

# The 'No-Win' Censors

By Roscoe Drummond - 6 JUL 1962

WASHINGTON.—Why is it that the Kennedy Administration, in pursuing a firm, no-appeasement policy in the conduct of the cold war, continues to have such a hard time convincing its honest critics at home that its actions mean what they say?

It seems to me that the Administration needs to ponder this matter more carefully than it has and not shrug it off as though it were an unfair question or a purely partisan complaint.



Mr. Drummond

It does seem rather ironic that an Administration which is doing so much to strengthen our defenses, is acting boldly to secure South Vietnam, is holding the line in Berlin, and is coming nearer to catching up with Russia in outer space, should find so many who honestly wonder if it isn't taking a no-win attitude in the cold war. I am not referring to the John Birch extremists, who seem to me to want to fight the Communists where they are weakest and to retreat from the fray where the Communists are the greatest danger. I am referring to responsible men who express recurring doubts about whether the White House and the State Department can be counted on to be firm and persevering. Democratic Sen. Thomas Dodd of Connecticut is a good illustration. Republican Senate leader Everett Dirksen is another.

Sen. Dodd puts some of his doubts quite strongly in his current book, "Freedom and Foreign Policy."

## Dirksen's Instinct

When Sen. Dirksen reads a report in the press about somebody who says he has talked with somebody who has heard something about the Administration's updated position paper on "basic national security" and who hints that it says the United States should be more responsive to the "mellowing process" in the Soviet Union—Mr. Dirksen's instinct is not to disbelieve the report but to hail State's Policy Planning chief before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and ask how come.

To some degree the Administration is, I think, responsible for the feeling that it is dedicated to something less than victory in the cold war.

Oddly enough, the Administration's actions are better than its words. The Administration is acting to win the cold war, but is refusing to say right out—clearly, simply and directly—that it is out to win the cold war all the way.

This is a mistake. This is a self-imposed handicap. This tends to

divide the country, not unite it. It evokes unnecessary misgivings among many people as to where the Administration stands.

Everybody in Washington and many others know that the State Department censors—who have a proper job to do and are still doing it improperly—are zealously and imprudently wielding the blue pencil to make it virtually impossible for even high government officials to say that the purpose of the United States is to "win" the cold war and that our objective is "victory."

## Rare Words

These are the words that rarely, if ever, get into public pronouncements or, when some venture-some official dares to put them in, they are struck out. Not often does any official win his battle with the censors on this point.

The explanation is that such frank talk seems to the censors as unduly provocative and that to say our goal in the cold war is "victory" is to imply that we want victory by war.

It means no such thing. Unless we confront the Communist goal of total domination with our goal of total freedom, we will not marshal our resources effectively.

I think the Administration ought to match its good actions with better words.

NEW YORK  
**Herald Tribune**