos Passos, Nicholas Duke Biddle, and Ambassador Spruille Braden, to name just a few.

What is even more interesting is the fact that recently, the U.S. State Department placed Cuba number three on a priority list of trouble spots, topped only by Korea and Vietnam.

Our intrepid researcher, David Zitch, who sent for the newsletter, also came up with a recent speech by Undersecretary of State Ball, in which he stated, "The most obvious and direct way to eliminate the Castro regime in Cuba would be by direct military action designed to replace the present government by a non-Communist government friendly to the West." Ball then piously disavows any advocacy of such crass behavior but calls instead for a severe program of "economic denial" designed to force Cuba into economic crisis and render her vulnerable and defenseless.

Meanwhile, US policy on reconnaissance flights over Cuba has not changed; the overflights still continue. How we would like it if the Cubans flew over the United States for reconnaissance purposes is a question seldom discussed in this country.

It would seem that the power structure is strongly committed to some kind of intervention with the purpose of putting Cuba back under the control of the US business community. It would also appear likely that the intervention will not come in the form of a direct assault by US armed forces, but rather an invasion by Cuban and other Latin-American

(Continued on Page 8)

# Nixon versus Cuba: Bay of Pigs return engagement?

(From Page One)

forces finances, trained, equipped and trained by the CIA in Guatemala, attempted a beach-head on Cuban soil. Largely on the basis of CIA "news" releases, headlines all over the country told of mass uprisings and revolt against Castro by the Cuban people. Meanwhile, the invading force was being systematically wiped out by Castro's forces, and nowhere in the entire island did a single Cuban raise a rifle on behalf of the "liberators."

On the very morning that the invasion force was landing at the Bay of Pigs; Secretary of State Dean Rusk told a group of newsmen: "The American people are entitled to know whether we are intervening in Cuba or intend to... The answer to that question is no."



The New York Times, in an editorial on May 10, commented: "The Cuban tragedy has raised a domestic issue that is likely to come up again and again until it is solved... Is a democratic government in an open society such as ours ever justified in deceiving its own people? A democracy—our democracy—cannot be lied to... The basic principle involved is one of confidence."

Then, there is our illustrious President-elect, Richard Nixon: If his role and public pronouncements with reference to Cuba is examined even superficially, there is good reason to look forward to a long-awaited return engagement of the Bay of Pigs disaster, with a cast of thousands.

Nixon was one of the earliest architects of the Bay of Pigs, when plans were first being laid, in the administration of President Eisenhower. In an article which appeared in Readers' Digest, Nixon wrote: "I was one of only three members of the president's cabinet who had been briefed on it and... I had been the strongest and most persistent advocate for setting up and supporting such a program..." "I had known and worked with Allen Dulles since 1947."

"I would find a proper legal cover and I would go in," Nixon said. He suggested three possible "legal" justifications for taking such action: (1) "A new definition of aggression based on the premise that Soviet-Bloc equipment was used by the Castro forces, and that we had an obligation to see that the Freedom Fighters were at least equally equipped." (2) "Send American forces in under our treaty right because of the potential threat

to Guantanamo," and (3) "Send American forces in to protect the lives and rights of several thousand American citizens still living in Cuba..." He then stated that he felt "...we must do whatever is necessary to rid Cuba of Communism and Castro."

Nixon further stated in the same article "There are two major lessons to be learned from the Bay of Pigs: First, when a decision has been made to commit American prestige, we must be prepared to commit an adequate amount of American power."

He also stated that Kennedy's policy of prohibiting wildcat raids on Cuba and committing the US to a no-invasion policy was the result of "incredibly bad advice."

It was this same policy, according to Jim Garrison, that prompted "elements of the CIA and Cuban 'Fascists' to blow Kennedy's brains out in Dallas on Nov. 22, 1963."

So much for Cuba and the American power structure,—except for one thing which I think goes to the heart of the matter. In his speech, which we quoted

above, Undersecretary of State Ball outlined the four objectives of the US program of "economic denial" which, it was hoped, the program would accomplish:

(1) "To reduce the will of the Cubans to export violence and subversion to other states;

(2) To make plain to the people of Cuba that the present regime cannot serve their interests...

(3) To demonstrate to the peoples of the American republics that Communism has no future in the Western Hemisphere, and,

(4) To increase the cost to the Soviet Union of maintaining a Communist outpost in the Western Hemisphere."

The point is this: It is a truism that you cannot destroy an idea with guns—and you certainly cannot destroy an idea with a "program of economic denial." The only way you can do that is to offer a better idea. Unfortunately, the US power structure, it seems, does not have a better idea, and the same kind of mental bankruptcy that gave us Vietnam, Santo Domingo, and Chicago, will very likely give us another Bay of Pigs.

\* Several lines or paragraph missing here?