

**FOREIGN POLICY & DEFENSE**

Alliance for Progress and the Peace Corps, as well as to the counterinsurgency philosophy embodied in the Army's Green Berets. But Kennedy's concept of "nation-building" gave inadequate attention to the world's diversity and complexity, the variety of political forces and cultural traditions, and the compelling appeal of revolutionary dogmas. Finally, says Patterson, Kennedy "did not estimate the strain that would be placed on American resources and patience in this long-term, global role as policeman and teacher."

Would JFK have changed had he lived? Probably not, Patterson suggests. The President would have had to drop his hard-line advisers and their Cold War notions, admit error, and abandon his natural predilection for bold action.

### *Two Views on Human Rights*

"The Carter Administration and Human Rights—Part I: A Crusade Quickly Cancelled" by Tracy Early; "Part II: A Commitment Sustained" by Patricia Derian, in *Worldview* (July-Aug. 1978), P.O. Box 986, Farmingdale, N.Y. 11735.

President Carter's human rights crusade has been abandoned, says Early, a New York writer, because "it endangered too many American interests without visibly weakening tyrannies abroad." Reduced to absurdity, "the crusade now amounts to looking at 105 countries receiving American aid or buying American weapons and finally deciding it is safe to penalize Nicaragua."

The policy was applied inconsistently, Early contends. It was pursued in the Soviet Union, where the United States has little leverage, but less so in South Korea, where U.S. influence is substantial. At the same time, Carter's crusade encouraged both those Americans who favor a return to the Cold War and those who welcome any excuse to withhold foreign aid anywhere. The President, says Early, should have recognized "the dangers of moralistic posturing."

Mrs. Derian, Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs, denies that the human rights effort has been abandoned. "Enhancing respect for human rights and human dignity remains a fundamental objective of U.S. foreign policy," she says.

Carter's human rights policy has been implemented on the basis of three principles: (a) that the policy is global and not aimed at any particular country; (b) that it should be implemented pragmatically, taking account of each country's situation; and (c) that it does not replace other U.S. foreign policy objectives, such as our national security, but will be pursued along with other significant national goals.

The United States has deferred bilateral economic assistance or opposed loans by the World Bank to countries that seriously violate human rights (e.g., Argentina). Human rights concerns have resulted in the reduction or denial of military aid to some countries (e.g., Ethiopia). The human rights policy of the United States will continue, says Derian, "because it is right and because it is in our national interest."