

of skin, religion, or the language spoken by any citizen.

In this respect Lyndon B. Johnson stated emphatically: "We cannot, we must not, refuse to protect the right of every American to vote in every election that he may desire to participate in." The literacy test in English is a barrier which obstructs all those citizens by birth, such as the Puerto Ricans, from voting "in any election in which they wish to participate." That barrier is not imposed by the Constitution of the United States. If this were so, it would be common to the 50 States of the Union. Yet it is a requirement of less than half of the States.

President Johnson gave no room for doubt in his message as to which were the inalienable rights granted by our Constitution. "This was the first nation," the President said, "in the history of the world to be founded with a purpose. The great phrases of that purpose still sound in every American heart, North and South: 'All men are created equal'; 'government by consent of the governed'; 'give me liberty or give me death.'"

Every practice or requirement which tries to destroy those goals must fall of its own accord. In the words of the President, "There is no constitutional issue here. The command of the Constitution is plain. There is no moral issue. It is wrong—deadly wrong—to deny any of your fellow Americans the right to vote in this country. There is no issue of States rights or national rights. There is only the struggle for human rights."

The enactment of the Federal law proposed by President Johnson will make it difficult for certain sectors of New York State to sustain or defend the position that this question is solely a matter of State legislation. On the other hand, to maintain that the necessary readjustment of State laws to Federal laws which would result from the bill presented by the President today would be a constitutional reform represents an anachronistic and dangerous trend.

"This time," Johnson warned, "on this issue, there must be no delay, or no hesitation, or no compromise with our purpose."

It is most urgent that all the citizens of this great country be truly equal, not only in theory but in practice; not only in the basic structure of the law but in its implementation. One can have the right to vote. If one cannot exercise that right because of "barriers" then that right is meaningless.

The most obvious "barriers" that exist and stand in the way of granting a true right to vote for American citizens of Puerto Rican birth is the elimination of the literacy test. El Diario-La Prensa and the community it represents have fought long and hard for many years for this goal. Neither Negroes nor Puerto Ricans nor any other group of American citizens have the right to vote unless all artificial "barriers" are removed on a practical and realistic basis. Puerto Ricans are citizens by birth regardless of the language they may speak. They should not be made "citizens of convenience" to suit the purposes of political or other pressure groups.

Straws in the Wind From Hanoi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during the recent hearings of the House Foreign

Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific, experts testified on the Sino-Soviet split and its implications for American policy in Vietnam.

Among them were Dr. Donald Zagoria of Columbia University and Dr. Bernard Fall of Howard University. Their testimony provided many valuable facts and ideas for the subcommittee members.

Among them was a hint of a relaxed stand by North Vietnam on establishing negotiations which Dr. Fall called to the attention of the subcommittee during his testimony.

In an article for the Washington Post on Sunday, March 21, Dr. Zagoria pointed to this information as one of several significant "straws in the wind" in the Vietnam situation. Dr. Zagoria believes that this new stand by Hanoi may be the result of pressure from U.S. bombings.

Because of the possible importance of this and other recent developments in Hanoi, I am inserting Dr. Zagoria's article in the Record at this point, and urge the attention of my colleagues to it:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1965]

HANOI MAY BE RELAXING TERMS FOR NEGOTIATIONS

(By Donald H. Zagoria)

There are two straws in the wind from Vietnam that could prove to be of considerable political significance.

First, the South Vietnamese Communists have launched a violent attack on a new Buddhist neutralist movement in Saigon which has called for the withdrawal both of American military advisers and Communist guerrillas from South Vietnam.

Second, Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, North Vietnam's powerful Minister of Defense, appears to have provided the first sign that North Vietnam is relaxing its conditions for negotiating an end to the war in the south.

The Buddhist group, the Movement for the Preservation of Peace and People's Happiness is led by an influential American-educated monk, Thich Quang Lien. Lien's goal is clearly to create the conditions for a genuinely neutralist Vietnam.

In statements made in Saigon earlier this month, he called for the dissolution of the Vietcong armed forces, the withdrawal to North Vietnam of the Communists in the South Vietnamese Liberation Front, the elimination of Soviet and Chinese influence in North Vietnam and an end to the war in the south.

VIETCONG ENRAGED

This program has so enraged the Vietcong that, in a number of recent statements broadcast over their clandestine radio station, they have attacked Lien for betraying the Nation and Buddhism, for being a "mouthpiece of the White House" and for building a "fake peace organization."

The intensity of the attacks on Lien and his followers seems to reflect Communist fear that a genuinely neutralist Buddhist movement, capable of rallying the South Vietnamese masses, could provide a political counterweight to the Vietcong and thus deprive them of the final victory they seem to believe is close at hand.

Therefore the Communists seek to nip this development in the bud by portraying Lien as an American puppet.

Perhaps equally important, however, the Communist attack on Lien indicates clearly that there are Buddhist leaders who might, if given proper American support and understanding, provide a popular nationalist alternative to communism. The Buddhist leaders are by no means united behind Lien.

HELD INCOMPATIBLE

Some are against the formation of any political movement on the grounds that politics and Buddhism are incompatible. Some are sympathetic to the Communists. Others are politically naive. Nevertheless, Lien appears to have a substantial following among the monks. If he did not, the Communists would hardly direct so much of their fire against him.

It is difficult to understand why the American Government has not called attention to the Communist attack on the Buddhist neutralists.

It would tend to support the American Government's position that the Communists do not want genuine neutralization; and it would undercut Communist claims to represent the broad masses of the people in South Vietnam.

General Giap's hint of a relaxed North Vietnamese stand on negotiations came in an interview given to a Japanese television delegation on March 10.

Prof. Bernard Fall of Howard University, an authority on North Vietnam, called this hint to the attention of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives last week while giving testimony on the Chinese-Soviet conflict.

KEY CONCESSION

The key concession apparently made by Giap was an abandonment of earlier insistence that the Americans withdraw from South Vietnam before negotiations begin. While insisting that the United States must stop at once its bombing of North Vietnam and must end immediately the war in South Vietnam, Giap did not put a similar urgent requirement on the demand to withdraw U.S. troops and weapons.

Such an omission is not likely to have been accidental. Moreover, in the same interview, Giap pointedly said that the American Government as well as the governments of all other countries participating in the 1954 Geneva conference must implement the Geneva agreements.

This, Fall pointed out, could have been intended as a signal to indicate that North Vietnam—which was one of the participating countries—would stop intervening in South Vietnam if the United States did so, too. It is such a signal that the American Government has insisted upon as a prerequisite for negotiation.

The use of such esoteric signals is not without precedent in the Communist world. One could not, of course, be certain about North Vietnamese intent unless these apparent signals were explored through diplomatic channels.

Taken together, the Vietcong attack on the Buddhist neutralists and Giap's hint of concession both point toward a more hopeful outlook for negotiations.

Giap's apparent signal must certainly be read against the background of American air attacks on North Vietnam and the growing Chinese-Soviet split. The North Vietnamese are extremely fearful of enlarged American attacks.

The Vietcong-Buddhist confrontation means that in any future negotiations an important political asset for the south could be the existence of an independent and anti-Communist Buddhist political force.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

Approved For Release 2003/10/10 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300160021-9
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

REPRESENTATIVES WITH
RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., Va.-----
Abernethy, Thomas G., 6278 29th St.
Miss.
Adair, E. Ross, Ind.-----4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, Wash.-----
Addabbo, Joseph P., N.Y.-----
Albert, Carl, Okla.-----4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., Ill.-----
Anderson, William R., 3006 P St.
Tenn.
Andrews, George W., Ala.-----3108 Cathedral
Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, Ala.-----
Andrews, Mark, N. Dak.-----
Annunzio, Frank, Ill.-----
Arends, Leslie C., Ill.-----4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., Ohio-----
Ashley, Thomas L., Ohio-----
Ashmore, Robert T., S.C.-----
Aspinall, Wayne N., Colo.-----The Towers Apts.,
4201 Cathedral
Ave.
Ayres, William H., Ohio-----
Baldwin, John F., Jr., Calif.-----
Bandstra, Bert, Iowa-----
Baring, Walter S., Nev.-----
Barrett, William A., Pa.-----
Bates, William H., Mass.-----
Battin, James F., Mont.-----
Beckworth, Lindley, Tex.-----
Belcher, Page, Okla.-----
Bell, Alphonzo, Calif.-----
Bennett, Charles E., Fla.-----1814 Rusticway
Lane,
Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., S. Dak.-----118 Schotts
Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., Ohio-----
Bingham, Jonathan B.,
N.Y.
Blatnik, John A., Minn.-----
Boggs, Hale, La.-----
Boland, Edward P., Mass.-----
Bolling, Richard, Mo.-----307 Warrenton Dr.,
Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Ohio.
Bonner, Herbert C., N.C.-----Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., Ohio.-----4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, Ind.-----
Bray, William G., Ind.-----
Brock, W. E. (Bill), Tenn.-----
Brooks, Jack, Tex.-----
Broomfield, William S.,
Mich.
Brown, Clarence J., Ohio-----
Brown, George E., Jr., Calif.-----
Broyhill, James T., N.C.-----
Broyhill, Joel T., Va.-----
Buchanan, John, Ala.-----
Burke, James A., Mass.-----
Burlison, Omar, Tex.-----2737 Devonshire
Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., Utah-----
Burton, Phillip, Calif.-----
Byrne, James A., Pa.-----
Byrnes, John W., Wis.-----1215 25th St. S.,
Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, Tex.-----
Cahill, William T., N.J.-----
Callan, Clair, Nebr.-----
Callaway, Howard H., Ga.-----
Cameron, Ronald Brooks,
Calif.
Carey, Hugh L., N.Y.-----
Carter, Tim Lee, Ky.-----
Casey, Bob, Tex.-----
Cederberg, Elford A., Mich.-----
Celler, Emanuel, N.Y.-----The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E.,
Mich.
Chelf, Frank, Ky.-----
Clancy, Donald D., Ohio-----
Clark, Frank M., Pa.-----220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., Calif.-----
Clawson, Del, Calif.-----
Cleveland, James C., N.H.-----
Clevenger, Raymond F.,
Mich.

Cohelan, Jeffery, Calif.-----1028 New House
Office Building
Collier, Harold R., Ill.-----
Colmer, William M., Miss.-----
Conable, Barber B., Jr.,
N.Y.
Conte, Silvio O., Mass.-----5619 Lamar Rd.,
Washington 16,
D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich.-----
Cooley, Harold D., N.C.-----2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., Pa.-----
Corman, James C., Calif.-----
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., Pa.-----
Cramer, William C., Fla.-----6714 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., Iowa-----
Cunningham, Glenn, Nebr.-----4920 Yorktown
Blvd., Arlington,
Va.
Curtin, Willard S., Pa.-----
Curtis, Thomas B., Mo.-----
Daddario, Emilio Q., Conn.-----
Dague, Paul B., Pa.-----
Daniels, Dominick V., N.J.-----
Davis, Glenn R., Wis.-----
Davis, John W., Ga.-----
Dawson, William L., Ill.-----
de la Garza, Eligio, Tex.-----
Delaney, James J., N.Y.-----
Dent, John H., Pa.-----
Denton, Winfield K., Ind.-----
Derwinski, Edward J., Ill.-----
Devine, Samuel L., Ohio-----
Dickinson, William L., Ala.-----
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., Mich.-----
Dingell, John D., Mich.-----
Dole, Robert, Kans.-----6815 Joallen Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., Mass.-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, S.C.-----2030 Laburnum
St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., N.Y.-----
Dowdy, John, Tex.-----
Downing, Thomas N., Va.-----
Dulski, Thaddeus J., N.Y.-----1719 New House
Office Building
Duncan, John J., Tenn.-----
Duncan, Robert B., Oreg.-----914 Lakeview Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.),
N.J.
Dyal, Ken W., Calif.-----
Edmondson, Ed, Okla.-----
Edwards, Don, Calif.-----
Edwards, Jack, Ala.-----
Ellsworth, Robert F., Kans.-----
Erlenborn, John N., Ill.-----
Evans, Frank E., Colo.-----
Everett, Robert A., Tenn.-----
Evens, Joe L., Tenn.-----5044 Klinge St.
Fallon, George H., Md.-----
Farbstein, Leonard, N.Y.-----
Farnsley, Charles P., Ky.-----
Farnum, Billie S., Mich.-----
Fascell, Dante B., Fla.-----
Feighan, Michael A., Ohio-----
Findley, Paul, Ill.-----
Fino, Paul A., N.Y.-----
Fisher, O. C., Tex.-----Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa.-----The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., Ga.-----
Fogarty, John E., R.I.-----1235 New House
Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., Wash.-----
Ford, Gerald R., Mich.-----514 Crown View
Dr., Alexandria,
Va.
Ford, William D., Mich.-----
Fountain, L. H., N.C.-----The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., Minn.-----
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., 3014 N St.
N.J.
Friedel, Samuel N., Md.-----
Fulton, James G., Pa.-----
Fulton, Richard, Tenn.-----
Fuqua, Don, Fla.-----
Gallagher, Cornelius E.,
N.J.
Garmatz, Edward A., Md.-----
Gathings, E. C., Ark.-----
Gettys, Tom S., S.C.-----
Giaino, Robert N., Conn.-----
Gibbons, Sam, Fla.-----
Gilbert, Jacob H., N.Y.-----
Gilligan, John J., Ohio-----

Gonzalez, Henry B., Tex.-----200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., N.Y.-----3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F.,
Conn.
Gray, Kenneth J., Ill.-----
Green, Edith (Mrs.), Oreg.-----
Green, William J., Pa.-----
Greigg, Stanley L., Iowa-----
Grider, George W., Tenn.-----
Griffin, Robert P., Mich.-----
Griffiths, Martha W.
(Mrs.), Mich.
Gross, H. R., Iowa-----
Grover, James R., Jr., N.Y.-----
Gubser, Charles S., Calif.-----
Gurney, Edward J., Fla.-----
Hagan, G. Elliott, Ga.-----
Hagen, Harlan, Calif.-----
Haley, James A., Fla.-----
Hall, Durward G., Mo.-----
Halleck, Charles A., Ind.-----4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, N.Y.-----
Hamilton, Lee H., Ind.-----
Hanley, James M., N.Y.-----
Hanna, Richard T., Calif.-----
Hansen, George, Idaho-----
Hansen, John E., Iowa.-----800 4th St. SW.,
Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler
(Mrs.), Wash.-----
Hardy, Porter, Jr., Va.-----
Harris, Oren, Ark.-----1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., Ohio-----
Harvey, James, Mich.-----
Harvey, Ralph, Ind.-----
Hathaway, William D.,
Maine.
Hawkins, Augustus F.,
Calif.-----
Hays, Wayne L., Ohio.-----1323 Barger Dr.,
Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, La.-----26 Cockrell St.,
Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, W. Va.-----
Helstoski, Henry, N.J.-----
Henderson, David N., N.C.-----
Herlong, A. S., Jr., Fla.-----
Hicks, Floyd V., Wash.-----
Hollifield, Chet, Calif.-----
Holland, Elmer J., Pa.-----
Horton, Frank J., N.Y.-----
Hosmer, Craig, Calif.-----
Howard, James J., N.J.-----
Hull, W. E., Jr., Mo.-----
Hungate, William L., Mo.-----
Huot, J. Oliva, N.H.-----
Hutchinson, Edward, Mich.-----
Ichord, Richard (Dick),
Mo.
Irwin, Donald J., Conn.-----
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., Ind.-----
Jarman, John, Okla.-----
Jennings, W. Pat, Va.-----
Joelson, Charles S., N.J.-----
Johnson, Albert W., Pa.-----
Johnson, Harold T., Calif.-----
Johnson, Jed, Jr., Okla.-----
Jonas, Charles Raper, N.C.-----
Jones, Paul C., Mo.-----1111 Army-Navy
Dr., Arlington,
Va.
Jones, Robert E., Ala.-----
Karsten, Frank M., Mo.-----
Karth, Joseph E., Minn.-----
Kastenmeier, Robert W.,
Wis.
Kee, James, W. Va.-----5441 16th Ave.,
Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, Mass.-----5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), N.Y.-----
Keogh, Eugene J., N.Y.-----The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., N.Y.-----
King, Cecil R., Calif.-----
King, David S., Utah-----
Kirwan, Michael J., Ohio-----
Kluczynski, John C., Ill.-----
Kornegay, Horace R., N.C.-----
Krebs, Paul J., N.J.-----
Kunkel, John C., Pa.-----
Laird, Melvin R., Wis.-----
Landrum, Phil M., Ga.-----
Langen, Odin, Minn.-----
Latta, Delbert L., Ohio-----
Leggett, Robert L., Calif.-----
Lennon, Alton, N.C.-----
Lindsay, John V., N.Y.-----
Lipscomb, Glenard P.,
Calif.

March 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

5441

Independence Day. On that day in 1918, Byelorussians became free and proclaimed their independence of Russia, only to be robbed of it 3 years later by the Red army. These dauntless people had been suffering under the regime of Russian czars for centuries. The czarist government had done all in its power to eliminate national traits among the Byelorussians in its effort to russify them. For many years the Byelorussian language, culture, and traditional national festivals were banned, and the authorities imposed the Russian language upon the Byelorussians. Byelorussian national literature was also proscribed, and lovers of such literature were severely persecuted. Then the government tried to spread and enforce the idea that there was no distinct and different Byelorussian national entity, and that the people of Byelorussia were Russians, pure and simple.

All such concocted and government-decreed notions were anathema to the Byelorussians. They were fully aware of the government's intent, and were determined to combat it with all the means at their disposal. They knew that any other course would have meant their extinction as a distinct entity. In the adoption of this determined course, in their vow to retain and maintain their Byelorussian cultural heritage, they displayed their wisdom, their courage, and their willingness to sacrifice and suffer in defense of these ideals. This struggle for national survival on the part of the Byelorussian people continued for centuries, and for centuries they carried on their fight on both spiritual and cultural fronts against an overwhelmingly powerful and ruthless enemy. At times their cause seemed lost, and they themselves must have felt downhearted, but they were never in despair and never doubted the righteousness of their cause. They were right. Their day came and their cause was won. They attained their long-cherished and richly deserved goal in 1918.

In causing the downfall of the czarist regime, the Russian Revolution of 1917 at first seemed a desirable by-product of the First World War, for by that single act, by the overthrow of the decrepit and detested czarist autocracy, subjugated groups in the Russian Empire were freed, and proclaimed their national independence. In Byelorussia this act was consummated not only by the united effort of the Byelorussian people, but with the support of all minority groups in Byelorussia. When a government was set up, it was recognized by a number of other sovereign states, thus welcoming the new state into the independent community of nations.

Unfortunately, the newly born Republic of Byelorussia was faced with insurmountable difficulties. At the time the country was still under German occupation, and as the Germans withdrew after the armistice, the Communist Russians began to make trouble. While the Byelorussian Republic was doing all it could to strengthen its position, the Communists were doing their utmost to undermine the authority of the Government in the country. As it turned out, the

Government was never given the chance to cope with the manifold problems it was facing on all fronts. Local Communists and the agents of the Kremlin were working for the overthrow of the legally established Government, and this they did with the active aid of the Red Army, which early in 1921 invaded Byelorussia. It was soon overrun and made part of the Soviet Union. Thus came to an end the independent Byelorussian Republic after a gallant but precarious existence lasting about 3 years.

Since that fateful year, Byelorussia has been and still remains part of the Soviet Union, and its helpless people victims of Communist tyranny. The agents of the Kremlin have had such a firm and unrelenting hold over the country that no effort on the part of the Byelorussian people has succeeded in loosening their deadly grip. On the eve of the last war, and even during that war, Byelorussians tried hard to get rid of their ruthless masters, but unfortunately they alone were not equal to the task. At the end of the war the Kremlin's grip over Byelorussia was even tighter, and so it remains to this day. These 10 million Byelorussians are not free today, and none of them enjoy the blessings of freedom. They are prisoners in their historic homeland, and do not even dare to celebrate their national holiday, to observe their independence day. But all lovers of freedom in the free world, and especially we in this great Republic, join hands with loyal Byelorussian-Americans in the celebration of the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day.

MORE ALLIED SHIPS GOING TO NORTH VIETNAM IN U.S. PORTS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, late evidence has been compiled to show that more ships of the free world have hauled Communist cargoes into North Vietnam and picked up trade from U.S. ports as well.

The vessel *Spalmatori*, owned by Spalmatori Cia. Nav., S.A., of Panama, and flying the Greek flag, sailed from Lake Charles, La., March 14, 1965, after having loaded rice. The *Spalmatori* went to Port Campha, North Vietnam, with cargo from the Vietcong in November

1964. Last year the *Spalmatori* also visited Tampa and Houston to pick up and deliver cargoes for the United States.

A week ago yesterday the *Severn River* sailed from New York where she had been tied up for a week because the International Longshoreman's Association had refused to load the ship because she had been in North Vietnam last year. The *Severn River* had also been in Richmond and Norfolk last year for the profits of American trade as well.

The ILA acted in the best interests of American labor. The American merchant marine, now employs only a fraction of the workers it used to. The U.S. shipping industry has slipped to the point where it carries less than 10 percent of this Nation's sea trade. The least we can do in this country is deprive those foreign flag interests which ship to our enemies their profits taken from U.S. shipping.

Last year a total of 15 free world ships hauled Red cargoes into Communist North Vietnam and then came into American ports to pick up or deliver shipments for the United States as well. I am inserting a list of those vessels which went to North Vietnam and the United States last year into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am making it available in the hope that it will be helpful in efforts to deter further foreign shipping interests who want to trade with America and the Red Vietcongs at the same time. The list shows the ships, their owners, the flag, and U.S. ports.

The U.S. Government has spent some \$350 million in the past year in direct subsidies to the American shipping industry. This sum shows the stake which the U.S. taxpayers have in this Nation's shipping industry. The subsidy is of limited help, and surely the cargoes moving through our ports would be of greater help if the majority of them were carried in American ships. The figure should be much greater than 10 percent, and the least the Government can do is deny American cargoes to foreign ships trading with the enemy.

I have introduced legislation to halt shipments to or from the United States aboard flagships engaged in trade with North Vietnam. That legislation, H.R. 6154, is before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, of which I am a member. I urge early passage of this measure as a first effort to cut the Vietcong supply line and strengthen the American shipping industry as well.

The aforementioned list follows:

Flag	Ship	Owner	Ports
Greek	Knios Belle	Pioneer Shipping Development, Inc., Panama	New Orleans
Do	Anastassia	Tarsiano Cia. Nav., S.A., Panama	San Diego; San Francisco
Do	Apostolos Andreas	Santa Katerina Cia. Nav., S.A., Panama	Guanics, P.R.
Do	Spalmatori	Spalmatori Cia. Nav., S.A., Panama	Houston; Tampa
Do	Constantinos	Conquistador Cia. Naviera, S.A., Panama	Houston; (twice)
Do	Aleyonis	Merculinama Cia. Nav., S.A., Panama	Cleveland; Detroit
Do	Etychia	Marganonis, Dem. P. & Sons, Athens	Norfolk
Do	Katerina	Marsiguro Cia. Nav., S.A., Panama	Los Angeles
Lebanese	Rodos	Orient Shipping Corp., Monrovia	Tampa
Do	St. Demetrius	26th October Maritime Co., Ltd., Monrovia	New Orleans
Italian	Cesco Corrado	Corrado Societa di Navigazione of Genoa	Los Angeles
Do	Marina G. Parodi	Parodi Societa Per Azione Emanuela	New York; Baltimore (twice); Newport News; Norfolk (twice)
Panamanian	Severn River	International Navigation Corp., Liberia	Richmond; Norfolk; New York
West German	Hugo Steinnes	Steinnes Hugh Eransozean Schiffahrt	Baton Rouge
Do	Brake	Sclpio & Co	(12 U.S. ports)

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. DERWINSKI'S remarks will appear hereinafter in the Appendix.]

CONCERNING THE CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION REGIONAL OFFICES AND HOSPITALS

(Mr. CLEVELAND was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, January 13 was a black day for veterans in New Hampshire. That was the day that the then Acting Director of the Veterans' Administration published an order proposing to close or reduce service in 17 regional offices, 11 hospitals and 4 domiciliaries across the country.

Two regional offices affecting New Hampshire were included. They are at Manchester, N.H., and White River Junction, Vt.

Since January 13, I have been working hard to discover what justification there could be for this order. I have found none.

The VA made an effort to claim that greater efficiency and economy would result from the order. It said the sum of approximately \$23,500,000 would be saved each year, if this order were allowed to go into operation. They told me this had all been run out on a computer and that was the answer and that was that.

GOVERNMENT BY COMPUTER

Now computers are very impressive, so I inquired what the savings would be from the order at Manchester and at White River Junction. I was told, through Mr. A. W. Stratton of the Veterans' Administration, that the savings at White River Junction would be around \$150,000 a year but he hastened to add that this estimate was "very approximate." No estimates for Manchester were provided at that time.

I wonder whether we ought to endorse actions very damaging to the interests of veterans or any other group of citizens on the basis of "very approximate" computers?

There is no question but that this action will be damaging to veterans.

There are 81,000 war veterans in New Hampshire. I am told that the Manchester regional office, as of December 31, 1964, had 65,707 claims folders, 16,397 loan guarantee folders, 1,686 guardianship folders, and 16,647 running awards. The workload called for handling 4,588 claims folders in slow August 1964, 5,513 claims folders in average October 1964, and 5,865 claims folders in peak December 1964. For the same months, the workload called for handling of 1,968 loan guarantee folders in peak August, 1,906 in average October, and 1,624 in slow December.

MISLEADING STATISTICS

The Veterans' Administration asserts that 90 percent and more of the business at Manchester and White River Junction

is by mail. Investigation shows this to be misleading. It turns out that the Veterans' Administration is not really talking about what percentage of the problems is handled by mail but rather what percentage of total communications is handled by mail and the VA includes in this figure all mail received whether it is administrative mail, mail for patients at the hospital, mail dealing with supply problems and so forth. This is according to the manager of the regional office at White River Junction, and the same is true at Manchester. The true ratio of personal contact is about one out of three.

CLEVELAND BILL A SOLUTION

In the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have a bill pending, H.R. 5028, which would require, among other things, that the Veterans' Administration maintain at least one office in each State. I am deeply concerned about the trend toward centralization of personal services on the part of the Federal Government.

Other Federal agencies, such as Social Security Administration, Small Business Administration, Federal Housing Administration, and others, maintain at least one office in each State. This is proper and I would be most reluctant to encourage an erosion of this principle.

LOSS OF SERVICE

At the present time, when a veteran goes to the regional office with a case which merits award, his case file is immediately available, a meeting before the adjudication board can be arranged at once, speedy treatment obtained. If the functions of the regional office are transferred to Boston, as is contemplated, the veteran will have to go either to Boston to a large, impersonal office, or depend on the vagaries of the mail. Personal contact will be lost. Confidence will be lost.

Many of our older veterans have arteriosclerosis with chronic brain syndromes. Now, it is relatively easy for them to go to White River Junction or to Manchester in connection with their claims. It is relatively easy for members of their families or representatives of service organizations to accompany them and guide them around. Who would meet them and look after them in Boston, assuming they could withstand such a long trip?

IS THIS ECONOMY?

Surely, the alleged saving of \$23½ million in this day of the \$100 billion Federal budgets cannot justify such a loss of service. In this connection, it may be informative to note that the VA has outlined proposed spending for new hospitals totaling \$113 million. The details may be seen on page 866 of the Federal budget for 1965-66.

It appears that the only purpose being served by this order is to permit the process of centralization to go on, dehumanizing Government functions even more than they are already. I strongly believe this is wrong and against the best interests of the veteran, and, as a matter of fact, contrary to the wishes of Congress.

For these reasons I strongly urge this committee to exert its great influence to have the January 13 order rescinded and to recommend enactment of my bill H.R. 5028 or similar legislation.

SOIL CONSERVATION CUTS SENSELESS PENALTY TO SMALL FARMER

(Mr. CLEVELAND was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Appalachian bill, I called to the attention of the House how unfair I felt it was that while \$17 million was being authorized to improve soil conservation services in the 11 Appalachian States, the administration announced plans to reduce funds for the technical assistance program of the Soil Conservation Service.

The administration estimates that these cuts would save the Government about \$20 million. This is to be done by setting up a revolving fund which would be financed by charging the people who use the technical assistance program for this service.

LITTLE GUY TO PAY

Although this may look appealing on paper, the impact on small landowners and the small farmer, whose taxes, incidentally, are being taken to help pay for this program in Appalachia, would be heavy. The usefulness of this valuable program would be crippled.

The impact in New Hampshire would be severe. It would mean that an additional sum of \$100,000 would have to be raised each year to maintain the program at present levels. Currently, around 22 man-years of Soil Conservation Service help is financed annually under the program. If the reductions are adopted, it would mean the loss of at least 11 people in New Hampshire, unless the various districts could raise the money.

The low-income farmer or landowner would suffer the most because he could not pay. It is doubtful that local government could or would raise the money.

Conservation benefits go far beyond the immediate benefits to the land on which they are applied. They affect pollution, sedimentation, land-use adjustments, the scenic countryside, and many other aspects of land improvement and conservation.

The administration's proposal would bring about a loss in the quality of service. Conservation personnel cut from the payrolls could not readily be replaced. The proposal would reverse a long-standing national policy of maintaining a uniform system of land and water conservation assistance for the good of the Nation.

SMALL DISTRICTS WOULD SUFFER

The various soil conservation districts would be put in a position where they would be competing with each other for available funds both for operating the districts and for the revolving fund to hire Federal employees.

Among knowledgeable people in New Hampshire with whom I have discussed the problem, it is generally felt that adoption of the administration's program would reduce the application of soil conservation practices by 50 percent. Many districts believe that the reduction would be greater.

March 22, 1965

It was also pointed out that supervisors would have to collect the moneys and, therefore, would have to be paid for this. It has long been the policy, however, that district administrators serve without pay and they have shown over the years that they are very dedicated to this job.

There was considerable feeling that the administration proposal would open the door for political pressures and that those that could pay would get the service while those who were too poor to pay would not. This would be a reversal of present national policy for applying soil and water conservation measures. It is certainly contrary to the so-called war on poverty.

As I pointed out during the debate on the Appalachia bill, the big programs in this country are all designed to help the big interests. The farm subsidy program is of little or no benefit to the little man, although he pays taxes to help finance them.

THE BIG GUY GETS BIGGER

Budget Director Kermit Gordon stated a few weeks ago that:

About 80 percent of our assistance goes to the one million farmers whose average income exceeds \$9,500. The other 20 percent of assistance is spread thinly among the remaining 2,500,000 farmers.

Last year's statistics from the Department of Agriculture show that the 1,300 biggest wheat farmers in the country qualify for annual payments averaging \$15,000 each, while the other 1 million wheat farmers qualify for annual payments averaging but \$58 each.

The small farmers and landowners of my district get nothing at all from these programs. Yet, they are being asked to assume additional financial burdens just to keep soil conservation assistance presently available to them.

On their behalf, Mr. Speaker, I protest.

NEW HAMPSHIRE PROGRAM DESCRIBED

Last year, technical assistance through this program was provided to 3,396 New Hampshire landowners and farmers. Planning services were given to 8,673 persons, and basic plans were prepared covering more than 860,000 acres. Soil surveys were conducted on 2,845,125 acres; water diversions affecting 192,683 feet were carried out; 1,605 farm ponds were built and 925 fishponds were stocked. Other practices were extensively employed, including construction of floodwater retarding structures; grade-stabilization structures; grassed waterways and outlets; irrigation storage reservoirs; irrigation system sprinklers; drainage mains or laterals; spring development; field and contour strip-cropping; wildlife wetland and habitat development.

Town planning assistance rendered or requested during the period included the furnishing of soil survey information and interpretations on limitations of the suitability of land for agriculture, recreation, housing, schools, industries, water supplies, etc.

Exclusive of the watershed program of Public Law 566, landowners paid \$522,000 on construction of conservation projects in 1964, a substantial increase

over the \$444,000 annual average expended privately over the last 3 years.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the people of New Hampshire are utilizing this program at an increasing rate. It is bringing tangible benefits of lasting value.

You can see from the facts recited above what a 50 percent reduction would do to the New Hampshire land operator. I am sure the situation must be the same all across the country.

The reductions proposed are unjust and do not make sense. As we construct new multibillion-dollar programs of social welfare, let us not dry up proven programs of longstanding benefit, especially when they cost so little.

(Mr. KEITH (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. KEITH'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

DEBT MANAGEMENT AS AN ECONOMIC POLICY TOOL

(Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of my chief complaints about administration economic policy has been the relative lack of public discussion devoted to debt management as opposed to fiscal and monetary policies. As administration economists well know, managing the huge and growing Federal debt has important economic effects, particularly on the money and capital markets. Debt management policies may actually conflict with and thwart other Government economic policies. For example, one of my fears during the tax cut debate—and it was almost impossible to get the administration to debate the issue—was that financing the growing Federal debt from savings would withdraw funds needed for private investment, while financing through the commercial banks or the Federal Reserve would lead to inflation.

I have been encouraged recently by a greater awareness among economists of the key role that debt management must play in framing overall economic policy. A recent lecture by Robert V. Roosa, former Under Secretary of the Treasury and one of the ablest men in the financial field, should do much to provoke thought and discussion about the role and problems of debt management. One of Mr. Roosa's main points is that, within limitations, the Treasury should manage the debt in such a way as to further the general objectives of Government economic policy. That the power of debt management to perform this function exists is clear from Mr. Roosa's statement that it may at times have a power and significance rivaling that of fiscal and monetary policy.

While I would not agree with everything Mr. Roosa says in this lecture, I

believe the issues he discusses are so important that it should be called to the attention of the House. Under unanimous consent I include a copy of the lecture in the RECORD at this point:

THE FEDERAL DEBT IN A MARKET ECONOMY (Remarks by Robert V. Roosa)

This occasion today offers an opportunity and an honor which, for at least three reasons, I could not resist. First and paramount, it enables me to speak for all of you in tribute to the half century of private enterprise in the public interest that has characterized Frazar Wilde's career. In his own firm, in the insurance industry, in the Committee for Economic Development, in the Commission on Money and Credit, and in numerous governmental bodies, Frazar Wilde has brought creative imagination and constructive energy both to designing the objectives and methods of responsible public policy and to diffusing the understanding of such policy among the public.

Second, having spent all of my professional life since World War II in either the Federal Reserve System or the Treasury, though I cannot now even informally and unofficially represent the monetary authorities, I am anxious to try to render a brief accounting of what has been done thus far toward fulfilling some of these objectives for financial policy which Frazar Wilde has done so much to mold, particularly through his work in the Committee for Economic Development which he now chairs, and most significantly through the Commission on Money and Credit which he chaired throughout its profound reexamination of the financial system of the United States at the beginning of this decade.

Third, in the spirit which Frazar Wilde has personified, that of exploring new potentials through inviting criticism and debate, I would like to look ahead toward some of the possibilities for broadening or redirecting the emphasis in our concern over the public debt, and in debt management, during the years ahead. In raising new questions for the future, I feel uniquely privileged at this juncture in my own career. For the first time in nearly 20 years I can speak without fear that anyone might impute to these remarks some motive or some implication with respect to the current actions or intentions of the Treasury or the Federal Reserve in the financial markets. And since I am truly in a transitional phase, having not yet settled into my new banking affiliation on a regular basis, there can be no possible extrapolation of these remarks to include the responsibilities, or the views, of any of my new partners.

The theme of these Wilde lectures, "The Economy Men Live By," might be taken as a provocative invitation to appraise the various economic doctrines as well as the varied economic institutions of all nations and all ideologies. I am neither that adventurous nor that ambitious. I do want to think aloud, though, about the financial side of the kind of economy that most of us know, and that we want to "preserve, protect, and defend" while we help it to flourish and grow.

This is the market economy, the economy guided by individual choice, as reflected through the flexible movement of individual prices, and characterized predominantly by private enterprise and private ownership. Many of us like to think of it, moreover, as the economy whose capital grows larger because the frontiers for its use are always expanding and because its savings are abundant, whose capital follows the incentive of profit to find its most productive uses, and whose savings are allocated to these uses through efficient, informed, competitive capital markets. We regard abundant savings, in turn, as the result of millions of

prudent decisions by millions of individuals enjoying rising incomes in an environment of prices that are, on average, relatively stable. This, perhaps slightly idealized, is the financial side—the capital side, if you will—of American capitalism.

But, more and more, many of us also realize, as the inherent strength of this kind of economy thrusts it forward into larger magnitudes, more intricate diversification, and more detailed involvement in the world outside, that there is also a useful, indeed a necessary, economic and financial role for Government to perform in these markets. No one, or surely only a scattered few, would challenge today the need for a powerful central bank in our kind of market economy. Yet during the founding years of the Federal Reserve, a half century ago, there were many who feared it as a menace to the free economy. Questions now center instead, not on whether it shall exist, but on how the central bank's influence can best be exerted to influence the general state of monetary and credit conditions. For it is widely agreed that this is the kind of governmental function that accords with the nature of the market economy—an influence exerted through the general framework surrounding the individual decisions, and not intruding directly into the decisions themselves.

Sheer size alone means that the Government's own borrowing operations—the way it handles its outstanding debts and the way it borrows new money—will, inescapably, be exerting a force of some kind upon the money and capital markets. Must changes in the outstanding amount of publicly held Government debt, its distribution among holders, and its composition by maturity, be determined by chance, through a succession of on-the-spot decisions made opportunistically as the arrival of maturities or the Government's need for cash push the Treasury into the market every month or two? Is this a set of forces to be exerted at random, more or less capriciously offsetting the impulses generated by monetary policy at one time, or enlarging those impulses at another time? Or can it be kept neutral? Or can it, should it, be channeled purposefully to help in meeting some of the same objectives being pursued by monetary policy, as a part of the Government's overall economic policy?

The answer that Frazar Wild and his colleagues in the Commission on Money and Credit gave was a positive one: "The management * * * [of the publicly held debt] * * * affects business and consumer behavior and has a direct relevance for the attainment of our economic objectives" (p. 100). They saw a danger of excess liquidity, a "potential built-in instability" (p. 103), in continued shortening of the publicly held marketable debt and urged that the Treasury, underneath any other current considerations it might have, work steadily toward a more balanced maturity structure. From such a position, they held—always recognizing the exigencies of the need to offer something the market would buy, and to keep the market reasonably receptive to other offerings that still must come in the future—" * * * management of the marketable debt can and should make some contribution to stabilizing the level of economic activity" (p. 105).

They saw, too, "compelling reasons why monetary policy and debt management must be formulated and executed in close relationship" (p. 107). But they did not favor "so drastic a method as consolidation of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve as a means of coordinating debt management and monetary policy" (p. 109). They saw that the need was not merely for a technical meshing of intricate administrative gears, but for assurance on the policy level "that the motivating forces in the two institutions are both driving in the same direction" (p. 109).

This, stripped of details, was the Commission on Money and Credit's redefinition of the role and potential usefulness of debt management: the Federal debt must, to be sure, continue (alongside all other outlets for the Nation's savings) to meet the test of investor acceptance. But the Treasury could and should, within the range of market acceptability, offer marketable securities that would, as they worked their way into the credit and capital markets, tend to absorb or retain or release funds in ways that would help to further the general objectives of Government economic policy.

As a result of the accumulating indebtedness of a century and a quarter, the Federal Government has come to account for a bloc of outstanding securities so large that it must always be a dominating influence in the markets, both the trading markets for outstanding securities and the issuing markets for new obligations or refunding obligations. Grasping the meaning of that fact, the Commission, quite consciously, propounded a paradox: for the free and private markets in money and capital to function will, not only technically but also in resisting cyclical fluctuations and in promoting the economy's growth, a special responsibility had to be exercised in those markets by the Federal Government itself, through the management of its own debt.

The Commission in its studies also reached far into fiscal policy—Government revenues, expenditures, budget deficits, and surpluses—as well as into the monetary and credit policy of the Federal Reserve, but I will leave the fascinations of all those aspects of governmental financial policy for other speakers in this series. I want to focus on debt management because, at least until the time of the Commission on Money and Credit, that aspect of governmental financial programing had received only a small fraction of the attention—and more importantly, only a small fraction of the critical analysis—to which central banking and fiscal policy have so rightly been subjected for many years. Yet, while clearly subordinate to these others, debt management may have at times, and perhaps has had at times, a power and significance nearly rivaling that of the others. To be sure, the fiscal function and central bank are each the source of primal forces in the economy. They add or subtract net changes to or from the grand aggregate of money flows. Debt management, by itself, does not. But unless the management of the debt (both the outstanding debt and the current changes in the amount outstanding) can be appropriately adapted to these other policies, the initial increases or decreases of money flows that fiscal policy or monetary policy may have intended to bring about can instead be partly or wholly absorbed through contradictory debt management, or may even be swamped and lost in a wave of influences that debt management has set flowing in the opposite direction.

Frazar Wilde and his colleagues on the Commission were not only right in the stress that they put on all the arms of governmental financial policy. They were also surely right (and even as late as 1961 they were among the pioneers) in stressing the need for Government to take full account of the array of various "mixes" that is possible among the elements of these various policies, as the Government tries to help influence needed structural economic change and growth, to help avoid or reduce the swings of cyclical fluctuations, and to help bring the Nation's international accounts into balance. Actually, new mixes among various elements of these policies were already being explored within the Government as the Commission's formal report was being completed in 1961. Emphasis was being placed upon the need to improve incentives for expanding investment and output, along with the more customary emphasis for a

recession period upon the generating of new money flows through a Federal deficit and the creation of added bank reserves by the monetary authorities. But debt management was also being used. For at the same time, in 1961 and thereafter, additions to the very short-term debt were raising those interest rates that could help to hold in the United States the short-term funds that Americans, following the free choice of the market, had been sending abroad in increasing amounts.

Along with that help to the balance of payments, which actually accompanied the stimulation of investment in the domestic economy, a gradual restructuring of the debt was also being carried forward. Following lines initiated in 1960 under the preceding administration, additions to the supply of longer term Government debt were counterbalancing the possible risks of an unduly large accumulation of the Government debt in the short-term area. Moreover, the extension was being accomplished very largely through greater use of the advance refunding technique which the Commission itself recommended. And partly because of fortuitous timing, it was proving possible to do all of this without notably increasing the interest rates that had to be paid on long-term money or interfering with an ample flow of capital and credit into a growing volume of domestic investment and residential construction.

Each of these—what has happened to affect short-term rates, the long term market, and the maturity composition of the debt structure—illustrate the way in which complementary relations have evolved among monetary policy, fiscal policy, debt management, and the performance of the private financial markets over recent years. If in commenting briefly on these developments I refer only to the past 4 years, that is because I had a somewhat better view over that period, but I am not for a moment forgetting that the roots of much that has proved practicable were planted earlier.

First a closer look at short rates—what happened, and why? Unlike previous postwar recessions, that of 1960 had not brought Treasury bill rates down to the 1-percent range, or lower. Reaching a bottom in the 2½- to 2¼-percent range, in August of 1960, they remained at that level for almost a year, and then began a gradual move upward that has continued into this past week, when 3-month bills have been trading about 3½ percent, some 1½ percent above their lows of 4 years ago.

The reasons for wishing to bring about this kind of a pattern in short-term rates have been clear enough. This was the first of the U.S. postwar recessions to occur after the return of currency convertibility to most of the other leading countries of the world, an achievement long sought by all of us, and completed at the end of 1958. The pull of the money markets serving these newly convertible currencies, many of them experiencing rising interest rates as they tried to combat domestic inflation, would have been strong in any case. But at this same time, a rapid enlargement was taking place in a new kind of market that had been developing "over the counter" among European (and Japanese) banks and business firms—the Euro-dollar market. The higher interest rates available in that "extraterritorial" market exerted an intensifying pull upon dollar deposits domiciled in the United States. There was no choice, as Chairman Martin was one of the first to point out. The United States could no longer be "isolationist" in its monetary and credit policy.

Yet there were equally compelling domestic reasons to keep credit amply available at home, and to make progress only slowly toward balance in the Federal budget. Indeed, as a combined result of rising savings and promotive Federal Reserve policy over the 4

paid directors and staffs whose duties it shall be to promote by every means possible a better coordination of all agencies engaged in crime control including police, courts, prisons, probation, parole, and prevention, and to promote the employment of men and women trained in the law and the humanities in all these agencies.

2. That the law schools (beginning, shall we say with the school of law at the College of William and Mary) establish a program in the administration of the criminal law which shall be open to 3d year law students, lawyers, and other professionally trained specialists who propose to engage, or are actually so engaged, in any phase of crime control activity. Such a program might begin with regular semester courses in crime control or in highly intensive instruction through short term institutes combined with field training under supervision for certification in the administration of the criminal law.

Within the past 50 years, there has developed in the field of medicine a whole new art of healing which bids fair to equal the practice of medicine and surgery without in any way denying the importance of these ancient skills or diminishing their place. The development of psychiatry and psychoanalysis based on the new and established concepts of psychology has added greatly to the practice of medicine. At first ignored by the medical schools, psychoanalysis has created institutes and disciplines of its own supplementing the basic training offered in the traditional schools of medicine. Is it too much to propose that the same sort of thing will happen in the field of law?

OMNIBUS CRIME LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the House of Representatives is presently considering a so-called omnibus crime bill. In my judgment, that bill contains many features which violate many precious constitutional rights and guarantees. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Freedom in the Third Degree" published in my hometown newspaper, the Eugene Register-Guard.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO "FREEDOM" IN THE THIRD DEGREE

Senator Goldwater has been having quite a bit to say about "crime in the streets." And he's been getting mileage out of the issue, too, inasmuch as nobody admits liking crime in the streets. His problem, though, has come when he has tried to make a Federal issue out of it, after all he's said about keeping the Federal Government out of the affairs of local communities.

In a speech in Florida, where street violence has been quite an issue this year, the Senator got around to clarifying what he meant. He's really angry at the U.S. Supreme Court. He said the Court 3 years ago held that "No evidence could be used if police investigators made some mistake—any mistake—in gathering the evidence." That's not what the Court said in the milestone Mapp case. It held only that evidence obtained in violation of the Federal Constitution, which evidence was already inadmissible in a Federal court, could not be used in a State court either.

He also charged that the Court "held that a voluntary confession made by a State prisoner was inadmissible because his lawyer was not present when it was made. This was held despite the fact that the prisoner admittedly knew of his right to remain silent."

Ope presumes that there he had reference to the Gideon, Escobedo, or Jackson cases.

These, incidentally, are the three cases that have caused so much work for Oregon's new public defender. Some prisoners in Oregon may be entitled to new trials because of these decisions. They have to do, generally, with the right to a lawyer and the voluntary or involuntary nature of a confession.

If elected, the Senator promised, he would appoint Federal judges who would "redress constitutional interpretation in favor of the public." If that didn't work, he said, he'd press for constitutional amendments, the exact nature of which he did not spell out.

To roll back these decisions, either by appointing hanging judges or by repeal of parts of the Bill of Rights, would not be in the cause of greater freedom. It would be, instead, to invite the unreasonable searches and seizures against which the Founding Fathers warned. And it would be to invite the bright lights and the rubber hoses of the third degree.

Constitutional guarantees are there for people who need them. Most of us go through our whole lives and never, ourselves, need the right to trial by jury, the right to a lawyer in a criminal proceeding, the right to be faced by our accusers, or the right to bail. These precious rights are there for those who need them. Those are the accused, who, it often happens, are not guilty under the law. Note the words "under the law." Innocence and guilt are not readily determined by mortal man. Laws are passed to see to it that each of us, in time of trouble, is treated fairly and evenly. The burden of proof must rest with authority.

One of the functions of law is to protect the citizen from overzealous authority. This is something the Senator, with all his talk of freedom, ought to know. A citizen can be just as badly mauled by a town marshal and a district attorney in a remote hamlet as he can by Federal officers and a U.S. attorney in Washington, D.C.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the omnibus crime bill that has been reported by a majority, but not a large majority, of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, not only is an invitation for the return of third-degree methods, but involves police tyranny. There is no place for that in the District of Columbia.

I am satisfied that under the administration of Chief of Police Layton, there is no desire on the part of the District of Columbia Police Department to have granted to the Police Department all the shocking proposals contained in the omnibus crime bill which a majority of the House Committee on the District of Columbia has recommended.

One such proposal is that Congress enact a proposal of arrest for investigation. Imagine, Mr. President, in the year 1965 legislators in a Congress who really believe that a police department should have authority, when they have no evidence of proximate probable cause for arrest, to put a hand on the shoulder of a free American and drag him into a police station, with none of the checks available, that must be made available to free men and women, against protection from the exercise of third-degree methods by the police.

The Washington Post has today published an editorial entitled "File and Forget." The editorial opposes the omnibus crime bill that has been reported by a majority of the House Committee on the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FILE AND FORGET

Mr. WEITNER's omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia is to come before the House today. It embodies all the contempt and distaste which he and his Confederate colleagues feel for the residents of the National Capital.

This bill ignores the District of Columbia's real needs. It ignores the carefully considered proposals for dealing with crime submitted to the Congress by President Johnson. It ignores the procedural protections provided for free citizens by the Constitution of the United States. It ignores the realities of life.

This legislation would be bad not alone for the people of Washington but for the American people as a whole. It is unbefitting to a free society as well as hurtful to its Capital. It is legislation for a conquered province, not for an American community. We ask the members of the House when they consider this measure today to ask themselves if they would be willing to subject their own constituents to such tyranny—whether they would be willing to impose on their home districts arrests for investigation, arbitrary detention by police authorities and a police censorship unfit for Yahoos.

So long as Congress insists on acting as municipal council for the city of Washington, it has an obligation to act considerately and conscientiously. That obligation imposes on the House of Representatives a plain duty today to throw this mish-mash of repression onto the refuse heap where it belongs.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I wish to put a persistent rumor to rest. The senior Senator from Oregon has no intention of using any delaying tactic or dilatory tactic to prevent the Senate from receiving at an early date whatever crime bill the majority of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia wishes to report. I shall vote against the bill that is pending. I shall do my best to offer amendments that will bring that bill within the framework of constitutional guarantees, as I believe those guarantees to exist. But if the Senate wishes to march back into the past half dozen centuries by passing Star Chamber procedure legislation, that will be a decision for the Senate to make. We shall let the people of the country pass judgment upon the Senate.

I introduce this material in the RECORD today so that the Senate will have available to it what I consider to be material that is a devastating answer to the unfortunate action taken by a majority of the House committee when it voted and approved this omnibus crime bill.

CRISIS IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Dr. Milnor Alexander, legislative secretary of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, written under date of March 19, 1965, addressed to me, be printed at this point in the RECORD. The letter contains a resolution passed by the organization, calling for a cessation of our warmaking policies in South Vietnam and seeking to work through international tribunals for a set-

tlement of the disputes in accordance with the procedures of international law.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 19, 1965.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATORS: The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom received the last statement on the crisis in Vietnam issued by Clarence E. Pickett, executive secretary emeritus of the American Friends Service Committee, on March 3. The statement was dated March 1 and our national office released it yesterday in connection with Clarence Pickett's death. This was his response to a wire sent to Nobel Peace Prize laureates and other world leaders for a statement on Vietnam:

"The struggle in Vietnam is futile. It will not really defeat the appeal of communism; also it jeopardizes the good name of the United States and sacrifices good American and Asian lives. Statesmanship by America calls for a commanding gesture for negotiation and a facing of the real problem of Vietnam—poverty, insecurity, and defeat. I urge a prompt turn in the direction of peace."

Would you please insert this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as another indication of the concern in this country about U.S. policy in Vietnam. Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. MILNOR ALEXANDER,
Legislative Secretary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from Prof. Frank M. Whiting, of the University of Minnesota, addressed to me under date of February 16, 1965. The letter expresses his disapproval of the country's policies in South Vietnam.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
Minneapolis, Minn., February 16, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On this frightening eve of what may well become a major and probably disastrous war in Asia let me express my appreciation and gratitude to you for having seen clearly and having had the courage to warn the Nation of the dangers long ago.

Frank M. Rarig used to say, "A good theater man should be an expert at placing himself in the other fellow's boots." Maybe this is why, although they are making a mistake, I can still understand why the poverty-ridden people of southeast Asia turn to China rather than to us. Even more alarming, I think I can see what I would do if I were in control of Red China. I fear that I would launch an all-out war with conventional weapons, thus placing America in the horrible dilemma of either being defeated or else turning to massive bombing of cities, an act which would win us the inflamed hatred of almost everyone in the world and might easily lead to the final atomic holocaust.

I realize that the alternative is probably a miserable one. A negotiated settlement or even withdrawal that would seem weak, cowardly, degrading, and unpopular to most Americans, but almost anything is better in the long run than a remote jungle war that could only be won by the most inhuman mass slaughter of civilians in history.

Mainly, I wanted to say that, although I realize that it must be lonely for you to be a

voice crying in the wilderness, some of us thank you nevertheless for your courage and clear thinking.

Cordially,

FRANK M. WHITING.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the San Francisco Chronicle of March 3, 1965, entitled, "Where the White Paper Is Silent" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle,
Mar. 3, 1965]

WHERE THE WHITE PAPER IS SILENT

The U.S. white paper on Vietnam solemnly observes in its introductory paragraphs that it is concerned with a new kind of war "as yet poorly understood in most parts of the world."

To that truism, it might well have tacked on the phrase "including the United States." For here at home, the events in Vietnam are swathed in inscrutable mystery, as evidenced by the confusing differences of opinion currently being expressed in the Halls of Congress, and even more markedly by the bewilderment of the American public.

This widespread puzzlement is in part the outcome of the persistent silence emanating from the White House. It has been dispelled but little if any by the white paper itself. That document labors hard to prove that the long and substantial U.S. commitment in South Vietnam is in simple opposition to flagrant aggression mounted and sustained by a Communist regime in the North against "an independent people who want to make their own way in peace and freedom."

It speaks in plaintive detail about infiltration by guerrilla fighters, technicians, propagandists, political organizers, and secret agents, lavishly armed and equipped. But it shies completely away from the circumstances that are confounding the speakers in Congress and the people at home.

How strongly, one would like to know, do the South Vietnamese in general actually yearn to make their own way in peace and freedom. For that matter, how independent are they? Are they, or are they not, being dragooned into an army and forced to fight a battle for which they have little heart and no stomach? Are they hopelessly split and divided along religious and political and social lines? Do they distrust and even despise the leaders who, by their incessant toppling and rebuilding of rickety governments, appear more concerned with self-aggrandizement than with national interest and democratic principles?

Also unanswered is the big question that leaps up with every new Vietcong success deep inside the territory of South Vietnam: Are the Vietnamese, by and large, too war weary or too much intimidated to fight off the invaders, or, as a matter of distressing fact, are they actually in sympathy with the Communists?

Here are some of the matters on which the American people need and ardently desire full and reliable information. It is not to be found in the white paper. The dogged avoidance of these matters is indeed disquieting at a time when there are signs of greatly intensified American activity in Vietnam, both North and South.

Is not the hour at hand for an end to President Johnson's studied silence?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Washington Post on March 22, 1965, entitled "Time for Diplomacy," be printed at this point in the RECORD. The editorial points out the war

propaganda nature of the white paper. In my opinion, it makes it perfectly clear that it was a very unfortunate paper because of the chain of inaccuracies to which this administration has attached its name.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME FOR DIPLOMACY

The American escalation of the war in Vietnam has so far produced a number of favorable political consequences. It has exacerbated the Sino-Soviet conflict. It has produced the first dim signals of concession from North Vietnam. It has forced some of the Buddhist leaders in South Vietnam off the fence and more openly into the international political arena. Several of the Buddhist leaders have told the Americans that they would support the bombing of North Vietnam and a continuation of the war if the North did not soon agree to negotiations on reasonable terms.

We are thus approaching a point where both the international situation and the internal situation in Vietnam are such that the United States could go to the negotiating table with impressive assets. North Vietnam is very fearful of continued American bombings which could eventually destroy her industrial plant. The North is probably fearful that it could not count either on Russia or China in a showdown with the United States. And even if it could count on China, it is not anxious to mortgage its independence to Peiping as the price for such support.

Russia is anxious to get negotiations going because a continued American escalation will one day face her with a horrible choice. Either Moscow will have to support North Vietnam and risk a confrontation with the United States or else the Russians will have to stand by while a Communist state is being decimated. In either case the Russians will lose.

Meanwhile, in South Vietnam itself, the Communists are repeating the same mistake they made in Laos. They are driving the true neutralist forces into the arms of the United States. Just as the Pathet Lao drove Souvanna Phouma and Kong Le into our camp, so now the Vietcong is busy attacking Buddhist monks whose only crime is to want a genuinely neutralist Vietnam.

These favorable circumstances, constituting as they do a certain vindication of the firm policy which the administration has pursued, confront the U.S. Government with nice problems of timing. The opportunity for a useful dialog with Hanoi may be approaching. The chance of a productive negotiation, in which the United States would not be proceeding from weakness, may be coming more swiftly than anticipated only a few weeks ago. To detect when that precise moment has arrived is the essence of the matter.

The President has made an appropriate response to the faint North Vietnam intimations of a greater readiness to consider reasonable solutions. He used his press conference Saturday to point out that the United States does not threaten the North Vietnam regime, that it has no desire to occupy or conquer the country, that it seeks only the end of aggression against South Vietnam.

Events are a long way from a solution in South Vietnam, but they may not be as far as we feared from a situation in which a solution could be profitably discussed. A climate favorable to such a beginning has been created—a situation in which each side is uncomfortable with the predicament in which it finds itself. At some point of mutual discomfort, the opportunity for a ceasefire, an armistice, or a pause may arrive. When it does, we should embrace it.

Whereas our agreement to a cessation of military action a month ago might have

looked to the South Vietnamese like the prelude to capitulation it would not look that way now. If the defense of South Vietnam's independence and neutrality were to be transferred from the field to the conference table, there is no reason to believe that gains of the past few weeks would be lost, in terms of the morale of the South Vietnamese. If nothing were gained at the conference table and the battle resumed, because the North Vietnamese proved intractable, the morale and solidarity of the South might even be strengthened by putting the blame for the suffering of the South where it belongs.

This country has nothing to fear from an encounter at the conference table, in the improved climate that has been created by a renewed demonstration of ability and willingness to pursue its original objectives in South Vietnam. We must be ready to act upon the first open and formal indication that Hanoi really desires peace.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter entitled "Playing Russian Roulette in Vietnam," written by Lewis Mumford, published in the San Francisco Chronicle of March 3, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLAYING RUSSIAN ROULETTE IN VIETNAM

(NOTE.—The following letter on America's role in Vietnam was written to President Johnson by Critic Lewis Mumford—EDITOR.)

Mr. PRESIDENT: The time has come for someone to speak out on behalf of the great body of your countrymen who regard with abhorrence the course to which you are committing the United States in Vietnam. As a holder of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, I have a duty to say plainly, and in public, what millions of patriotic fellow citizens are saying in the privacy of their homes. Namely, that the course you are now following affronts both our practical judgment and our moral sense.

Neither your manners nor your methods give us any assurance that your policy will lead to a good end; on the contrary, your attempt to cure by military force a situation that has been brought about by our own arrogant, one-sided political assumptions cannot have any final destination short of an irremediable nuclear catastrophe. That would constitute the terminal illness of our whole civilization, and your own people, no less than the Vietnamese and the Communists would be the helpless victims.

In embarking on this program, you are gambling with your country's future, because you have not the courage to discard a losing hand and start a new deal, though this was the magnificent opportunity that your election presented to you. Your games theorists have persuaded you to play Russian roulette. But you cannot save the Government's face by blowing out our country's brains.

From the beginning, the presence of American forces in Vietnam, without the authority of the United Nations, was in defiance of our own solemn commitment when we helped to form that body. Our steady involvement with the military dictators who are waging civil war in South Vietnam, with our extravagant financial support and underhanded military cooperation, is as indefensible as our Government's original refusal to permit a popular election to be held in Vietnam, lest communism should be installed by popular vote. Your attempt now to pin the whole blame on the Government of North Vietnam deceives no one except those whose wishful thinking originally committed us to our high-handed intervention; the same set of agencies and intelligences that inveigled us into the Bay of Pigs disaster.

Instead of using your well-known political adroitness to rescue our country from the military miscalculations and political blunders that created our impossible position in Vietnam, you now, casting all caution to the winds, propose to increase the area of senseless destruction and extermination, without having any other visible ends in view than to conceal our political impotence. In taking this unreasonable course, you not merely show a lack of "decent respect for the opinions of mankind," but you likewise mock and betray all our country's humane traditions.

This betrayal is all the more sinister because you are now, it is plain, obstinately committing us to the very military policy that your countrymen rejected when they so overwhelmingly defeated the Republican candidate.

Before you go further, let us tell you clearly: your professed aims are emptied of meaning by your totalitarian tactics and your nihilistic strategy. We are shamed by your actions, and revolted by your dishonest excuses and pretenses. What is worse, we are horrified by the immediate prospect of having our country's fate in the hands of leaders who, time and again, have shown their inability to think straight, to correct their errors, or to get out of a bad situation without creating a worse one.

The Government has forfeited our confidence, and we will oppose, with every means available within the law, the execution of this impractical, and above all, morally indefensible policy. There is only one way in which you can remove our opposition or regain our confidence; and that is to turn back from the course you have taken and to seek a human way out.

LEWIS MUMFORD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Jersey Times on January 1, 1965, by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott, entitled "United States Requests Token Forces," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The article deals with a subject matter that I have discussed twice on the floor of the Senate. It concerns the attempts of our State Department to get the heads of state in Latin America to make some token contribution, either by way of military personnel or nonmilitary personnel or materiel to warmaking policies in South Vietnam. Such contribution would be made by these Latin American countries to our great detriment in Latin America. This course of action on the part of this administration has stirred up, and rightfully so, a great deal of resentment in a good many Latin American countries.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jersey Times, Jan. 1, 1965]

**UNITED STATES REQUESTS TOKEN FORCES—
LATIN COUNTRIES GET STRONG APPEAL TO
HELP IN VIETNAM**

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

At least five Latin American countries are being strongly "urged" by the United States to send token military or economic units to strife-lacerated South Vietnam.

They are Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Peru, and Venezuela.

Other South American nations reputedly are under similar backstage pressure but this has not yet been positively established.

The five definitely known to be impertuned are among the leading beneficiaries of U.S. aid. Latest available official figures

show that since 1946 they have received the following huge totals:

Brazil—more than \$2.25 billion. This does not include \$1 billion in new credits the United States took the lead in arranging last month, with several other NATO countries, to enable the reform regime of President Humberto Branco to combat soaring inflation and other grave economic disorders.

Chile—upward of \$850 million, with new large-scale aid proposals pending. Colombia—more than \$550 million, with additional grants and loans under consideration. Peru—upward of \$500 million and, like the others, seeking more funds. Venezuela—around \$350 million, of which more than \$317 million has been in loans and only \$18 million in outright grants. Since 1962 this oil-rich nation has received less than \$10 million in U.S. aid.

All these countries are markedly cool to getting involved in the increasingly chaotic and unpredictable South Vietnam conflict.

They are displaying distinct reluctance to dispatching even token forces, such as medical or logistic units, or teachers, agricultural experts, and technicians—as the State Department has pointedly "suggested."

Various objections are being raised, foremost among them lack of funds to meet the considerable cost of "showing the flag" in distant southeast Asia.

The United States countered by offering to foot the bill.

Presumably that would include financing transportation, pay, maintenance, and other charges.

These urgent backstage exhortations and proposals are in striking contrast to the administration's cold-shouldering of offers from three U.S. allies in the Far East to send thousands of combat troops to South Vietnam.

South Korea, Nationalist China, and the Philippines expressed readiness to send some 50,000 fully equipped and trained fighting men.

In each instance, they were turned down.

The official explanation was that employment of these Asian battle forces would seriously risk escalating the conflict into a major war. Secretary of State Dean Rusk asked the three allies to dispatch instead noncombat elements, such as medical and logistic units.

All three have complied.

Another baffling South Vietnam enigma is the role of Thrich Tri Quang, leading Buddhist who was given refuge in the U.S. Embassy in the 1963 struggle with the late President Ngo Dinh Diem.

U.S. intelligence has flatly tagged Quang as an agent of Communist North Vietnam acting on instructions from the Hanoi regime.

Yet Quang is a key adviser of both Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh and Buddhist members of the civilian council that was abolished by the so-called young Turk generals with Khanh's backing.

Quang also has been consulted by Deputy Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson on establishing a stable government in Saigon.

Early last fall former Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge visited a number of NATO capitals seeking assistance for South Vietnam. He undertook this mission as the personal emissary of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Lodge's results were virtually nil.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that telegrams and letters addressed to me, which bear upon my position in opposition to the U.S. outlawry in South Vietnam, and certain additional newspaper editorials, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULLERTON, CALIF.,
January 23, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We heard you tonight on "Newsmakers" and I want you to know I thought your comments and suggestions regarding foreign policy were excellent. Good luck to you.

JOHN F. BISHOP,
A Republican From Fullerton, Calif.

MALIBU, CALIF.,
January 24, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support you, you expressed our view tonight on CBS.

Mr. and Mrs. PETER L. DIXON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
January 24, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thrilled by news conference on foreign policy. You are absolutely right. Keep it up.

REUBEN W. and MADELINE BOROUGH.

PULASKI HEIGHTS
CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

Little Rock, Ark., March 5, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: To me you are one of the few voices at the top who are making any sense on our policy in Vietnam. I share your concern—and this letter carries with it my appreciation for your speaking out and my best hopes that you may be heard far and wide, so that some change may be made in our present policy.

The enclosed sermon was my attempt to raise my voice in opposition.

Best regards,

RHODES THOMPSON, Jr.,
Minister.

THE THINGS THAT MAKE FOR PEACE

(Sermon preached at Pulaski Heights Christian Church on Sunday, Feb. 28, 1965, by Rhodes Thompson, Jr., minister; scripture: Luke 19: 34-44.)

This morning as we sit here in the silence of this sanctuary an escalating war is gaining daily momentum in the steaming jungles and soggy rice paddies of Vietnam. Perhaps at this very moment, in our effort to win friends and influence people in Asia, American jets, flown by white American pilots, are dumping their hungry loads of napalm jelly fire on grass-thatched villages where hundreds of bewildered brown-skinned civilians—among whom there "might be" a few more wily Vietcong guerrillas—are being transformed into human torches. While we, in our well-guarded and affluent society, have numbered just over 300 casualties among our American sons, our Heavenly Father is mourning the loss of thousands of His children whom we haven't even bothered to count. Meanwhile, all too many voices in our land are calling for more Asian bloodletting as the solution to our tragic impasse in that corner of the globe. Incredulously, we hear some of these voices affirming that this is our only alternative to disaster, even if this course of action should involve us in a full-scale war with Red China and with Russia.

With all the fervor at my command and with God as my witness, let me lodge my vigorous protest. I do not propose to base my objection on political grounds, although my reading in recent weeks has led me to feel a deepening concern even on this level. Today I want to register my objection purely and simply on Christian grounds. In short, I abhor the philosophy of violence that has gripped the architects of our political and military strategy. This philosophy can find no justification in the spirit or teachings of

Jesus. It has led us to view the problems of our world through khaki-colored glasses and to assume that the only answers to those problems are those which can be spelled out in bombs—and twisted steel—and shattered corpses. If negotiation—or referral to the U.N.—or withdrawal—be no answer in Vietnam, then let me add: neither is an expanded war. This philosophy of violence has brought us to the verge of mental and spiritual bankruptcy in a world that cannot tolerate even one ill-advised miscalculation. Although this philosophy has been thoroughly discredited by man's historic experience, it seemingly illustrates the observation that "the only lesson that history teaches is that men will not be taught by history." And from our crucified Savior I am certain it evokes the same response now that it did on that day when, weeping over Jerusalem, He said: "Would that even today you knew the things that make for peace. But now they are hid from your eyes" (Luke 19: 42).

But in our time of need, why should "the things that make for peace" be hidden from our eyes? First of all, let me suggest that the things that make for peace are hidden from our eyes because the things that make for war have gotten our attention. Let us be frank about it: waging war is more dramatic and glamorous than waging peace. The poet (Richard Le Gallienne) had hold of this truth when he wrote:

"War
I abhor,
And yet how sweet
The sound along the marching street
Of drum and fife; and I forget
Wet eyes of widows, and forget
Broken old mothers, and the whole
Dark butchery without a soul.

"Without a soul—save this bright drink
Of heady music, sweet as hell;
And even my peace-abiding feet
Go marching with the marching street,
For yonder goes the fife,
And what care I for human life.

"The tears fill my astonished eyes
And my full heart is like to break,
And yet 'tis all embarrased lies,
A dream those little drummers make.

"Oh, it is wickedness to clothe
Yon hideous, grinning thing that stalks
Hidden in music, like a queen
That in a garden of glory walks,
Till good men love the thing they loathe.

"Art, thou hast many infamies
But not an infamy like this—
Oh, snap the fife and still the drum,
And show the monster as she is."

Is the same not true of you and me? Are we not captivated by the speed and power of a silvery jet against a clear blue sky, little realizing the terror which such a sight inspires in millions of our fellowmen who know first-hand the fiery death it sows? Are we not thrilled by the majestic sight of a sleek missile rising effortlessly off its launching pad and moving unerringly toward its appointed destination thousands of miles away, little realizing its capacities to carry nuclear death to millions of our fellowmen? Do we not shower our children with gifts of toy guns—and toy tanks—and toy battle-ships—and toy helmets, little realizing that we are already conditioning them for their roles as the soldiers of the next war? Whether we are young or old, we must confess that the things that make for war have captured our imaginations and gotten our attention, thereby hiding from our eyes the things that make for peace.

Our first task then must be to seek ways of attracting people's attention to peace-making. The late Sir Basil Zaharoff, world dealer in munitions, was on the right track when he said, "Let enough people talk peace,

think peace, and dream peace, and there will be peace on earth." Perhaps that's too oversimplified, and yet it is true that which gets our attention usually gets us—and the things that make for peace have been getting neither. One of the motivations behind the establishment of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency a few years ago was to focus more of our Nation's attention on this vital aspect of peacemaking—but even yet, who has heard of this agency or its work? Indeed, within this past week Congress has been holding hearings in which some have been urging the discontinuation of this committee because they do not regard its work as being relevant to our day. Proponents for this committee's continuation, I think, are basically united in their feeling that the subject of arms control and disarmament must not be permitted to slip clear out of our attention. They would concur with President Kennedy's stirring words to the United Nations on September 26, 1961:

"Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when it may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut out at any moment by accident, miscalculation or madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

"Men no longer debate whether armaments are a symptom or cause of tension. The mere existence of modern weapons—ten million times more destructive than anything the world has ever known, and only minutes away from any target on earth—is a source of horror, of discord and distrust. Men no longer maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes—for disarmaments must be a part of any permanent settlement. And men no longer pretend that the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness—for in a spiraling arms race, a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase.

"For 15 years this organization has sought the reduction and destruction of arms. Now that goal is no longer a dream—it is a practical matter of life or death. The risks inherent in disarmament pale in comparison to the risks inherent in an unlimited arms race."

Yet even now there are some within our Halls of Congress who would dismantle the only agency our Government has for focusing attention on the basic research necessary to taking some first steps toward disarmament.

Let me say that it is at this very point that I think the Peace Corps has rendered an invaluable service to our country and to the world. It has helped to dramatize peace-making, and thousands of our finest citizens have enlisted to wage peace across our world. Beyond any speeches made or programs launched, the Peace Corps has helped to attract our attention to the problems of mankind; indeed, it has even served to attract attention to the church's "peace corps" of missionaries who have been all too often almost unnoticed in their quiet overseas ministry to human needs. Last Sunday during the church school hour we were privileged to see the excellent sound-film, "Profiles of Promise," which portrayed some of the church's worldwide efforts to help people help themselves, thereby creating the conditions in which peace can prevail. However, even when the church does its audio-visual best to get people's attention focused upon the need for service to mankind, these efforts seem dull and drab by comparison with the color and pageantry of a missile launching. Nevertheless, in my considered judgment, this must be our first task: to seek more effective ways of attracting people's attention to the things which make for peace which are presently hid from our eyes.

Again, let me suggest that, having gotten our attention, the things that make for war have gotten our money. I think it would be generally admitted that the real motivation behind our race to the moon is the military one of maintaining supremacy over the Russians in space. In an article in the Saturday Review on August 4, 1962, Warren Weaver raised some pertinent questions and shared some disturbing facts, which may indicate more clearly why the efforts to make peace are hampered by a lack of funds for their implementation.

"It has been forecast that it may cost \$30 billion to 'put a man on the moon.' But how much is \$30 billion?"

"It is sobering to think of an alternative set of projects that might be financed with this sum. We could: give a 10 percent raise in salary, over a 10-year period, to every teacher in the United States, from kindergarten through universities, in both public and private institutions; plus give \$10 million each to 200 of the best smaller colleges; plus finance 7-year fellowships (freshman through Ph. D.) at \$4,000 per person per year for 50,000 new scientists and engineers; plus contribute \$300 million each toward the creation of 10 new medical schools; plus build and largely endow complete universities, with medical, engineering, and agricultural facilities for all 53 of the nations which have been added to the U.N. since its founding; plus create three more permanent Rockefeller Foundations; and still have \$100 million left over to popularize science.

"Whether you are primarily concerned with national welfare, international prestige, or science, weigh these alternatives against a man on the moon."

Well, one does not have to weigh for long these alternatives before realizing that so long as the things that make for war command the major portion of the financial resources of our Nation's annual budgets, the things that make for peace will remain hidden from our eyes and from our thoughtful consideration. That realization was altogether clear to former general and then President, Dwight Eisenhower, when he appraised the international situation on April 16, 1953:

"Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies—in the final sense—a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children.

"The cost of one modern bomber is this: a modern brick school in more than 30 cities. It is: two electric power plants, each serving a town of 60,000 population. It is: two fine, fully equipped hospitals. It is some 50 miles of concrete pavement. We pay for a single fighter plane with a half-million bushels of wheat. We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people.

"This is—I repeat—the best way of life to be found on the road the world has been taking. This is not a way of life at all, in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron. These plain and cruel truths define the peril and point the hope that come with this spring of 1953."

Twelve years have come and gone since then—and yet today we find ourselves still believing the counsel and still paying the bills incurred by those whose best answer to the tragic problems of our day is an expanded war in Vietnam, which carries with it the risk of fanning those sparks into a global conflagration of violence.

Permit me to go on record today as saying that peace will never be gained by utilizing the methods of violence and war, else ours is a different kind of universe and ours a different kind of God than we have come to

know through Jesus Christ. We cannot continue to invest \$850 per American family in military expenditures and only \$4 per American family in sharing our religious faith with other peoples of our earth (quotation from Henry Smith Leiper), yet continue to hope to harvest the fruits of peace on earth, good-will among men. Peace is not the mere absence of war; peace is a positive state of relationship between men and nations. As such, it demands the payment of a price every bit as sacrificial as that required to win a war. In the early 1950's the late Senator Brian McMahon asked the U.S. Senate to appropriate several billions of dollars for atomic research and development, this part of his speech received wide publicity in our newspapers. However, in a largely unreported section of that same speech he pled for a matching sum of money to be devoted to imaginative peacemaking efforts in the underdeveloped nations of the world, and warned that if the latter sum were not appropriated, the former expenditure would bring our world closer to the brink of disaster. You know the result of his appeal: the things that make for war got the money, and the things that make for peace remained hidden from our eyes. And now, almost a decade and a half later you know the consequences of disregarding his warning: a world closer to the brink of destruction than it was then, and a chorus of voices crying out for more war to solve the problems of our day.

All that I have said thus far simply serves to bring us to the heart of the matter; namely, having gotten our attention and our money, the things that make for war have gotten our hearts as well. How great was Jesus' insight into human beings when He said: "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also" (Matthew 6:21). Mars, the ancient Roman god of war, has become our god; Mars now commands our resources; and Mars has captured our hearts. Let me offer as evidence our increasing tendency to place our trust in force and power as the only effective means of achieving our purposes in the world. Of the Russians we often hear someone say: "Force is the only language they understand." But what of us? Force is fast becoming the only language that many Americans understand, and consequently the only solution to international problems which such ones can see are those which are translated into the language of force and violence. Few there are in positions of leadership who believe that the power of love has any part to play in international relations—or in solution of the problems of Vietnam. Indeed, many of us are apt to regard Jesus' teachings about turning the other cheek, loving our enemies, and forgiving 70 times 70 as starry-eyed idealism which has no relevance to the complex problems of our world. If you are wondering whose faith is in Mars and in force as the still more excellent way to solve our problems, I invite you to pay particular attention to the statements which are even now being daily made by some of our respected statesmen regarding our course of action in Vietnam. Many of them have already struck my ears as nothing less than bone-chilling battle cries.

Amidst the din of these cries for the application of more violence, let me remind you of the voice of One who is calling upon us, as peacemakers, for the application of more love to the problems of our world. Him we have accepted as our Lord and Saviour—and as the Prince of Peace. Yes, despite our high-sounding professions of faith in Christ, our practices led a thoughtful Jewish judge to remark: "It is the greatest irony in history that the most militaristic and acquisitive nations in the world should have chosen a pacifist Jewish peasant not only as their prophet but as their God." Christian friends, time is running out in our world for those

of us who profess such faith in Him to match that faith with peacemaking.

The words of Benjamin Mays cannot but impress us with our clear Christian responsibility:

"We talk glibly about the Prince of Peace. We sing fervently, 'Joy to the World; the Lord Is Come,' 'Silent Night,' 'Hark the Herald Angels Sing,' and 'It Came Upon the Midnight Clear'—and yet, as we sing, we prepare for war. We go out to build the best army, the finest navy, the most durable airplanes, and each nation puts its chemists to work to discover the most deadly gases. The national debt may soar sky high, depressions may come and depressions may go, unemployment may mount on wings, and slow starvation wages may take thousands to their graves, but the preparation for war must go on. And when the war comes, we bless it in the name of Jesus. We call it a holy war, and we ask God to join us in our holy crusade to help kill other men who are His children and our brothers.

"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter. We cannot get rid of Jesus. The only way to get rid of Jesus is to accept Him in mind, in heart, and in soul. Jesus represents God and God is the absolute—not man, not race, not economic nor political systems—but God. And whenever man in his arrogance and pride sets himself up as the absolute, he will be beaten to the ground."

What our broken world most needs today, to use the words of Arthur Brisbane, is "a peace conference with the Prince of Peace."

Jesus Christ is weeping over our world today, of that I am certain. Across 19 centuries of time I can hear the echo of His words:

"Would that even today you knew the things that make for peace. But now they are hid from your eyes."

In this moment of international peril, may our gracious God raise up some prophet from among the statesmen of our world whose vision is clear to see that which is hidden from other eyes, and whose leadership will be divinely inspired in causing others to see and to lay hold of "the things that make for peace"—before it is too late—before it is too late—before it is too late.

THE DALLES, OREG.,

March 9, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: If the facts presented in this letter to the editor of the Oregonian are true then I feel we have done the wrong thing in Vietnam.

Are we so great that we can't swallow a little pride or admit we are wrong? If this is the case then in my opinion we have some lessons to learn.

I will back you in your belief that we do not belong in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

ROY MILLER.

BEAVERTON, OREG.

MARCH 13, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your stand on foreign aid and Vietnam. Two of the most insane issues facing this country. How educated, informed person can believe our money swelling the coffers of Communist countries helps the United States is beyond my comprehension. And what we are doing in Vietnam I doubt God himself knows. A meaningless slaughter of American boys and men.

Sincerely,

(Mrs. C. F.) FRANCES BERNET.

GRANTS PASS.

ATLANTA LAUNDRIES, INC.,

Atlanta, Ga., March 4, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard your comments about the war in South Vietnam over

March 22, 1965

television last night on WAIL, channel 11, Atlanta, Ga.

I sure do agree with you. You are to be commended for your statement.

I can't understand what is wrong with our Government. When our boys are dying over there and not one British boy has been lost and the British are sending supplies to North Vietnam. Have we gone crazy, or what?

Please give me your opinion so I can write my two Senators; maybe there's something I don't know.

Sincerely,

WM. J. SHIRLEY.

LANCASTER, PA.,
March 5, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As a simple citizen of the Nation, this is to express my sincere appreciation to one of the few governmental officials having the courage to remain constantly opposed to our Government's Asiatic folly.

I have no doubt that your adherence to this stand is at considerable cost and at the face of unbelievable pressure. You are, no doubt, the recipient of scurrilous letters, the butt of much invective, and object of intense hatred from the military. Lesser men would have capitulated, as did Senator SCOTT from my own State. I would be proud to be one of your constituents.

I'm afraid the cause is lost—and with it all humanity. But, if any historians survive the holocaust, they will write that our diplomacy manifested the sheerest stupidity of all time while the fate of civilization hung in the balance.

Don't let them silence you by crowding you with other assignments, by threats, or by any of the devious machinations practiced by the hate merchants. Yours is about the only strong voice left to speak for sanity.

Sincerely,

O. H. AURAND.

EUGENE, OREG.,
March 10, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I've lived in Oregon only a year and a half. I am proud to be a part of your constituency, for I approve wholeheartedly of your stand on Vietnam. Don't give up.

You're not getting enough publicity outside the State, I hear, but soon summer will come and vacationers can spread the word—I hope it's not too late.

Yours truly,

(Mrs. W. H.) RUTH A. SILLS.

WRIGHTSVILLE, PA.,
March 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please keep talking about our pitiful role in South Vietnam. The York Gazette and Daily gives you good coverage.

I am a Democrat who is truly disillusioned with our "reasonable" leader.

Sincerely,

ANNA S. GLEATON.

PACIFIC SEED & HARDWARE CO.,
Portland, Oreg., March 9, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the good work, get us out of Asia and Africa. It is noble to go to the aid of others only as far as you can without material injury to yourself. I feel we are only mudding the waters by meddling in others domestic affairs. Stop throwing our assets around and we can build

our own strength to a point where we can tell them off and they will listen. These noble experiments are going to bankrupt our Nation. We owe \$50 billion more than all other nations combined.

FRANK SORENSEN.

GROSSE POINTE, MICH.,
March 7, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I've been wanting to write you for years and thank you for raising your voice against all the injustices being practiced around the world today.

So many people like me hear you and read about your courageous speeches in the Senate, and though we agree with you and love you for speaking out we fail to write and tell you so. Forgive us.

History will record that only two voices in the body of Congress were raised against our idiots policy in southeast Asia.

May God bless you and Senator GRUENING. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely

Mrs. HOWARD A. LEE.

BALDWIN, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.,
March 8, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Although, the writer is a conservative he must by all state of conscience support your stand regarding Vietnam. It may be very unpopular to state that we are the aggressors, but the strange fact remains we are just that. You have always had the courage of your convictions and although the writer may have disagreed with you on many issues, he cannot help but agree with you on this and mind you this is not the conservative point of view.

It is indeed a sorry thing to say but in the writer's mind, the President has no actual sense of history, merely an academic one. Although, you were in opposition much of the time to the late Robert A. Taft, the writer feels that if he were living today, this great Senator would have taken the same stand despite the opposition of the White House.

Thanking you again for your courageous stand.

Very cordially yours,

RICHARD V. GRULICH.

WILDEWILLE, OREG.,
March 17, 1965.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: We support your stand on the senseless war in south Asia. In this small community my thought seemed to be shared by many others. Count on our continued support.

We thank you for your actions in this respect.

ADELAIDE BAINES.
WARD BAINES.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
March 9, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I, a former refugee from behind the so-called Iron Curtain, agree fully with you in regard to the dirty war in Vietnam. We should not have been there at all because we should not arrogate to ourselves the right of meddling in other people's affairs. If we wanted to defend freedom, to fight for freedom, the very place is here at home, in Alabama, in Mississippi and other places.

I admire you for the courage of speaking without fear your honest and independent convictions, to serve truth and justice, and to serve the best interests of our country and the peace of the world. I am convinced that the conscience of America is with you.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY OLIVARI.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON DENTAL SCHOOL,
Portland, Oreg., March 8, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit me to extend my congratulations to you on your very forceful Chicago speech on March 4. Many of us hope and pray that our administration will lend an ear to your clear insight to this grave Vietnam problem.

Sincerely yours,

DUANE R. PAULSON, D.D.S.

CARTERVILLE, ILL.,
March 7, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I add my small voice to those opposed to the apparent policy of the present administration in South Vietnam.

After 10 years and billions of dollars, plus the most precious thing of all, the lives of our soldiers, it is high time we recognize the futility of trying to save 15 million people from Communist domination, who apparently don't want to be saved. At least not by us. It might have been a different story if our two countries were of the same racial and cultural background.

I am completely confused as to just what our present plans and policies are for South Vietnam. All I hear is the timeworn phrase "We must stop the spread of communism." This has been parroted by some politicians and about 90 percent of the people for so long that it has become meaningless. Most certainly I believe that practically all of us agree with its original concept, which I believe was first promulgated by President Truman. But the distortions to the original concept, brought about by the jingoism of the McCarthy, John Birch, and like movements, has created an atmosphere of unreasonable fear and suspicion to the point where, I believe, otherwise straight thinking, knowledgeable men are unconsciously endorsing and advocating views and policies contrary to their own deep-seated best judgment.

I do not feel that there is any reason to criticize President Eisenhower's decision to intervene in Vietnam. At the time it looked like the thing to do, and although there were many problems, the chances for success seemed to be on our side. So he could not decide otherwise. But 10 years have brought many changes, and our chances of success have gone aglimmering, and our position is rapidly becoming untenable.

The time has come for the Johnson administration to clear the boards and take a new look. Many an honorable strategic retreat has not only won the battle, but the war.

We can ill afford to continue with a policy that will eventually drive Russia into Red China's camp. And how much longer can we hide our head in the sand and ignore the existence of a nation of 650 million people, even though they are our deadliest enemies? And last, but not least, we cannot afford to become involved in a war whereby victory can be achieved only by destroying ourselves.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR T. BLAKE.

WILLINGBORO, N.J.,
March 9, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to take this opportunity to express to you my appreciation for the effort you have been making and continue to make on behalf of a sane policy in Vietnam. You, and a few others, are the

March 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5377

only redeeming factor of our many branches of government in the shameful policy we have adopted in Vietnam. I thank you and support you fully in the stand you have taken, and hope that in time others will see the only way to regain our self-respect and dignity in the eyes of the world is to negotiate and withdraw from a situation where we never should have been in the first place.

Please continue in your efforts to bring the truth before the American public and know that you have the support of many.

Sincerely,

Virginia Hill
Mrs. TED HILL.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Davis, Calif., March 8, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just wish to write you a short note to commend your courageous and intelligent position on Vietnam. More voices with as much honesty and frankness as yours are needed in the U.S. Senate. Unfortunately the Senate lately has become, or is becoming, a lobbyist group for the military-industrial complex. I hope you continue to be outspoken and critical as long as our administration preaches pulpy potato love (The Great Society) while failing to give the American people any answers except the most unsatisfying cliches and empty phrases. It is frightening that the United States is becoming a huge Disneyland, composed of illusions and facades, behind which such action, totally unjustifiable, as that in Vietnam is carried out. Again, thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT E. LOUCY.

MOUNTAIN LAKES, N.J.,
March 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for speaking out openly on U.S. policy in Vietnam. I hope and trust that you will continue to do so. Rule by force must end.

Sincerely,

ADRIAN VAN L. MAAS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
March 9, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I thank God for your forthright and courageous opposition to the administration's Vietnam policy. I am praying that you will find support in the Senate and that God will move our troops out of Vietnam speedily.

I am writing today also to Representative EDITH GREEN, President Johnson and the Oregon Journal expressing my support for your stand.

I shall be praying that God will give us a leader, at the next presidential election who will lead our Nation into a better understanding with all peoples of the world.

Yours sincerely,

DONALD W. NOVAK.

GENERAL INSURANCE CO. OF AMERICA,
SAFECO INSURANCE CO. OF AMERICA,
Seattle, Wash., March 5, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Several times recently I have heard you speak (TV), and read your quotes regarding this mess in Vietnam. Our damn Senate, President, Armed Forces, and State Department are in conspiracy to build (escalate) this mess into a war. But this approach will actually lead into another type Korea, and eventually some type of World War.

Speak out. Keep it up. You and yours have our support.

HARRISON C. MACK.

No. 51—10

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

DEAR MR. MORSE: We very much thank and appreciate you. We believe that you are doing all that is possible for anyone to do—regarding the situation in Vietnam.

We are sure living in terrible times and only by God's help and prayers will we ever make it through.

According to our faith in God will be the answer. Our very earnest prayers are with you now.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. CECIL BEELER.

WHITMAN, MASS.,
March 7, 1965.

HON. WAYNE B. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Enclosed please find copy of a letter sent to President George Meany on March 2, 1965, on the situation in Vietnam.

Please continue to do everything possible to end this conflict and save our country from further disgrace in the eyes of the world.

Yours truly,

J. J. BELLEFENILLE.

MARCH 2, 1965.

Mr. GEORGE MEANY,
AFL-CIO Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: You have just recently, on behalf of the executive council and yourself, endorsed the action of the Johnson administration in escalating the war in Vietnam. By this act, you have identified yourself with Barry Goldwater, who campaigned on such a program. The only other support given to this act came from EVERETT DIRKSEN and the Dixiecrats.

Such support brings shame and disgrace on the labor movement in the eyes of 81 percent of the American people, who in a Gallup poll recently called for withdrawal of American troops in Vietnam and negotiation of the issues involved. Strong voices in Congress support this action.

History tells us that in 1776, a revolution took place here to oust a colonial oppressor; namely, George III and a new form of government was formed establishing freedom as its cornerstone. This action was then opposed by the entire world, but it did not deter this country one iota from setting up this new form of republican government.

Recently we participated in a war, based on the principle of four freedoms and the right of nations to self-determination without interference from any source whatever.

After the ouster of the French in Indochina and the 1954 Geneva Conference, settlement of this issue, we then had no business following the advice of John Foster Dulles or Richard Nixon, thereby causing more suffering to a nation that had already suffered too much.

May I therefore, humbly suggest that you reevaluate your position on Vietnam, and that you base your decisions in the future more in line with the expressed wishes of the people, who, in the first instance, repudiated such a policy at the polls last November.

Fraternally,

J. J. BELLEFENILLE.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCE,
New York, N.Y., March 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE B. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In the loneliness of the position you are espousing on the floor of the Senate, in regard to shameful behavior of our Government in South Vietnam, please know that I am proud to be living at the same time as you are.

Your courage and patriotism is in the pure line as exemplified by Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. Please be assured that history will accord you an honored place as one who kept his sanity and courage when all around him dropped their weapons and fled.

I salute you.

Sincerely yours,

MARTIN POPE,
Associate Professor,

St. Louis, Mo.,
March 7, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When Senator Goldwater was running for President, I was afraid that the people backing him were going to make the same mistake German industrialists did when they put Hitler into power in Germany because they thought they needed a strong man to stand against communism. It turned out that they lost everything they would have lost even if Communists had taken over.

Well, the voters turned Goldwater down with a resounding thud, but it turns out that President Johnson is doing exactly what the voters were afraid Goldwater would if he got in. Apparently, Mr. Johnson is not the man to bother with this nonsense about democracy and a democratic government. He is running the country as he sees fit, and he could care less whether the voters like it or not. Incidentally, he couldn't do a worse job than he's doing.

He is fighting an unpopular war, and if he put it to a vote, he would find the voters about 10 to 1 in favor of pulling out of Vietnam now without bothering about negotiations. He has accomplished what seemed almost the impossible, in bringing Russia and China back together, which was a master stroke in favor of world communism. All in all, Mr. Johnson seems to be shaping up as the most blundering, bullheaded ass we have had in office since Herbie Hoover, and he has all the earmarks of an emerging Hitler, because he is setting up a dictatorship with all the means within his power.

The way he is going, all the Republicans have to do in 1968 is to run anybody who doesn't make waves, and he will win by as large a landslide as Goldwater lost last time.

NICHOLAS PARKMAN.

GRAND COULEE, WASH.,
March 4, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR WONDERFUL SENATOR: We want to tell you that we agree with you 100 percent on your stand on the Vietnam situation. Keep it up and may God bless you.

We think that bombing, etc., that our country is doing is horrible and terrible.

We just wish that you were President of this country. We are back of you in what you are trying to do.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM EHLERS.

CHINESE OVERSEAS CHRISTIAN MISSION,
Timonium, Md., March 9, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You are absolutely right in your stand on the war in Vietnam, and you are the only leader I have heard who dares stand up and be counted in opposition to our warlike policy in Asia.

"Negotiation in strength"; i.e., from a "position of strength" is a reliance not upon the justness of our case in southeast Asia but upon our capability and willingness to destroy human life. It is brinkmanship to the nth degree, with the lives of our little brown brothers and of our own GI's as the stake.

My wife and I were born and reared in Asia and have spent 40 years as missionaries in north China, 1911-51.

God bless you.

FREDERICK M. PYKE.

March 22, 1965

5378

BROWN UNIVERSITY,
 Providence, R.I., March 6, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to say how fine a role I think you have assumed in the Vietnam debate. Your position has made it possible for creative doubt to be a growing factor in our southeastern Asian policies.

Sincerely,

NICOLAUS C. MILLS.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,
 Philadelphia, March 10, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have long wanted to express my deep gratitude to you for your magnificent and courageous fight for sanity in our policy in southeast Asia. You have performed, in my opinion, the highest form of public service, and I am quite sure that there are millions of Americans who feel the same way.

It is unfortunate that, in spite of your efforts, we appear to be at a more critical position than ever before, and under the direction of a President who carried out a campaign for peace, responsibility, caution, etc. The opposition to Goldwaterism has been put in a very awkward position by the fact that their (and formally my) hero, the campaign dove, is carrying out policies that appear to be pure Goldwaterism.

Once again, please accept my thanks for your superb efforts of the recent past, and permit me to urge you to keep firing from both barrels.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD S. HERMAN,
 Associate Professor of Finance.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
 March 9, 1965.

The Editor,
 The Washington Post and Times Herald,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The verbal heart of our justification for enlarging our participation in the Vietnamese war is the contention that the North Vietnamese are aggressing against South Vietnam. Proof of aggression thus far has consisted of showing that a quantity of arms and men (minuscule relative to our own contribution) has been transferred from north to south; plus unverified and unconvincing allegations of control of Vietcong actions from Hanoi. However, if the revolt against the Saigon Government was initially largely homegrown, and if it has substantial indigenous support, the use of the word aggression to describe active aid to either side is dangerous rhetoric. And if the Saigon Government commands less support in South Vietnam than the rebels, which may very well be the case, our use of the word aggression to describe North Vietnamese support of the Vietcong is hypocritical in the extreme.

What is really distressing is that our highest officials seem to regard their references to Hanoi aggression, and our own highly moral defense of liberty in South Vietnam, as more than the claptrap that it appears to be. Is there nobody in Washington bold enough to point out that the Emperor is without a stitch of clothing?

Very truly yours,

EDWARD S. HERMAN.

P.S.—I would be grateful if you would publish this letter. From long experience I can assure you that this letter or any reasonable facsimile would not be published by any Philadelphia newspaper.

IOWA CITY, IOWA,
 March 8, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As citizens of the United States and erstwhile Oregonians, we

wholeheartedly endorse the stand you have taken on the Vietnam issue.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES S. HILLAND.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
 March 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I just heard your discussion with Hans Morgenthau on WBBM and I am very, very grateful for your comments and I appreciate your courage and forthrightness. I agree with you wholeheartedly. Keep up the prophetic task.

You might like to know that I am also sending a letter of praise to WBBM since you implied that radio is meeting an information-spreading need that the press is not.

Sincerely,

PAUL VAN NESS.

P.S.—I have also written my Congressmen of my opinions.

WAVERLY, NEBR.,
 February 26, 1965.

SENATOR MORSE: We are with you all the way on the Vietnam situation; keep talking and telling the truth about this situation.

MERLE O. FUCHSER.

MILLERSVILLE, PA.,
 March 9, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am concerned about the continuing buildup of American forces in Vietnam and our increased aggressive action there. If democracy is to be successful the people must receive adequate information upon which to base their judgments. I do not think that the majority of the American press or the agencies of our Government have been supplying us with a clear perspective of the situation in Vietnam and southeast Asia and I want to commend you for your efforts to give the American public this vital information. I hope you will continue to speak out against these actions and strive for a peaceful and moral solution to the situation in Vietnam.

I would also like to call your attention to the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily. I am sure you would find its editorial page a refreshing change from the opinions usually expressed by the Oregonian and the Oregon Journal.

I recently changed my address to Millersville State College from Oregon State University where I recently completed graduate studies and if I could I would like to continue receiving your newsletter.

Sincerely yours,

VERNE M. CHAPMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
 March 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORRIS,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My hearty support for your position on Vietnam.

I believe that every bomb will drive the Vietnamese closer to the Vietcong. Surely the people in that unhappy country feel more solidarity with each other, regardless of political forms, than any of them do with us—so utterly alien, so grimly insistent.

We say we want independence for Vietnam—but how about independence from United States? Surely all Asian and other colonial peoples are united against foreign domination, clumsily designated foreign (military) aid.

I have written the President and my Senators urging an immediate negotiated peace, to be followed by a pullout and strict impar-

tiality; then foreign aid to the whole country, if requested.

We can hardly persuade the North Vietnam peasants to turn their backs on China by bombing them. And the South Vietnam peasants have no allies against our juggernaut except the Vietcong—or in the case of the Buddhists, the fire.

Sincerely yours,

GERTRUDE K. STOUGHTON.

CULVER CITY, IND.,
 March 6, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I congratulate you on the long hectic stand you have taken regarding our policies in Vietnam. I would like to encourage you to continue with your seemingly unpopular but just cause.

My purpose is to inspire you with the information that among the great majority of my acquaintances I find that they hold opinions comparable to yours.

Although we did not sign the Geneva Treaty of 1954 I understand that our delegate, Walter Smith, committed the United States to honoring all but article 13. Therefore, I contend that we are violating the Geneva accords by intervening in the internal affairs of the South Vietnamese.

As so-called champions of democracy, why did we not allow the elections that were to have taken place 2 years after the treaty was signed?

We have installed and supported an oppressive and unpopular government upon the people of South Vietnam instead of democracy. Our own popularity there is indicated by the demonstrations of the Buddhists who, I understand, make up the majority of the people.

Guerrilla warfare is not practical without the sympathy of the peasant class. Because of their cooperation with the guerrilla forces we have aided in tearing them away from their homes and villages and under Operation Sunrise, have herded them into "strategic hamlets." When the Germans did this to political dissenters we frowned upon activities so brutal and undemocratic and we called strategic hamlets concentration camps then.

When we rain bombs upon the unsuspecting people of Laos and North Vietnam we call it retaliatory. When the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor without a declaration of war we called it aggression.

It has reached a point now in this country where we have defined war out of existence. According to my dictionary, to exert force or violence against another is war. We redefine war by saying that we are not in a state of war without the approval of the Congress. This is not a defining characteristic of war. Our people know that we cannot legislate war out of existence by redefining the word without the knowledge of analytical philosophy.

Congress has given the President the power to defend South Vietnam but we don't need a slide rule to figure out that defense and aggression are two different things. Our President tries in vain to foist upon the public the idea that these two words have the same denotation. This is the same as saying that a gorilla and a mocking bird are of the same species.

What is happening in this country today is an insult to the intelligence of the American public. I very much resent being treated as though I were a nincompoop.

If our idiotic foreign policies do not end up in a world holocaust and humanity survives to write the history of our times, I am sure that you and very few others will go down on its pages as one of the voices of sanity raised amid the uproar of raving lunatics.

I voted for Johnson because he claimed to stand for peace and indicated that he would not close the door to the negotiating table. He is not only a liar, but I am more

March 22, 1965

5379

convinced every day that we have a madman in the White House.

I was happy to participate in the Second World War, fighting against the abominable atrocious policies of nations that believed in concentration camps and acts of undeclared war. Now my President implies that I lack understanding; simply because I will not condone the suppression of people who for years of miserable, terrible revolution have tried to become self-determining and free to control their own destinies.

I'm afraid that, should my country need my services in this war I would choose jail. I never thought the day would come when I would say that I am ashamed of being an American but it has.

I leave it up to you, Senator GRUENING, and a few others to restore faith in my country and pride to myself.

I sincerely wish you well and please don't give up.

Sincerely,

CHARLES F. REED.

P.S.—It would be better to lose face than one more precious life in Vietnam.

KINGSTON, R.I.,
March 7, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: From what we have heard and read of your speeches and position on the problem of South Vietnam, we feel that you are taking a realistic view. Neither the State Department nor anyone in the administration has explained the indifference, if not hostility, of the average South Vietnamese to the U.S. program, or the continuance of their poverty. If the two are linked, and the guerrillas are supported by the South Vietnamese, then why do we bomb North Vietnam, unless we want to draw China into the war? Wouldn't it be better, as I believe you say, to negotiate under U.N. auspices so as to pull out at minimum cost before we antagonize irrevocably other Asians (and indeed citizens of underdeveloped areas in other parts of the globe as well)? Attempts to bomb both the guerrillas and North Vietnamese inevitably kill a lot of innocent people.

Many people that we talk with seem to feel that the United States is making a big mistake but there seems to be no way of getting the President or the administration to be open and frank on the reasons for our present policy. We just heard Dean Rusk on TV. He said that the President was acting as Congress wanted him to. But aside from your speeches and a few others we don't think there has been a chance for Congress to debate the question fully.

Very truly yours,

JOEL and BARBARA DIRLAIN.

BRYN MAWR, PA.,
March 9, 1965.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I strongly endorse your feeling about our position in South Vietnam.

I am a retired schoolteacher having served 42 wonderful years with the future citizens of the United States. I hope and pray none of these former pupils of mine will shed their blood in a war in which I feel we should have not been involved, now or never.

May God bless your effort in preventing such a massacre.

Yours truly,

MARIAN C. CROOK.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
March 9, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am extremely glad that you are making your misgivings, to say the least, about our present policy in South Vietnam known in the Senate. You seem almost alone in your public opposition. I am

not as informed or as convinced as you in this matter, but do feel that our present policy of bombings, etc., is likely to end in failure. Do you have a statement of your views and/or working alternatives to our present policy that you might send me?

Sincerely,

PETER W. CASTLE.

MARCH 8, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Last night I listened to the taped discussion you and Hans Morgenthau made for WBBM radio station. I agree with you wholly. After seeing the newsreel of Selma, Ala., and the treatment of our Negro people there I think the marines should have been landed there to protect the Americans of Negro blood treated so savagely. Note I did not use the word "citizen"—that privilege having been denied them so long.

I am Caucasian but hate to see such injustice.

Sincerely,

MARY WAUNETAH MANLEY.

CHICAGO, ILL.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
March 9, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to support you in your position regarding our Nation's role in the Vietnam conflict.

I agree that troops ought not to be sent unless a war is declared by Congress. In my opinion, our Federal troops would make a greater contribution to freedom if they were sent to Selma, Ala., to protect our citizens from the guns, billy clubs, and horsewhips of racist State troopers and other segregationists.

Further American involvement in Vietnam, in view of the growing peace movement there, can lead only to stronger anti-American sentiment. A negotiated settlement appears to be the only sensible solution to this difficult situation.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN KARANIKAS.

WATERBURY, CONN., March 11, 1965.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to you because you seem to be one of the few sane people left in our Government, unless the others are afraid to speak out.

First, I want to thank you for your expressions of reason and humanity. It seems like the only ray of hope left in the madness that is overtaking us. Isn't there anything we can do to stop it?

It's true, I'm a mother of two sons, God bless them, but I can honestly say that I feel sorry for all the world's children who have to live under the threat of nuclear war, and now with the possibility and even the probability of it.

President Johnson was elected as a Democrat, but he is following the warlike path of the Goldwater Republicans. He was elected on a peace mandate, but he is listening to the Pentagon or the Military Establishment. Can't he see that the military mind is warped and sees the world in terms of military strategy, assuming the military posture for any problem that arises?

Vietnam and the Selma, Ala., incident only reveal how callous we have become toward human life. This is why the military attitude can brainwash the people into thinking that we must bomb China, even with nuclear bombs, before China gets nuclear bombs. People just don't matter anymore. I should think that people would rise up en masse and demand that we stop this killing. Can't they see the discrepancy: using bombers against guerrilla fighters? And now we are going from this immorality

to greater immorality, in the name of anti-communism. The southeast Asians will hate us for killing them off. We are driving them into communism, not stopping its spread. Why can't we treat them as human beings and help them better their lives, so that they won't accept communism?

Please, I beg of you, do what you can to make President Johnson listen to reason and humanity. We mothers want our children to live and to have a livable world to grow up in. If we would teach them love instead of hate, we would win over even the Communists to love instead of hate. Killing them and our children off will get us nowhere except to "hell on earth."

Thank you very much for your kind attention, and good luck.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY STEIN
Mrs. Morris Stein.

AQUILA PRESS, INC.,

Noblesville, Ind., March 10, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For some time I have noted your intelligent and courageous stand in respect to our position in Vietnam. I want to commend you for your forthright thinking both in your appearances on TV and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Thinking Americans should be grateful for your leadership in the U.S. Senate.

Although our basic efforts are in the field of social-economic reform so that our best technology can be fully utilized for the maximum good of all the people, we know that prevention of nuclear war must have first priority. I am enclosing a copy of our magazine, the Eagle's Eye, which contains the main article on Vietnam.

We would appreciate being on your mailing list for any releases from your office.

Very sincerely,

MELFORD PEARSON.

COMMUNITY CHURCH

(CONGREGATIONAL),

Hubbard, Ore., March 11, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to tell you I am glad you are speaking out as you do in opposition to the escalation of the war in Vietnam. I think the situation is very dangerous. I can't think of a worse place to be involved in a conflict that could escalate into nuclear war. I agree with you that we don't even belong there in a military way.

Keep the good work up.

Sincerely,

THOMAS McCAMANT.

L. G. HANSCOM FIELD,
Bedford, Mass., March 11, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am moved to write to you, having noted the letter published in the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., yesterday.

You are right—we do not belong in Vietnam, and you are a most eloquent speaker on this subject.

I hope that you keep right on, giving voice to your beliefs on the subject, and perhaps, in time, you will win more people to your way of thinking.

You do not know me, but I am a person who grew up in Baker, Ore., went to Oregon State University, later worked in Medford, with the Public Welfare Commission, and married a young man from out of State.

We have been here and there through the years and hope to live in the Far West some day again. My sister is married to John P. Kerns, who is a son of the late J. W. Kerns in Klamath Falls. We have had copies of the Oregonian describing the great damage wrought by the storms and floods. I hope that Oregon will have some Federal help in

March 22, 1965

getting the roads rebuilt so that the lumber industry can be fully operational again.

My husband and I are on your mailing list and we wish to continue to receive news of Oregon and your own activities for its benefit.

Sincerely,

RUTH HILL HALLIWELL,
Mrs. Edwin H. Halliwell.

CANTON, MASS.,
March 11, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please continue to speak out against our escalation of the war in Vietnam.

The white paper was absurd. If that is all the evidence we have, than North Vietnam is helping the rebels less than I imagined they were.

I am opposed to bombing, attacks, particularly those against North Vietnam. Bombing is too inaccurate a weapon. I suspect that the more we bomb the more rebels join the Vietcong.

My ancestors fought against the British in the American Revolution. I'm ashamed to see American troops playing the role of Hessians in an Asian revolt.

Please continue to advocate negotiations. We should ask U Thant to sponsor peace talks.

Sincerely yours,

B. F. GREENE.

LA GRANGE PARK, ILL.,
March 9, 1965.

Senator MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard over a broadcast a few days ago that you were objecting to the undeclared war in Vietnam.

I had despaired of any Senator standing upon and objecting to the usurpation by the executive branch of the right of Congress only to declare war. The State Department, says it isn't a war, but I don't think that it can pull the wool over the public's eyes to that extent.

I applaud your stand, and only wish that you were not a voice crying in the wilderness.

Sincerely,

W. R. HOMAN.

DENVER, COLO.,
March 10, 1965.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to thank you for your efforts in arousing public opinion to the necessity of a peaceful settlement in Vietnam and of our flagrant violation of international law there. I have just sent letters to my two Senators and my Representative urging that U.S. troops get out. I also urged that those troops be sent to Alabama instead.

I am a former resident of Oregon, and I had the pleasure of voting for you there. I wish that a man of your stature represented Colorado.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MUELLER.

EAGLE ASSOCIATES,
San Francisco, Calif., March 6, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my commendations for your valiant efforts to change our position in Vietnam and thus to set us on a more moral and humanitarian course. We have no legal or political rights in Vietnam and are clearly and openly aggressors. It is the highest exercise of patriotism to oppose the policies of our Government when it is so patently wrong, for it serves to correct this wrong position, thereby strengthening it.

All considerations of humanity, morality, legality, military feasibility, or political wisdom aside, the Vietnam venture is harmful rather than helpful to our security and economic stability. It absorbs the energies of our best men, Lodge, Taylor, the Bundy brothers, Rusk, and countless generals, admirals, and others as well as the President. The talents of these men can be better employed elsewhere. It contributes to our economic instability by depriving us of much needed gold and constitutes a considerable portion of our balance-of-payments deficit.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE EAGLE, O.D.

CHAPEL HILL, N.C.,
March 10, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I guess I haven't always agreed with you in the past, but I do completely on this Vietnam affair. I have read all I can find on the matter, and I guess I've become what Walter Lippmann calls a neoisolationist.

Perhaps you can tell me how best to approach our two Senators on this matter. I would like to make a letter to each of them meaningful enough to awaken them to the folly and danger of our involvement and would appreciate any advice.

I have written to President Johnson about this, and I intend to write to Senator Fulbright who seems (except on the racial matter) one of the more sensible of your colleagues.

Couldn't you get one of the TV networks to set up a debate or panel or something of the sort in which you show (publicly and for the Nation to see and hear) the position you hold? I would dearly love to have you give Mr. Nixon a little lesson in statesmanship.

Keep up the good work you are doing and let me know how I can help.

Sincerely,

C. CARROLL HOLLIS.

ALLYN, WASH.,
March 5, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to once again thank you for your efforts to modify our country's actions in southeast Asia. Our church group, after considerable study, agree that you represent the proper course. We have written our President asking him to reconsider our present stand.

Very respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. L. C. MORSE.

SANTA FE, N. MEX.,
March 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept the thanks of a citizen who is not one of your constituents for your outspoken and repeated opposition to the escalation of the war in Vietnam.

I am in agreement with you 100 percent on this issue, and hope that you will continue to voice the opinion of those of us who believe with you that increasingly belligerent activity on the part of the United States in this area is dangerous, unnecessary, and entirely counter to our best traditions.

Sincerely,

ISABEL R. CARROLL,
Mrs. Thomas A. Carroll.

NORWICH, N.Y.,
March 10, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although you are not the Senate representative from my State, I would like to congratulate you on your

stand on the administration's policy in Vietnam.

This country's present policy in Asia cannot bring the desired results, it can only lead to a major war and disaster.

I urge you to continue striving for a peaceful settlement of the issues, and I urge you to continue your opposition to the administration's current policy.

Respectfully,

JOHN J. LUCAS.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
March 10, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have long been deeply appreciative of your clarity and courage in urging our withdrawal from Vietnam. I hope that you will not become discouraged and will continue to work to extricate us from a situation in which the worst of emotions seem to be making the decisions, rather than reason.

You are giving voice to the conscience of mankind.

Most sincerely,

EVELYN HOWARD.

MARCH 8, 1965.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MORSE: It seems to me that our country is heading into a mess that we will regret in Vietnam. Our only hope is in what power our Senators and Congressmen have. The present administration seems to carry its own poll in its pocket for reference. Surely it is not listening to the popular sentiment (Gallup—80 percent to negotiate). Please, Mr. MORSE, listen to us. Stop this lunatic drive toward no return. Negotiate.

Sincerely yours,

MARION C. THOMAS.

BURTON, WASH.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
Berkeley, Calif.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You win my vote for the greatest Senator of our time; this is of course due to your courageous position on Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN SMALE,
Professor of Mathematics.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,
March 7, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I commend and support you, sir, on the stand you have consistently taken in regard to Vietnam. This is statesmanship of the highest order at a time when it is most needed. I have followed your public career for many years and have always found you to have the courage of your convictions regardless of whether or not the issue was domestic or foreign affairs and whether or not the stand you took was the "popular" stand.

Why should we try to tell Vietnam how to run its affairs when we can't even guarantee the privileges of citizenship to people in Mississippi, Alabama, and other places? It seems to me we are driving the Philippines, Malaysia, India, and other Asian nations toward the Communist camp by our actions in Vietnam. This is certainly no way to gain or hold the confidence of the Asian people.

I firmly believe that peace is within our grasp if we could but see it. No, the world would not be as we would have it, but at least we could agree to disagree agreeably. Just who do we think we are, anyhow? Going into a situation like Vietnam on our own and without United Nations sanction?

Keep up your efforts. There is an ever-growing minority coming around to your sensible thinking on this important matter.

Very truly yours,

TED H. CRAFTREE.

P.S.—As you can see, among other things, I'm not a typist.

March 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5381

MARCH 5, 1965.

Hon. Senator MORSE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bless you for your stand on "peaceful negotiations" in Vietnam. Thank God for our precious Senators who have courage, mingled with wisdom. They are in the minority.

Why President Johnson is letting this killing continue, without even considering to negotiate is beyond my realm of understanding.

My heart bleeds for the American boys who have died in Vietnam, but my heart bleeds for the 43,000 Vietnamese people who have died already.

We must stop this killing, or risk nuclear holocaust.

God bless you always.

Respectfully,

MRS. WALTER CARTMELL,
GROVE CITY, OHIO.

RANDOLPH, N.Y.,
March 10, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: My husband and I fully support you and those colleagues who recommend negotiation and withdrawal from Vietnam. We believe that war has been cancelled out in this era of the bomb.

It is morally irresponsible to continue to depend on a militaristic foreign policy. Even to preserve "freedom." For freedom cannot be preserved while we are at war. We are all slaves to this policy when we dare not speak out according to our true convictions. Fortunately some of us are not afraid, including yourself, for which I am supremely grateful.

We have lost prestige. It is now "us" against the world. The United States can gain back its prestige only by cooperation among all the nations of the world to improve the human condition. China and Russia have both, in the past 4 years, called for such cooperation which we have firmly ignored.

It is only through recognition of Red China that we can ever hope to begin to set the world on an even keel. Then we could leave no stone unturned to seek all avenues of agreement between both China and Russia and ourselves.

We are ruining our relations with Russia as we seek to prove that China has been right about us all along. It is frightening to think what affect this can have on the Government of Russia. Perhaps another overthrow would mean a much harder line toward the West.

So much could be said, but I shall close with best wishes for your success. Do not betray the American people as our President has done. Keep freedom alive for without it we cannot have peace.

Very sincerely,

LAURABELLE T. RICE
Mrs. Edwin R. Rice.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
March 10, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a mother of two young children I wish to thank you from the bottom of my heart for your brave stand on the Vietnam crisis. Our children's future is already hampered by the moral situation here in America and instead of trying to clean up our own backyard we are spending millions sticking our nose in somebody else's business. I hate communism as much as anyone but if the majority wants it who are we to change their minds?

God bless you.

Mrs. DONNA LOWER.

GARDINER, OREG.,
March 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

I wholeheartedly support your position regarding our undeclared war in Vietnam.

As time goes on it is more and more evident that the U.S. position is a very bad one. We can only continue to lose not only the war but also the respect of the nations of the world.

Respectfully,

DONALD W. BROWN.

MOUNT PROSPECT, ILL.,
March 8, 1965.

President L. B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last night, I heard Senator WAYNE MORSE and Dr. H. Morgenthau of the University of Chicago discuss the Vietnam situation on an audience-participation program over Chicago radio station WBBM.

I am sure it will interest you to know that over 80 percent of the persons calling WBBM disagreed with our present Vietnam policies. It was my belief over 90 percent of the individuals fully agreed with the viewpoints held by Senator MORSE and Dr. Morgenthau.

I am one of the individuals living in a suburb with a heavy concentration of Republican voters, who worked long and hard for your election. One of the reasons I voted for your administration was because of my complete disagreement with Senator Barry Goldwater's viewpoint on how he would handle the Vietnam situation.

It is most discouraging to see we seem to be pleasing the minority that agreed with Senator Goldwater during the election and causing dissatisfaction among the majority that voted against the policy of bombing raids on Vietnam.

During World War II, I participated in 30 bombing missions over Europe. Our base in England was being bombed night and day by the Germans. These bombing raids did not weaken our morale. On the contrary, they made us even more convinced our cause was just.

I strongly urge you to seek a negotiated peace in Vietnam.

I also wish to see more action on the injustices taking place in Alabama and Mississippi when U.S. citizens are deprived of their constitutional rights to register to vote. I feel it is more important for us to defend democracy within the continental limits of the United States than try to bring about democratic principles in distant lands while many of our citizens are deprived of their constitutional rights.

I wish you much success in your progressive administration programs that do not deal with our present Vietnam policies and pray that we are able to obtain a negotiated peace in Vietnam before it is too late.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. GONZALEZ.

POTTSTOWN, PA.,
March 10, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your remarks on Vietnam are the most daringly truthful of those I have heard expressed. Don't let yourself get whipped in line by the warmongers. There are just a few Senators who have the courage to maintain their identity. The others sound like parrots. The future of this country in the next decade will depend on leaders like yourself—men who realize the great revolution of mankind emerging as a powerful political force throughout the world. If we want any friends, we will have to stop being the "heavy" in the world and support left leaning revolutions which are inevitable. Our domestic policy is much

further to the left than our foreign policy. If men like yourself do not act, we in this country will have drained our resources and neglected our domestic problems. Our children will be shackled to a huge national debt derived from our blunders. This is certainly not the worst thing. They will have to raise their children in a less desirable atmosphere than we live in now, with the whole world alined against us because of our useless goals of our obsolete foreign policy. After Vietnam, what next, Latin America, Africa? This can go on and on. Is this the heritage we want for our children? Our children need colleges now so they can enter the next decade gracefully. There are hundreds of other urgent items which need our attention more than Vietnam. Informed Americans know that we have no more right in Asia than Asians have in Selma, Ala. I wonder if there are any Negroes from Selma in Vietnam. If there are, I wonder if they ask themselves, "What am I doing here?" I am sure the answer usually given by our top men won't inspire them much. I don't think Martin Luther King would feel a trip to Vietnam by him would be in the best interest of freedom.

We need a change in the State Department with their horse-drawn ideas, and we have to get the CIA out of foreign affairs which should be left up to Ambassadors. The Cuban fiasco, a product of the CIA; the Khrushchev and Eisenhower peace talks which were sabotaged after a long preparation, by the U-2 hoax, another CIA incident; and the Congo crisis caused by the white mercenaries, were armed, trained, and paid by the CIA. The CIA is starting to make the Gestapo of Hitler's time look like schoolboys. Most of the CIA adventures are against international law as well as our own. After Vietnam is settled, the CIA has to go.

Yours truly,

JACOB M. SCHOLL.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
March 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: There are many people who strongly support your logical and courageous stand on the Vietnam crisis. Please continue to make your voice heard; you represent those of us who are extremely concerned over the military direction of U.S. policy there.

Mrs. RUTH HARVEY.

REDMOND, OREG., March 10, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
417 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have noted with dismay the march of events in the Vietnam situation along the very course you predicted almost a year ago. Your warning at that time that certain elements were deliberately working to create an expanded military operation is seen to be founded on factual knowledge, and that adds substance to your recent warning concerning eventual involvement with Red China.

We support and applaud your stand on this issue. We concur in the views you have given, and express our hope that you will continue to alert the people to the insidious dangers that lurk in the current U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

Discussing current events with friends, acquaintances, and even strangers, we notice most people quite dubious as to a hope of desirable outcome in the Vietnam matter, but find few who are forthrightly critical. Confusion resulting from observance of the inconsistency between the administration's

5382

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

March 22, 1965

statements and actions seems to inhibit rational consideration.

So we are grateful that in Senator MORSE we have a spokesman who gives a candid exposition of the verities that do exist. Our fervent hope is that more of our national legislators will assert the prerogative of that branch of our Government to keep at least some braking pressure on the administration and its war-bent military advisers.

Our very best wishes.

Sincerely,

DONALD S. KNOWLES,
Mrs. DONALD S. KNOWLES.

CLAYTON, MO.,
March 11, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: What has happened to your wonderful stand on negotiated peace in Vietnam. We need your magnificent stature to help save the human race.

Please continue.

Respectfully,

MILTON R. ISRAEL, M.D.

SOUTH SIDE PHYSICAL MEDICINE CENTER,
Chicago, Ill., March 10, 1965.

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This note is to register my emphatic dissent with respect to your policy in South Vietnam. My reason for dissenting are numerous and it would be presumptuous of me to burden you with all of them, especially since you already possess full familiarity with these reasons.

I want to say that my frustration as an American citizen goes beyond the matter of finding myself in disagreement with the policy my Government is following. My special conundrum is that the party and political standard bearers for whom I, as an independent, voted, presented to the American public a clear image of those who planned not to escalate the war in southeast Asia. The campaign phraseology still rings in my ears. Now that phraseology has been converted to the policies in action of the defeated party that I voted against. I feel disenfranchised.

My faith in the sincerity of presidential candidates' statements is not as strong as it was. I feel that the creation of a climate of world peace has been set back substantially.

I trust and hope you still plan to negotiate a settlement which is honorable and is realistically compatible with a lasting entente.

I hope Senator WAYNE MORSE will hereby (on receipt of a copy of this letter) advise me what I may do to further this course. He has the support of the overwhelming majority of the people with whom I have personally discussed this matter. I hope I will influence others to write similar letters.

Please—an end to escalation. Not withdrawal, but a negotiated peace based upon reality and eventually self-determination of the local population.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR A. RODRIGUEZ, M.D.

MARCH 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My family is newly restored to you as constituents. (Please enter the address below on your mailing list in place of past California and Connecticut addresses.)

We are late in expressing our support for your position on Vietnam, but we support you most fervently. Please persist.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. HALEWOOD.

PORTLAND, OREG.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,

March 11, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am receiving letters daily from all my friends abroad placing the United States of America in the same category as Nazi Germany because of our aggression in Vietnam. This makes me very sad and ashamed since I was in Germany during the reign of Hitler and cannot refute these charges.

Knowing you to be one of the same men in Washington who has urged negotiations, I want to assure you of my continued support and hope that you will continue to stand your ground. Otherwise, we are headed for total destruction.

Yours sincerely,

MISS PAULA MAENAK.

OBERLIN, OHIO,
March 11, 1965.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for opposing our participation in the Vietnamese civil war. It is reminiscent of Senator _____ who courageously opposed our fighting the Filipinos at the turn of the century.

What have we to offer those unfortunate people in Vietnam. Anarchy? Death? Let us have the courage to admit that we are not omnipotent. We cannot undo the effects of French colonial policy and Diem's rule by willing it. By supporting Diem, I believe we lost the "mandate of heaven" in the eyes of the people. To remain as a reactionary force is repugnant to me. After all, when I read the story of the American Revolution, it is not the Tories with whom I identify.

Unfortunately for them, I do not think the Vietnamese have the chance for freedom, as we know it, whichever side wins. It's more a question of who will be left to sign the peace papers.

Yours truly,

Mrs. PHYLLIS KUESTNER.

HOLLYWOOD, FLA.,
March 10, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR: Woke up last night in a cold sweat, after dreamed that I was partly to blame for the Vietnam situation, because of voting for AuH₂O. On awakening I realized I had done no such damn fool thing.

Might as well have though. Our actions there, and lack of same in Selma, turns the whole wide world against us.

Page Welch. Are you conscious agents?

JOHN W. HARVEY.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
March 12, 1965.

SENATOR MORSE: The weight of one person's opinion seems like a futile thing but let me add my expression of opinion on the subject of Vietnam to those I know you are also receiving.

I feel the United States has no right legally to be in Vietnam at all. From all I have read, I am sure that technically this is true. But morally we have no right there. We say we are trying to stop the spread of communism when I feel that it is not our business what form of socioeconomic power structure they build. It may be our concern but it is not our business. I think there is a considerable amount of confusion generated by the equating of communism with the Russian Government or, in this case, communism with the Red China Government. I think we have far more to fear from the spread of China's power in the Vietnams than we have of the spread of communism. And I think the Vietnamese—North as well as South—feel the same way. Historically they have feared China. Since we will never

never win in Vietnam (out of an unthinkable third and last World War), we are playing exactly into China's hands.

I am carrying this letter on for too long. If you have a pile of letters begging that our Government place this problem square in the lap of the United Nations—please add this to the pile.

Sincerely,

DON CONFREY.

P.S.—I know the U.N. is shaky. But that is how it grows and it needs to be pulled together and take another step.

CAMBRIDGE, IDAHO,
March 12, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I just heard your statement over the radio about Vietnam and I cannot express my thoughts in words how thankful I am to you that you have so much courage in the time like this, when most of the Senators support the President's war policy in Vietnam.

I have talked to lot of Idahoans and most of them say "If the election were to be held today they would not cast their vote for Mr. Johnson." I would not vote for him now either.

I have written many letters to FRANK CHURCH from Idaho about Vietnam and I am very much satisfied that United States is fighting a losing war. I use to live there for some time.

I say thanks to your courageous work there, and my hat goes off to you.

Very sincerely yours,

EDWARD WILPONEN.
ADA M. WILPONEN.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
March 9, 1965.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Berkeley Democratic Club in special called session took the following position on the crises in Vietnam: We support the prompt negotiation of a cease-fire in Vietnam and settlement of the Vietnamese civil war under supervision of the United Nations. We oppose escalation of the American military effort in Vietnam.

We wish to send our thanks to you, Senator MORSE, for your outspoken stand on this subject.

Sincerely,

BERKELEY DEMOCRATIC CLUB,
AET WALENTA, President.
NAOMI McLANE, Secretary.

BERWYN, ILL.,
March 12, 1965.

SENATOR MORSE: Thank you so much for your stand on Vietnam.

Present events bear out your contention that we (I sure don't) want to bomb Red China.

I would like to see peace in Vietnam soon.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. CHUTKA.

SPOKANE, WASH.,
March 11, 1965.

Hon. SENATOR MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: Out here in the West we are very conscious of the great tragedy going on day by day, and we are also looking hopefully and listening to such courageous men as yourself, and Senator GRUENING, who are taking the Vietnam question seriously and asking for negotiations. I know it takes courage but without that in this case there will be no chance of survival—all of us older folks that had sons in the last war (we had five boys in it) do not want war any more—my dear husband now dead—went to Alaska to help in the last war as a civilian, and I also worked to do away with war, and now

March 22, 1965

5383

look what we have to leave to the young folks. This note is written to thank you and commend you, and to tell you there are people all around us who are waking up to the fact that our foreign policy is all wrong.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. O. A. CONRAD.

EUGENE, OREG.,
 March 12, 1965.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are terribly concerned over the situation in Vietnam. We believe, as you do, that there must be a negotiated settlement between the south and the north and the United States must withdraw.

Your forthright stand on this issue is both constructive and courageous. We thank you and we pray that reason and right may prevail before the present U.S. policy of increasing military intervention leads to a full-scale Asian war.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. E. W. ANACHER.

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
 Junction City, Oreg., March 9, 1965.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
 U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I admire your courage to speak up about Vietnam. When I read the enclosed news item and then the editorial from the Oregonian this morning I felt sure that many would agree with you and not with the editor. But since you people get so much criticism I want you to know you have supporters too.

I write as a World War II veteran, not a pacifist, and a registered Republican—for whatever that's worth.

Sincerely yours,

BEN E. VEGORS.

CHAMPAIGN, ILL.

DEAR SIR: Just wanted to let you know that I agree with your statements on Vietnam. Please keep doing whatever lies in your power to prevent escalation and to obtain a negotiated settlement followed by withdrawal.

When the President asks Congress to declare war, I'll be counting on you to lead the forces who try to defeat the request.

I have written to my own Senators, DOUGLAS and DIRKSEN, about my feelings on this matter. I have also written to HUMPHREY and JOHNSON. Is there any more that one lone citizen can do?

Mrs. B. ALBERT.

TUCSON, ARIZ.,
 March 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 U.S. Senate,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In these times of great troubles in Vietnam it is very encouraging to realize that at least a few Members of the Congress realize the real situation in southeast Asia.

I am only 16 years old, but I feel that foreign policy of my country is important to all Americans, regardless of their age.

As far as Vietnam is concerned, I feel it is bad for any nation to defy a Geneva agreement and enter a country in the midst of a civil war. What is even more disturbing to me, is that our President, whose campaign I aided, seems to have no regard for human life, having ordered bombings as if they were a routine thing.

I hope that more Congressmen and Senators will see this argument and also urge the United State's withdrawal from South Vietnam.

Very sincerely yours,

KEN KAISERMAN.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
 March 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I attended your lecture here at Rinn Tech auditorium this evening and wish to applaud your comments in writing. Yours was the most cogent criticism of the U.S. policy, or what one can make of it, in Vietnam that I have yet heard from a public official. I only regret there was not more time for questions.

Your analysis of principles and the facts of United States, South Vietnamese, Vietcong, and North Vietnamese actions seemed sound; your concluding comments on social and economic goals were particularly appropriate. I find only one lack in the analysis and proposals you gave, and in those of your comments that have reached the Congressional Quarterly: Insufficient emphasis of the exceedingly diverse and complex cultural patterns of the peoples living in the area of land called Vietnam, as well as in southeast Asia in general, and their historically isolationist ways of life. No government or trusteeship that seeks to insure peace and promote social welfare can long ignore this complexity without serious weakening. The Vietcong certainly have not. Their provisional governments, as you are no doubt aware, are carefully tailored, as circumstances permit, to the variations presented by each community; their goal is not homogeneity or military victory, but simple expansion of control.

I look forward to hearing your voice continued in this much needed protest and hope you will be joined by some of your less bold colleagues before long. There is much need to show the President that he has neither consensus nor acquiescence on these issues.

Sincerely,

G. CRAIG BOLON.

PROVIDENCE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,
 El Paso, Tex., March 11, 1965.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is a voice from such a far country on the border that you may hardly recognize it. At least I want you to know my thankfulness for your incisive thinking and clear courage on the Vietnam crisis. Power to you.

I have just read Hansen Baldwin's article advocating a million men and all that goes with it as the solution. So he would put that land and people through the meat grinder with our boys. Actually, I can't believe that he is serious unless he has taken leave of his senses. This would indeed be going it alone. We should recognize that he and his company are eyeless in Gaza, reaching for the pillars to pull down this temple of civilization upon us all.

With every good wish,

Cordially yours,

PAUL NEWTON POLING,
 Chaplain.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
 March 11, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I honor and commend you for your intelligent, hence courageous, stand on American military participation in Vietnam. It is now overwhelmingly clear that such participation, especially the attacks on North Vietnam, do not even make sense militarily, let alone diplomatically or ethically. I devoutly hope that your judgment of this as preparation for a war on China proves to be wrong. Perhaps because of your speaking out it can be avoided. I honor you for your stand and hope that you will be able to maintain in the face of majority pressure for war and irrational action. I hope that your example

will stir your colleagues to like action, and to an examination of the realities, as opposed to the rhetoric, of the situation.

Best wishes for yourself, and for the tiny voice of sanity you represent.

Sincerely,

NANCY ODINOV.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
 March 8, 1965.

DEAR SIR: I admire your courage in the stand you have taken on the crisis in Vietnam.

My hopes, and prayers are for you. I truly believe that our only hopes of averting an all-out nuclear war is to withdraw our troops, and negotiate for peace. For the sake of all present and future Americans hold firm in your stand for peace. May God bless you.

Thank you.

Mrs. ROBERT RICHARDSON.

NEW ROCHELLE, N.Y.,
 March 12, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are truly grateful to you for your enlightened and courageous stand on our disastrous policy in Vietnam. We strongly support your call for a negotiated settlement.

Very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. ELIAS TANENBAUM.

MARCH 10, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you very highly for your stand in favor of peaceful negotiation of the present conflict in Vietnam. You may be sure that millions of intelligent American citizens back you in this stand and are not taken in by the present dangerous policy of the administration to escalate the war. President Eisenhower, in making his farewell address to the Nation, warned of the menace to freedom by a powerful "military-industrial complex." It certainly seems that this group now dictates policy and humanity is again faced with the terrible danger of a thermonuclear holocaust.

Keep up your struggle against the forces which are leading mankind to disaster, continue to be fearless in exposing them, disregard the criticism of colleagues who have jumped on the bandwagon of "brinkmanship" and know that you are on the side of the human race and certainly have the backing of the majority of our citizens whose voice is not heard by the ruling clique.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. HELRIEGEL.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

ASHLAND, OREG.,
 March 10, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
 Senate Office Building,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope the letters and poll printed on the page of the San Francisco Chronicle enclosed will encourage you in your fight against our increasing, and increasingly futile and murderous meddling in Vietnam, where we've far less excuse and chance of success than King George III had in his American Colonies in 1775-83. It's sad we've forgotten so much, so soon—but please keep trying.

Yours truly,

ROBERT IAN SORT.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle,
 Mar. 9, 1965]

VIET PULLOUT IS FAVORED IN POLL

The northern California public is disenchanted, dismayed, concerned and confused by the state of affairs in South Vietnam, ac-

ording to the balloting in the Chronicle poll on the Vietnam dilemma.

Two out of three respondents say they are confused about what we are fighting for, six out of seven say they are disenchanted over the South Vietnamese Government, and the depth of their concern is made evident by the large number of comments which they enclosed with their ballots. In letters to the editor today will be found a sampling of these views.

Although the Johnson administration seems committed to a hotter war, northern Californians are opposed to intensifying action in Vietnam. Their answers to question 2, for example, show only 14 percent favoring increased action; 24 percent are for holding the line against a wider war, but the majority opinion of 64 percent actually wants to see the United States pull out of South Vietnam. Respondents do not feel that U.S. security is at stake there; 80 percent deny that our security is essentially involved. (The State Department, however, is sending form letters to its correspondents saying: "We are involved in Vietnam because * * * our involvement is essential to American security.")

In an altogether confused situation, what seems clearest is the desire of the Chronicle poll respondents to get the United States extricated somehow from Vietnam, to get the United Nations to accept responsibility for maintaining Vietnam's territorial integrity and to seek the neutralization of the country through negotiations involving the major interested nations, including Communist China and the Soviet Union.

The percentage favoring the bringing of China and Russia into negotiations was 82, which corresponds precisely with a Gallup poll sampling of nationwide opinion.

In a dispatch to the New York Times, James Reston wrote after a journey through the South that he had found the mood in the country about Vietnam to be an odd mixture of concern and trust in the President. Reston heard no serious discussion of the Vietnam problem. To judge from the intensity of feeling displayed by most of our respondents, that is not the case here.

CONFUSION AND CONCERN OVER VIETNAM DILEMMA

Alice E. Ginn, and Jimmie Ginn, San Francisco: "If the United States had not gone to South Vietnam's aid in 1954, it seems certain that the Vietnamese would be ruled by a government of their own choice. They have had, instead, a series of military dictators fighting for U.S. handouts. * * *

"Democracy, by definition, cannot be imposed. A correct U.S. policy in Vietnam should stem from the principle that a government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed."

Walter Gerstel, El Cerrito: "We must end the disastrous Kennan-Dulles containment doctrine in favor of positive, peaceful measures of the foreign aid without military and political interference, perhaps of the Peace Corps type.

"Leaves from the 'Teahouse of the August Moon'—again we are finding ourselves teaching the natives democracy even if we have to kill every single one of them."

Gilbert F. Whipple, San Francisco: "A traditional peasant population which has suffered the dubious advantages of 60 years of French colonial rule, Japanese occupation and then a succession of reactionary autocrats and military strongmen and which has been brutally terrorized by the forces on both sides of the conflict, confined in concentration camps and shuffled about the country, is unlikely to recognize the inherent advantages of constitutional government and the free enterprise system, in whose name these barbarities have been committed.

"The really unfortunate fact is that in this instance even blowing the whistle for the

Marines will not solve the problem. Short of the direct application of nuclear devices the United States would never be able to win a ground war against the Chinese on the southeast Asian peninsula."

Carolyn Allfree, Woodland: "Thank you for your thought-provoking questions. They helped to clarify the problem in my mind and lead me to examine my opinions and personal motives as a citizen of the United States and of the world."

Walter Ballin, San Francisco: "I believe that the 14-nation Geneva Conference should be resumed. The conference should agree on a coalition government (consisting of the right-wing, moderates and leftists) for South Vietnam. This government would pave the way for free elections. The people would probably vote for communism, but if that is what the people want, that is their right, and no nation (including the United States) has the right to interfere in the internal affairs of another country."

M. Mattson, San Francisco: "I think that it is idealistic to hope that we will win the war the way things are going. Unfortunately, we simply must fight harder in order to progress to victory. South Vietnam's war is now also our war. Our prestige, for whatever it's worth, and our security, indirectly, are involved and threatened. The United Nations is simply not strong enough to contain the war, although, I agree that it would be much safer to hand the whole thing over to them * * *

"South Vietnam is simply another Communist stepping stone to world domination. They must be stopped somewhere. South Vietnam is just as good as anyplace."

H. E. Soderstrom, Healdsburg: "It seems to me that the Communist issue is greatly overdone in Vietnam as it is elsewhere. I think the issue in Vietnam is the age-old issue of the people versus the landed gentry plus the military.

"Why is it that our country, founded in revolution, always takes the side of the status quo, against the revolution?"

George S. Koch, Berkeley: "It seems to me senseless to carry on military operations in a country where it would seem we really are not welcome by the majority of the people. At least the people (the little people) do not seem to want our kind of freedom and democracy, as they know it by our actions—air raids on villages where nonmilitary people are killed and so on.

"Before it is too late—let us get the world into a conference to settle this affair—our do it yourself program just isn't worth it."

R. S. Adams, Oakland: "I am convinced that the Vietnamese people would be better off with a Communist government than they have been under the control of foreign military and Roman Catholic rule.

"United States ambitions in Vietnam include all the evils of extraterritoriality from which China suffered until the Communists ended it. This opinion does not all imply a favorable attitude toward communism in the rest of the world—but it would probably be an improvement over the status quo in South Vietnam where, again, the Catholic politicians block all social evolution."

John Laurie, Nevada City: "The issue of the war in Vietnam is the same as the issue of the Korean war. The issue is whether the Communists should be allowed to conquer and subjugate the world by the use of force. The value of Vietnam lies not in whatever small strategic value it may have. Vietnam is a symbol to the entire world of our determination to resist the spread of communism and to allow the peoples of the world to choose their political philosophies by their economic and social merit rather than by their local military strength.

"We must * * * make it our intention to supply enough aid to the Vietnamese people to insure the speedy defeat of the Vietcong aggression."

Walter S. Strauss, San Rafael: "In particular reference to question No. 5, I feel that there is a very substantial difference between the Vietnam and the Korean conflict.

"In the latter, the United States had support from other members of the United Nations and, certainly full support and cooperation from the South Korean Government and people. None of this is true in Vietnam."

Dorothy Heinemann, Concord: "If the United States became almost hysterical at the thought of Cuba, 90 miles away, being a base for weapons not marked 'made in U.S.A.' and demanded their removal, is it then perfectly all right to fill up Vietnam and Laos and the South China Seas with American weapons just as close as we can get to China with whom we decline even to speak?"

"Is it 'unprovoked aggression' when a person born in Vietnam, and whose parents and grandparents were born there, sets off a bomb at an American military installation in their country, and then is it perfectly all right and a victory to burn and destroy Vietnamese people, houses and villages because someone there does not hold the officially approved made in America' opinions?"

James C. Brown, Felton: "I believe the United States has problems enough here at home to solve and it is not necessary to expend billions in taxpayers' money and sacrifice the lives of our soldiers to impose our way of life on a people who clearly are not adapted to our kind of society.

"China has been exploited by Japan, Russia, Great Britain, France, and the United States. A new era has dawned and we must recognize that China is a dominant force in the world and any settlement of southeast Asian problems will have to have China's concurrence."

Philip S. Whalen, Palo Alto: "It is far past time to shape a more human definition of victory in Vietnam. The program of developing the lower Mekong Basin, in which several countries have already participated for several years, is eminently constructive, humanly beneficial, and relatively immune to political attack.

"Introduction of a United Nations presence in the form of a much-needed security force for that program would give the U.N. prestige and influence in southeast Asia. As a counter to Sukarno's and Mao's unprincipled, warlike goals there, this would constitute both a substantial and genuinely moral victory for us."

THE CHRONICLE POLL: RESULTS OF BALLOT No. 45—DILEMMA IN VIETNAM

Following are the results of ballot No. 45 of the Chronicle poll which appeared on this page February 23. The percentages indicated are based on the total number of ballots received. Where the "Yes" and "No" percentages do not add up to 100, the difference represents ballots expressing no opinion.

1. Eleven years ago the United States began giving military aid and advice to the South Vietnamese to help them resist infiltration and takeover by the North Vietnamese.

(a) Do you think it was wise to take that step onto the mainland of Asia? Yes, 28 percent; no, 70 percent.

(b) If the United States had not gone to South Vietnam's aid in 1954, do you think communism would control the country today? Yes, 53 percent; no, 27 percent.

2. Today South Vietnam admittedly has not achieved the political and military stability which the United States set out to encourage, and the situation is deteriorating. Check which of the following courses of action you favor:

(a) Hold the line against widening the war. Yes, 24 percent; no, 16 percent.

March 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5385

(b) Increase action; do whatever it takes to win, even if that means widening the war. Yes, 14 percent; no, 34 percent.

(c) Pull out of South Vietnam. Yes, 54 percent; no, 16 percent.

(d) Obtain the U.N.'s acceptance of responsibility for maintaining the territorial integrity of South Vietnam. Yes, 63 percent; no, 11 percent.

3. From what you know about the principles of the South Vietnamese Government, are your sympathies with it? Yes, 12 percent; no, 76 percent.

4. Do you feel it is essential to our security that the U.S. Armed Forces hold South Vietnam? Yes, 19 percent; no, 80 percent.

5. Do you feel that the issues in the Vietnam conflict are basically the same as those in the Korean conflict? Yes, 44 percent; no, 44 percent.

6. General de Gaulle and U Thant are pressing for negotiations among the major interested nations for the neutralization of Vietnam and other parts of southeast Asia.

(a) Would you favor inviting Communist China and the Soviet Union to sit in on these negotiations? Yes, 82 percent; no, 15 percent.

7. U.S. forces in South Vietnam now number about 24,000. Many are draftees who complain they do not know why they are there or what they are supposed to be fighting for.

(a) Do you share this confusion? Yes, 61 percent; no, 34 percent.

(b) Would you favor a policy of sending only volunteers—not draftees—to military duty in Vietnam? Yes, 32 percent; no, 46 percent.

HELPER, UTAH,
March 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to tell you that I am in full accord with your opinions expressed concerning Vietnam. We have no business there and should get out at once. Our actions there is a worldwide disgrace. We are in there on the excuse that the South Vietnam Government invited us in to help. But that was some nine governments ago, and the Vietnam people are not with us in this struggle.

I am suspicious that the administration's real reason for intensifying the campaign there is to inveigle Red China into the conflict so we can, with some reasonable excuse, obliterate China's nuclear potential before they get it perfected. I vigorously disapprove of this, too.

It is disgraceful to know that the United States sends marines and others to establish "freedom" in Vietnam, while it will not do likewise for its own people here at home in South.

The most powerful country in the world cannot save a country from communism, or any other "ism," if most of that country's people do not also have their heart in the struggle. And the South Vietnam people do not.

Keep up the fight. Some one must. I wish that our own Utah Senators would do likewise. If I can help you in any way, I am glad to do so.

Yours truly,

G. T. HARRISON.

SCAPPOOSE, OREG.,
March 10, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for putting into words what many of us feel about our policy in Vietnam.

Our "escalation" of this war in North Vietnam and eventually China can only lead to world war III and disaster. We will bleed

our Nation white in a 30-year war on the Asian mainland.

Please keep plugging away loud and clear until our President shakes loose of the war hawks and narrow thinkers and gets our Nation on the path to peace.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD SAHOJIAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
March 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I wish the President would listen to your advice on Vietnam.

His wisdom, practicality and morality are in sharp contrast to the phony psychology at the basis of our present policy.

I am dismayed and heartsick, after voting and working for Mr. Johnson, that he repudiated his campaign pledges and appropriated the mad policies of Mr. Goldwater.

You are a great patriot and I hope that you and your colleagues of like mind will get increasing support to result in a change toward peace instead of war (undeclared).

Thank you.

Yours very warmly,

HAROLD N. EVANS.

MEXICO, MO.,
March 12, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please keep talking. Your voice is strength to thoughtful Americans and those of us who have sons in military service.

Gratefully,

MARY SEARFOSS.

CHICAGO, ILL.

SENATOR MORSE: Please keep on with trying to get us out of Vietnam.

Everything happening there proves out your contention that the United States wishes to get at Red China.

Enclosed is a column by Mr. Akers that has a quote made by President Johnson about Vietnam.

What a change from then to now.

What a "Great Society" we are getting.

Has Vietnam always been used as an excuse or is this of recent origin?

I hate reading the papers lately—all it is about is Vietnam, the racial strife out South, the teenage problems (I do not blame the youngsters, it is the terrible headlines they are subjected to; they feel they must live fast—they might not be around for long), the violence found out in the streets, etc.

Sincerely,

STEPHANIE CHUTKA.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times,
Mar. 10, 1965]

TIME WILL TEST VIETNAM POLICIES
(By Milburn P. Akers)

On February 10, 1954, President Dwight D. Eisenhower said he "could conceive of no greater tragedy than for the United States to become involved in an all-out war in Indochina."

When he made that assertion the position of the French, who had spent nearly 8 years trying to reestablish themselves in their colonies of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, was becoming desperate. They were destined to surrender at Dien Bien Phu in a few months.

Throughout that long and bloody struggle (France had an estimated 172,000 casualties, the Communist Vietnam more than three times that number, and approximately 250,000 civilians had been killed) the United States supported France unstintingly with economic aid.

As the French situation degenerated, Paris sent numerous emissaries to Washington seeking active military intervention by the

United States, pleading, when its army was under siege at Dien Bien Phu, for an airlift of sufficient size to supply its troops.

It was in this context that President Eisenhower publicly stated his determination that the United States avoid an all-out war in Indochina. It was in the same context that a Senator from Texas, Lyndon B. Johnson, declared in Senate debate that he was "against sending American GIs into the mud and muck of Indochina on a blood-letting spree to perpetuate colonialism and white man's exploitation in Asia."

It was in the same context that Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, then Army chief of staff, reported that "the price of victory in Indochina would be as great as, or greater than, that we paid in Korea." Ridgway also insisted that the United States could not win without involving its ground troops.

It was less than a year earlier that John Foster Dulles, then Secretary of State, had hailed the so-called Navarre plan as one "designed to break the organized body of Communist aggression (in Vietnam) by the end of the 1955 fighting season."

That turned out to be wishful thinking. Gen. Henry Navarre, author of the Dulles-approved plan to reestablish French control in Indochina, subsequently informed his government (in a secret report later made public) that the war in the southeast Asian peninsula could not be won in a military sense, and that all that could be hoped for was a "coup nul," or draw.

The French were fighting Vietnamese Communists in 1954; Communists who, in fact, were led then as now by Ho Chi Minh who had, then as now, Gen. V. Nguyen Giap as his chief military commander, one whose strategy and tactics proved superior to anything shown by the elite of the French general corps. The enemy was the same in 1954 as now.

The Geneva (Switzerland) accords of 1954, which came after the French surrender at Dien Bien Phu, split Vietnam in two. A Communist entity was established in the north and a supposedly pro-Western one in the south, for the revolt against French efforts to reestablish themselves did not receive united backing among the Vietnamese themselves. Many fought with the French.

The Eisenhower administration, which had supported the French effort financially and with military equipment, took the South Vietnamese regime of Ngo Dinh Diem under its wing and poured in vast amounts of economic aid and provided a group of 600 military advisers to assist Diem in training an army.

All the while the Vietcong—initially indigenous Communist guerrillas—were increasingly harassing the Diem regime. By 1961 they had gained such foothold that Ho Chi Minh, Communist master in North Vietnam, decided to play a bigger hand in South Vietnam.

The late President John F. Kennedy, decided to give Diem even greater assistance. Since the decision, the United States has become increasingly involved. It now has more than 26,000 soldiers and marines in South Vietnam; its Air Force is engaged both in South Vietnam against the Vietcong and in North Vietnam in strikes against Communist military installations. We continue to maintain the fiction, however, that we are in South Vietnam merely as advisers to the Saigon government.

The shape of things to come—still far from discernible—will demonstrate whether Eisenhower and his chief of staff, General Ridgway, were correct, or if Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, followed a wiser policy.

5386

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

March 22, 1965

Will the result be a "coup nul," as the French general predicted was the most that could be expected at that time?

MADISON, WIS.,
March 3, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have had an opportunity to read only small snatches of your speech before the Senate in which you pointed out what should have been known by all long ago: that our foreign policy is in many instances our oil policy. As you no doubt know, the wire services and big city dailies in the Middle West ignored your speech in their reporting. Although I am not technically one of your people, I believe that all progressives look upon you as more or less their man for today. If it would be possible I would be most grateful to you and your office if they could send me the text of the above-mentioned speech in full.

Your position on Vietnam is, along with those of a few other sane Senators, the only reasonable solution to that rotten mess. Your position has the added virtue of having been proposed long before most of the others spoke out. For many years now I have respected you as a man who serves the people of the United States in their continuing battle against entrenched privilege, greed, and power. You are, furthermore, the greatest Senator since George Norris.

Very sincerely yours,

Rev. RUSSELL G. GEEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
March 9, 1965.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate of the United States,
Capital Hill,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please continue in your stand against our Vietnam policy. All the many arguments against it that I can think of you have expressed better in your speeches. Yours is one of the few voices of reason—please continue to make it heard.

When I became a citizen of this country last year I did so with the conviction, which many Europeans used to share, that America was the great moral power in this world. This conviction is receiving a serious blow. Not only are we not acting in Vietnam's interest, but I believe, not even in our own. Please persevere in your efforts to enlighten Congress and the American people.

Sincerely,

BRIGITTE DEWOLFE
Mr. FRED DEWOLFE.

NAPLES, FLA.,
March 7, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: I agree with your views on U.S. foreign policy, Vietnam issue specifically. I only wish your opinions could be carried to the people with greater frequency. I know you spoke at Stanford this past week, yet I have not been able to find any coverage of your speech in the press. Is there any place to which you would direct me?

Yours,

MAC WADDELL.

EUGENE, OREG.,
March 13, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are commended on your fight to stop escalation of the war in Vietnam and to seek peace through negotiation. I urge you to continue in your efforts. The aggressive actions taken by our

Government in that country become more and more appalling each day.

Sincerely,

JUDITH Y. NEWTON.

DETROIT, MICH.,
March 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to express my wholehearted support for your courageous stand on immediate negotiations to end the war in South Vietnam. I would welcome your sending me copies of your speeches on this subject.

Enclosed is a copy of my letter to President Johnson urging an immediate end to the war. Please let me know what I can do to help you in your struggle for a peaceful world.

Sincerely yours,

MAX WENDER.

DETROIT, MICH.,
February 14, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: I am horrified at our three unprovoked air-raid attacks against North Vietnam. If some foreign power had done this to the United States, we would all rise in indignation against such barbarism.

These air strikes are obviously moves in a titanic chess game played by our militarists, using the lives of 180 million Americans as pawns. When the game has been escalated to the point of firing off of atomic missiles, 100 million or more American lives, including your family and mine, will be sacrificed to the whims of these callous war hawks. None of the issues at stake can possibly be worth the extermination of our country.

I supported your election campaign because you and the Democratic Party promised us peace. When Senator Goldwater advocated the bombing of North Vietnam and the introduction of atomic warfare, he was considered a maniac and thoroughly repudiated by the American people. Now you appear to be carrying out the Goldwater suicidal war program.

The Pentagon war hawks must not be permitted to plunge the world into annihilation. I strongly urge that you take immediate and urgent steps to stop our headlong race into world war III. I recommend that you order the immediate return home of all our Armed Forces. This will not only assure the preservation of world peace, it will also put an end to our gold drain which is already shaking the foundations of our economy.

You now have the historic choice of unleashing a terrible atomic war which would destroy all humanity, or of taking your place in history as a great humanitarian alongside of Washington, Lincoln, and Roosevelt by acting to preserve world peace. Your ordering our Armed Forces to return home will have the support and blessing of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Very respectfully yours,

MAX WENDER.

FOOTHILL COLLEGE,
Los Altos Hills, Calif.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your recent speech at Stanford gives some of us who have despaired of late at the turn of events in Vietnam some hope that we are not sliding down the grade of war without a whimper. Your voice of dissent loud and clear is a fine display of personal courage and high morality. It is necessary if our children are to learn that democracy means something more than

"rally round the flag" in times of great issues.

I might say that your attempt to keep the press here from misinterpreting your speech by placing the body of that speech in their hands met with little success. The San Francisco Chronicle of Friday, March 5 made it seem as if you were accusing the Air Force of deliberately provoking a war with China.

Might I have a copy of that press release so that I may have it to document your opinion on this matter?

Yours truly,

W. E. TINSLEY,
Department of Philosophy.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
March 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have my full admiration and support for your courageous stand on that Vietnamese tragedy. If you have available copies of statements or speeches you have made on our Vietnam policy, I would appreciate whatever you can send. I would like to distribute them to those with whom I work.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT DRESBACH.

KIRKLAND, ELLIS, HODSON,
CHAFFETZ & MASTERS,
Chicago, Ill., March 8, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although I have heard comments of high praise concerning your taped interview last Sunday on radio station WEBB, I am disappointed that I was able to hear only the last portion of the broadcast. My personal inclination leads to serious misgivings concerning the direction of the administration's direction in Vietnam. However, the "news blackout" (particularly in the Chicago press) makes it difficult to make an intelligent evaluation of the facts pro and con which underlie the current course of events in southeast Asia. For this reason, the factual objectiveness of your remarks was refreshing and helpful to those seeking an enlightened evaluation of the U.S. commitments in Asia.

Since, as I mentioned, I was not able to hear the complete broadcast, I am anxious for further information. I wonder if you have reprints of any speeches you may have made in which you have detailed the factual basis for your beliefs concerning Vietnam. I would appreciate any such information.

Congratulations on your conscientious efforts to objectively challenge further U.S. commitments without full disclosure of the facts and enlightened debate of the consequences of such commitments.

Sincerely yours,

CRAIG W. CHRISTENSEN.

WINCHESTER, MASS.,
March 8, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my appreciation for your courage in speaking out against the present administration's decision to escalate the war in Vietnam. There has been a conspicuous lack of candor on the part of the President and his advisers regarding the situation there. That it has reached a critical stage is clear by now.

Your speeches on the Senate floor have been only very sketchily reported by the daily press and I would therefore appreciate receiving some of this material and your views.

Very truly yours,

F. M. WIENER.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
March 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your effort to persuade the President to mediate the war in Vietnam. Please continue; we wish we had more courageous people like you.

Please send me a copy of your speech of March 2, also any other material on Vietnam that you have available, including previous speeches of yours.

Thank you for your continuing efforts on behalf of peace.

Sincerely,

BEATRICE BOYER.

MELROSE PARK, PA.,
March 15, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I warmly support your position on Vietnam. To further that position I hope that you can do something to broadcast publicly the number of women and children that our successful air strikes in North Vietnam have succeeded in killing. The American people are entitled to know how many nonmilitary persons have to be mutilated or killed in order to prove that peace is the wisest policy.

Sincerely yours,

EDGAR H. SCHUSTER.
NANCY P. SCHUSTER.

EL CERRITO, CALIF.,
March 15, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want you to know that you have citizen support in your pursuit of a sane U.S. policy toward Vietnam.

We feel we must seek peace under any circumstances in that country.

Sincerely,

PAUL LICHT, Ph. D.,
BARBARA LICHT.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
March 15, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: President Johnson's expansion of American aggression in southeast Asia shows his contempt for the American people who voted overwhelmingly for peace in last November's election. I am wondering if we have representative government any more, or has the Administration gone insane? It is very evident that the "military industrial complex" of which President Eisenhower warned has now superseded Congress in making important decisions, with the Pentagon sadists in the driver's seat.

The incinerating of helpless peasants and their children with napalm bombs, the herding of whole communities into concentration camps, the poisoning of food crops and destruction of homes are crimes which put the United States outside the pale of civilization. These barbarous acts have only been paralleled by the Nazi monster of Europe. And all these excesses are necessary we are told to "preserve freedom in southeast Asia."

At the trials of the Nazi criminals in Nuremberg, the Court held that the German people were equally guilty in that they failed to stay the hands of the sadists. All humanity, including the World Council of Churches, the Pope, and our European allies call for an end to this genocidal war and for an early negotiated peace. In reply, President Johnson lands additional forces in South Vietnam and steps up the bombing of North Vietnam. Someone in Washington is itching for a world holocaust. The collective voice of the American people must rise to a crescendo and stop these maniacs from destroying the world.

Your constant fight for peace, Senator, is well known and appreciated. While there is still time, a still greater effort must be made in Congress to stop the drift toward total destruction. I am fully confident that you will do more than your share to realize this worthy goal.

I remain,

Very truly yours,

MICHAEL CLUNE.

LINCOLNWOOD, ILL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have followed with interest your recent statements on our policy in Vietnam. For whatever good it does, I just wanted to thank you, since I agree substantially with them.

Sincerely yours,

REUBEN EISENSTEIN.

MARCH 15, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: First let me tell you that I agree 100 percent with your stand on the Vietnam mess and I hope and pray that many more Senators will come to see things your way.

Second I also agree with you 100 percent regarding our foreign aid spending because it is just the same as throwing this good money and material down the sewer.

Third, do you print a newsletter like the one that Senator NEUBERGER does and if so would you please be so kind as to place my name on your mailing list.

And last but not least can we of the U.S. Postal Service count on you to support any fair legislation that our organizations might be seeking.

Please continue to take the independent stand when it is the right thing to do regardless if not popular with the Democratic Party. We need more men like yourself in the Congress and I hope and pray that you will be in the U.S. Senate for many more years.

May God bless you,
Very truly yours,

PETER A. CLARIUS.

STATEN ISLAND, N.Y.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
March 13, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept my expression of admiration and gratitude for your efforts toward world peace. It is inevitable that men of your vision and courage are subjected to criticism and abuse but be assured that millions, like myself, are admiring and grateful.

Sincerely,

MAURICE H. SCHY.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
March 13, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your statement at Stanford University was an oasis of clarity in a desert of blind administration policy. Please be assured that many Americans cling to your continued courageous statements decrying American attempts to wreak its will in Vietnam through pure bullying power. Our course seems morally indefensible, and conceivably strategically ridiculous—or disastrous. Power politics in the nuclear age merits only derision, as an instrument of children—but the associated horrors force us to substitute shame and terror for laughter.

International policing and international consensus are the only goals worth working for these days. As the most powerful Nation on earth, we, above all, should lead the way

toward such an end. We have the potentiality to be an inspiring force, but if we insist on attempting to rule the world, we can expect to go the way of Rome, Napoleon, and Hitler.

But while the country allows WAYNE MORSE to speak, I can still be proud of what the United States stands for—and hope that someday such voices will be multiplied sufficiently to change our militaristic stance.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MORRIS B. PARLOFF.

FRESNO, CALIF.,
March 12, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your principled stand in regard to the U.S. undeclared war in Vietnam.

In my estimation you are a giant among pygmies. Your steadfast stand is beginning to gain some support from other Congressmen.

It appears President Johnson and his clique are a stubborn lot so it is going to be a tough struggle to reverse their disastrous course.

Again, many thanks for your good work.

Yours respectfully,

ARMAS WIDGREN.

LONGVIEW, WASH.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Again, congratulations on your firm stand on Vietnam. You must try for more and more publicity of your views and your reasons for holding those views.

Your TV statements on Vietnam hearten me greatly. They make me realize that insanity is not unanimous in the U.S. Senate.

Respectfully,

RALPH W. JOHNSON.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
March 16, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please stop bombings of North Vietnam before we have a war with China. Negotiate.

THOMAS A. ZEITZ.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 13, 1965.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Perhaps shock treatment might wake the President to the truth * * * that most of our people are against the Vietnam war. Start a movement toward impeachment. This might make the front pages and make everyone realize the insanity of our actions.

I voted for J.F.K. only because I was so much against Goldwater. Johnson promised peace. He has betrayed me and the American people, in fact, the whole world. The New York Times of March 7 even indicates he personally may have selected some of the targets for bombardment.

Bold action is indicated. Please keep up your wonderful work.

You are, to me, one of the few honorable Senators.

Respectfully,

HARRY HURST.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
March 14, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to express strong support for your sane, courageous stand on South Vietnam. I have written many letters to Senators, Representatives, and others in support of your urging of nego-

tations, a reconvening of the Geneva Conference, and the peaceful administration of Vietnam.

Thank you for your dedicated service to our Nation.

Respectfully yours,

Miss ELLEN THOMAS.

WOOSTER, OHIO,
March 12, 1965.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: From what I read in the papers and hear over the radio we seem to be getting more deeply involved in Vietnam each day. It sounds like we are not only involved in the civil war of an Asiatic nation, but are in the middle of a fight between Catholics and Buddhists.

There seems to be considerable doubt as to whether the majority of South Vietnamese understand what they are fighting for, and our present tactics may not help much.

On February 27 Drew Pearson's column reported Gen. Samuel Williams, former U.S. military adviser to President Diem, who says "Every non-Communist in a village that we bomb is going to be a darned good Communist by the time we get through."

Several times recently I have heard a news report indicating that you are one of the few Senators who dares, not only to think for yourself, but to express your views even when most everyone else is "parroting" what they think the most influential Government leaders and citizens want to hear.

It certainly is difficult to understand why we can spend billions of dollars trying to preserve freedom and protect South Vietnamese from the brutalities of communism, but are helpless to prevent the same kind of treatment of citizens in Alabama and Mississippi by city and State officials.

Please continue your courageous leadership.

Sincerely,

ALMA CHITTUM.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
March 16, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Protest insane Asia policy. Demand McNamara and Bundy brothers resign.

WOODY BANES.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
March 15, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am very much interested in your statements relating to the official white paper on Vietnam. I am preparing a term paper for college, and would appreciate your sending me both a copy of the white paper, and your answer. I am not quite sure just what the white paper means—does it represent what is referred to in slang "a whitewash" or to use a more dignified term, a rationalization of our policy there.

I assure you that you have the whole-hearted support of thousands and thousands of Americans, but somehow this support is not evidenced in the reports of the newspapers. The major magazines editorially support the present escalation, and try to play down the people's outcry for negotiations and peace.

At the moment I am reading Carl Sandburg's "The War Years" (life of Lincoln) and it seems that the forces against Lincoln were highly publicized while the people's voices were played down. The role of the press it seems to me has always been to withhold what the people are saying. Today however, the civil rights movement seems to have caught on and even the press is begin-

ning to realize that it must keep up with the people.

Thank you for whatever you may be able to send.

Respectfully and cordially yours,

Mrs. ROSE BOIN.

BRONX, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I appeal to you (one of our enlightened Senators) to urge the President to lift the veil of silence surrounding our Asiatic policy, and to use all possible channels to negotiate for peace in Vietnam. W. Lippmann, in the March 15 issue of Newsweek, and the editorial article in the New York Times of March 10 clearly state the reasons for such actions.

The President was elected mainly because of his nonmilitary attitude to a solution of the Asian situation, consultation with our allies, neutrals, and a regard for world opinion, as well as self-determination, should be factors in our foreign policies, and deterring influences in the escalation of the war. Any other course will tarnish our image, gain us enemies, and add to our burden in the loss of men and fortune. The military faction should not influence our judgments. I doubt if we have the support of the Buddhists (who constitute the majority in South Vietnam) if we have to export their priests. Again I urge you to renew your efforts for peace.

Sincerely your,

SOLOMON SCHIFF.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch,
Mar. 19, 1965]

THE HARD MORSE HEAD

You need a good, hard head to keep on battering it against the wall of official propaganda. We are grateful that Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, has one. President Johnson may succeed in silencing some critics of his Vietnam policy, but he will not silence Senator MORSE, whose analysis of the State Department's white paper is excerpted on this page. Right or wrong, the Senator is performing a public service by insisting that policies which could lead to nuclear war shall at least be discussed; and on the whole, in our opinion, he is right.

The power of Government to dominate if not control public opinion on the most momentous issue of our times is frightening indeed. For various reasons, many Americans appear to have abdicated their responsibility of judgment in foreign affairs; they do not feel competent to have an opinion on matters so remote and complex.

The fallacy here is that judgments on the big issues of foreign policy—the issues that decide the very destiny of man—do not actually depend on esoteric knowledge available only to highly trained "experts." The basic questions are simple. Every American is entitled to an opinion on them even though his information may not be as extensive as the State Department's.

If the typical American knows what is right and decent in Alabama, he is capable of knowing what is right and decent in South Vietnam. It is not right, it is not decent, to wage war in Asia on the hypocritical pretext that we are seeking peace.

President Johnson's intentions may be good, but he still has around him advisers who have never been able to think up any foreign policy for the United States except anti-Communist "containment," which is not a policy so much as a bankrupt state of mind. As John K. Galbraith said the other day, foreign policy has become "a favored field for those who have a nostalgia for past error." It is time that the enormous error of our Vietnam policy be corrected, and men like Senator Morse are doing a great service by saying so.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch
Mar. 19, 1965]

SILENCE ON THE NEW ASIAN WAR: SENATOR REPLYING TO WHITE PAPER, URGES PUBLIC TO INSIST ON DISCUSSION

(From an address by WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon)

Last summer and fall, many voices were raised by American politicians and by political generals of South Vietnam to "go north." The war in South Vietnam was being lost. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, one of the passing parade of Vietnamese leaders, was anxious that the losses in the south be covered by expansion of the war into North Vietnam by the United States. A presidential campaign was being conducted in the United States almost entirely on the issue of who was placing his faith in military power to solve all our problems and who was not.

On September 28, 1964, at Manchester, N.H., President Lyndon Johnson said of all this:

"So just for the moment I have not thought that we were ready for American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys. What I have been trying to do, with the situation that I found, was to get the boys in Vietnam to do their own fighting with our advice and with our equipment. That is the course we are following.

"So we are not going north and drop bombs at this stage of the game, and we are not going south and run out and leave it for the Communists to take over. We have lost 190 American lives, and to each one of those 190 families this is a major war * * *"

Time after time, the spokesmen for the administration told the public and told congressional committees in private that what was going on in South Vietnam was essentially a civil war.

Yet last month all these policy statements of why expansion of the war would serve no purpose were thrown out by the same people who had made them. Something called a white paper was published by the State Department to coincide with the change in policy. But this white paper did not afford any explanation or any reason or any justification of a change in policy.

What it did in fact was to confirm and verify what we have been told so many times: that somewhere between 10 and 20 percent of the number and about 10 percent of the weapons of the Vietcong rebels come from outside South Vietnam.

That is what the white paper confirms. That is all. It does not even claim that the war is any less a civil war than it ever was.

The white paper estimates that a maximum of 37,100 infiltrators entered South Vietnam from the north from 1959 through 1964. Yet with the known casualties and the estimated current guerrilla force, these men from the north still constitute at most 20 percent of the Vietcong. The confirmed infiltrators constitute only 12 percent.

Everything in the white paper with the sole exception of the boat sunk on February 16 of this year was known to the administration last summer and last fall when the President said "we are not going north," and when both the Pentagon and the State Department insisted that no useful purpose would be served in the south by attacking the north.

And today it is still just as true as it was then that the Vietcong rebellion is essentially a South Vietnamese affair in personnel and weapons.

The white paper is the signal for a new war, because we could not win the one that was already going on.

The committing of 3,500 marines to ground combat is only the first installment of U.S. ground forces that will be needed. I am satisfied that what is behind our expansion of the war is a design to match our half mil-

lion ground forces in Europe with half a million in Asia, to act as the "tripwire" that would bring the full American nuclear power to bear upon China should she make any move to support local governments.

That is the direction we are now taking in Asia. It is the direction of singlehanded U.S. containment not only of China but of all political movements that seek to remove Western influences from southeast Asia. No longer do we propose to organize groupings of friendly countries to act in concert, such as the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. No longer do we plan to seek the concerted action of our Western allies.

We are now committed to "going it alone" and putting American soldiers into Asia on whatever scale needed to carry out this objective.

The pretense that we are in South Vietnam to help the people win a fight for freedom has been entirely dropped. From now on, the war will be conducted by Americans, under American command, for American objectives.

I am satisfied that the President understands the inherent fallacies in his presumption that we can bring the Vietcong to heel by bombing North Vietnam. He knows the American people will understand them, too, if there is any discussion in depth of Asian affairs.

His announced policy requires North Vietnam to stop aiding the rebels, it requires the Vietcong to collapse as a result, and it requires stability to emerge in South Vietnam, all as a result of these bombings. The likelihood of any of these things happening is so remote that I do not wonder at the massive campaign with the press and Members of Congress to support what is being done without raising questions or objections.

I hope that silence on the part of the American public and its Congress will not continue. If it does, that silence will be broken not by wisdom but by casualty lists.

I do not suggest that South Vietnam is not of interest to us. But it is not the kind of vital interest that deserves to be protected by American blood. It is the kind of interest that should be the subject of discussion with other affected nations, and there are many nations that are even more vitally affected than we are.

That is why I continue to hope that the President will respond to U Thant's appeal for negotiations under United Nations auspices. And above all, I hope that the American people will bestir themselves to examine the implications of our present course in Asia, and make their voices heard in support of U Thant, Pope Paul, and the Council of Churches. Otherwise, we stand to awaken only when we are being drenched in blood and for an objective that is not shared by any of our allies or even by those nations in Asia whose really vital interests are at stake.

**POLITICS, ECONOMICS BEHIND
 KRUPP DEAL**

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Elliot Janeway, entitled "Politics, Economics Behind Krupp Deal," published on February 24, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**POLITICS, ECONOMICS BEHIND KRUPP DEAL
 (By Elliot Janeway)**

NEW YORK, February 24.—Once again, the biggest businessman in Europe is Krupp. When the weapons of war were just bullets and bombs, Krupp was the armament king. Now that nuclear weapons have transformed the nature of war, the struggle for national

power has moved from battlefield to marketplace. In today's economic warfare, Krupp is again proving itself preeminent.

Here's what Krupp is up to. This biggest of all private industrial empires, this personification of capitalism, this symbolic target of Russian propaganda, is going into partnership with the Polish Government.

Believe it or not, Krupp is putting its money into a joint venture to produce machine tools at a new plant to be put up near Warsaw. No question about it, this is not an essay in reparations or aid. It is a business proposition, and Krupp makes no bones about expecting to do well out of it. This projects a pretty high rate of return.

ALWAYS POLITICAL ANGLE

Not that there isn't a political angle to this latest move of Krupp's. The way things work in Europe, there always is when a major corporation makes a major move abroad—in Europe, foreign investment and foreign trade are extensions and expressions of foreign policy (a lesson which Americans have yet to learn).

The main political purpose behind this economic move is a scissors play on East Germany, which will thus be caught between new enemy West Germany and old enemy Poland. By extension, this serves a more general political purpose; namely, to intensify the competitive splits among the hungry satellite countries. Washington is for the first time alert to the opportunities arising from this competition and the economic and social unrest it reflects.

Here's the economic meaning of Krupp's [Bonn-blessed] partnership with Polish statism. Not merely West Germany, but all of Western Europe, simply has too much industrial capacity to earn its living by taking in its own washing—that is, by consuming what it is capable of producing.

CONTINUING TO EXPAND

Far from solving this problem of excess capacity, the Common Market has intensified it. For all of Western Europe is continuing to expand its productive capacities—and, be it noted, the business incentive to invest in expansion has increased even faster than Americanized living standards and the population growth have increased consumption.

More than ever, Europe must export to live. What's more, everyone in Europe knows it. Everyone in Europe also knows that there isn't going to be any unemployment in Western Europe. French President Charles de Gaulle may talk all he pleases about what is sound in finance but, if times get tough, France will follow the rest in subsidizing employment by dumping surplus production abroad.

Right now, Europe's money men have the jitters for fear that the United States may "solve" its supposed payments crisis by draining Europe of the dollars that have been lubricating her boom. Characteristically, Krupp is making a beeline for the closest dumping ground in sight.

But the biggest dumping ground for any European industrial surplus is the United States. If we try to look too good dollarwise, and in the process put too much of a squeeze on Western Europe moneywise, we are likely to find ourselves flooded with distress European products dumped here at giveaway prices. Krupp's move into Poland is an early warning signal that its energetic salesmen must be expected here, too.

IMPROVEMENT OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Congress has a unique opportunity to enact significant legislation for the improvement of American education. As a long-time proponent of Federal assistance to education, it is encouraging to

me that the elementary and secondary education bill proposed by the President has a better chance for enactment than any such legislation in my memory.

In addition, the administration's higher education bill offers considerable promise for dealing with the problems which beset our colleges and universities and the students who attend them. I am particularly interested in title III of that bill which is devoted to strengthening our less developed institutions of higher learning. In recent years the Congress has provided substantial assistance to higher education in the form of research grants through the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, NASA, the Department of Defense, and other Federal departments and agencies. Also, the fellowships and other assistance provided in the National Defense Education Act have made a significant contribution. However, by the nature of such assistance it all too often goes to those institutions which have already established themselves as leaders in the various fields of academic endeavor. As all too often is the case, the rich have gotten richer and the poor have gotten poorer. Schools which have limited financial resources and, therefore, less prestigious faculties are often left in the dust in the race for NEA fellowships, research grants, and other benefits which flow from Federal programs.

Title III of S. 600 offers promise for directing Federal assistance where it is needed most, and I am pleased that the Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has begun hearings on the bill.

In an effort to aid the committee in its consideration of this legislation, I have addressed a letter to the chairman of the committee suggesting an amendment to title III which I believe would be of particular benefit to many small colleges which are struggling to meet increasingly heavy demands. I know this subject is of concern to many Senators and particularly to many of my colleagues from the South which has a disproportionate number of the poorly financed institutions in our country, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred and the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and proposed amendment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
 March 19, 1965.

HON. LISTER HILL,
 Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my understanding that your committee will begin its consideration of the higher education bill proposed by the President (S. 600) following the completion of work on the elementary and secondary education legislation. I would like to draw the committee's attention to one section of the bill which I believe can be improved.

Dormitories, administration buildings, and libraries are vital to the quality of our universities and colleges and the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 provides the means for developing these tangible assets of our institutions of higher learning. It is, however, the intangibles that in the final

analysis distinguish the quality schools from those unable to keep pace with the increasing demands upon our colleges and universities. It is no secret that the collective ability of a college faculty determines the quality of education available to its students. A very fine article on this subject in the February issue of *Indicators*, published by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, contained this comment: "A professor is a prism through which the light of the past is refracted to the present; rare is the person who can give in his teaching a quality of instruction that he himself has not been given."

All higher education suffers from an inability to offer salaries which are competitive with those available in private industry. And, the rising cost of higher education to the students makes it increasingly difficult for those interested in a professional teaching career to obtain an advanced degree without incurring debts which are not easily repayable from an instructor's salary.

While true of American education generally, the difficulty of obtaining advanced degrees is compounded for many faculty members in our institutions in Arkansas and other Southern States. Only 43 percent of the faculty members in institutions in the South hold doctorate degrees as against a national average of 51 percent. Fifty-five percent of college level teachers in the West and Southwest and 54 percent of such teachers in the North Atlantic region have doctorates. While the process of education is not so mechanical that a perfect parallel can be drawn between the percentage of Ph. D.'s on a faculty and the quality of its instruction, it is fair to say that in general the additional work required for such advanced degrees contributes materially to the worth of the institution and the character of the degrees it confers.

Southern colleges and universities which have long labored under the handicap of inadequate financial resources have only 16 percent of the Nation's teachers who hold doctorate degrees. Teachers' salaries in both private and public colleges and universities in the South are considerably lower than in other sections of the country and, in part, this accounts for the disparity between educational opportunities available to southern students and those open to students in other sections of the country. The inability of many potential teachers to pay the cost of their own higher education also contributes to this deficiency.

These circumstances have particular consequence for colleges which historically have served Negro students and for Negro teachers who on the average are less able than whites to pay the costs of higher education. Only 28 percent of the faculty members in Negro institutions, most of which are located in the South, have Ph. D.'s, Ed. D.'s or the equivalent. This depressing statistic has immediate relevance to the future course of race relations in our country.

I do not mean to imply that all colleges and universities in need of help are in the South or that they are limited to institutions which historically serve Negroes. All higher education is beset by higher costs, rising enrollments and increasingly complex subject matter. However, these burdens fall with added weight on less developed colleges, a disproportionate number of which are in the South. The proposals contained in title III of the higher education bill recommended by the President offer hope for effective action to strengthen these schools wherever they may be. Paying special attention to these needs will benefit all American education and, indeed, our entire society.

I believe it is unrealistic, however, to conclude that many faculty members from top-flight colleges and universities will be induced to teach in the "developing institutions" by a fellowship paid by the Federal

Government as proposed in title III. This statement is not made in opposition to this concept, which should be tried. It is offered as a realistic appraisal of a difficult problem. The increasing pressures on our entire educational system require our better colleges and universities to resist any efforts to lure away members of their faculties no matter how worthy the cause. I discussed this proposal with a top administrator at Columbia University recently and was told that Columbia's faculty is so structured the necessary leaves of absence would be almost impossible to arrange both because of the many graduate programs which depend on top professors and the immediate need for classroom teachers.

Thus, the problem which afflicts all higher education in this country centers on an overall lack of qualified teachers rather than merely a poor distribution of them. New legislation in this field should focus on the development of new talent in greater quantity if significant progress is to be made in improving "developing institutions." Rather than trying to relocate teachers in these schools, we should provide the means for creating new ones to serve them. I believe the most realistic and potentially fruitful way to do this is through providing fellowships for faculty members in such institutions to obtain advanced degrees, thereafter returning to their schools and helping to raise their academic standing. It is the opinion of the Office of Education that section 304(a)2 of S. 600 is sufficiently broad to include such a program through grants to developing institutions. However, I would respectfully submit to the committee that an amendment giving specific sanction to such a program is in order. Enclosed is a draft of an amendment to achieve this purpose which I hope will be acceptable to the committee. It would permit the development of study programs for teachers designed to promote the improvement of specific departments and areas of instruction in developing institutions. Using a system of project grants as proposed in the bill and my amendment would tailor Federal assistance to specific needs.

This concept is by all odds compatible with the aims of S. 600. It would provide the bootstraps which do not now exist for many poorly financed institutions. Its adoption would be in the interests of many poorly endowed and supported colleges and thereby of enormous potential benefit to young people who because of geography, background and lack of money cannot attend well-supported and prestigious colleges and universities.

I would be happy to discuss this matter with you, Senator Morse, or the committee as a whole if you feel it would be helpful.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

Amendment by Mr. FULBRIGHT, S. 600, to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in post-secondary and higher education:

On page 30, line 8, before the semicolon insert a comma and "including fellowships leading to advanced degrees".

PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on March 16, the day after the President made his emotional speech before a joint session of Congress, I made a short statement to the Senate. It appears at page 5022 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not pretend to know what the voting bill will contain which the President states he will send to Congress, but if I am to judge from what he said last night at the joint session of Congress, I have no doubt that it will contain language whereby Congress will fix the qualifications of voters.

It is my judgment that if the President is successful in having Congress enact such a law, every Representative and every Senator will have violated his oath of office to defend and protect the Constitution, because the right to prescribe qualifications for voters is left to the State under article I, section 2 of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I do not like to say this, but I am sorry to note that the President has fallen to the will and the actions of Dr. Martin Luther King in providing for this proposed legislation. He has even adopted the demagog slogan "We Shall Overcome." Dr. King knows, deep down in his heart, that there would be few Negroes eligible to vote if given a fair qualification test. I do not mean only Southern States, but all States. King's plan is to have Congress enact a law abolishing voter qualifications. In other words, the applicant for registration would merely be required to give his name, age, and length of residence in the State in order to qualify to vote.

The action taken by Dr. King in Selma and other parts of the South is regrettable. If such action should be continued, it may lead to anarchy in government. Are the States no longer to be allowed to maintain law and order? Is responsibility for protection of life and property to be taken away from local authority? The first duty of any government, national or local, is to maintain internal order. Are we to allow the agitators and demonstrators to take over control of the streets and public buildings? Apparently the National Government is prepared to do so.

I have been a Member of this body for 28 years. It is my judgment that bypassing the courts, making shortcuts, and bypassing the Constitution, will lead us to a government where our cherished freedoms will become but memories. Our Government is not so weak that it must succumb to every threat.

I grant that in some States of the South—in some counties and in some parishes in my State—things have been done which should not have been done, in order to prevent Negroes from voting. However, if Senators were to take the trouble to look at the reasons why this was done, they would probably be sympathetic—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is my judgment that Senators would be sympathetic to those who tried to prevent the registration of unqualified voters. In my State, there are parishes where Negroes outnumber whites 3 to 1. If Congress should enact a law whereby all the citizens of those parishes would be able to vote overnight, without regard to qualifications, we would have governments in the counties and in many of the cities in the hands of incompetents.

That is why, as I have stated, the people there have guarded voting rights, in the hope that they could maintain sound local governments and in time Negroes would become competent as a result of being better educated.

March 22, 1965

5343

He was broke when he reached America as a refugee from Russia and he was broke many times thereafter. Twice he left Alaska broke, determined that this was no place for him.

Loussac's life history reads like an adventure tale. He was born 27 miles from Moscow, Russia, on July 13, 1882, the son of a manufacturer of mouldings. An engineering course at the Imperial Polytechnical Institute at Moscow was chosen for him by his parents, "probably because my mother liked the dark green uniforms with gold buttons and braid that the students wore," he said.

But his education there was a short one for in his first year, the future Alaskan was expelled from school. He was accused of participating in a revolutionary movement. Loussac explained that this charge was based on the fact that he had been studying some of the more liberal literature of the time.

He went to southern Russian to visit his grandmother and crossed the border into Germany, while government officials searched for him. This was the beginning of a trek that led to the United States.

Arriving in New York City at the age of 18, without money and unable to speak English, he got a job running errands for a corner drugstore in a Russian neighborhood. A man returning from the Klondike visited in the neighborhood and the drug clerk heard glowing tales of the discovery of gold at Dawson. The man emptied large nuggets from his pockets to support his claims. The stampede was on in full force and the man's statements were supported further by bizzare newspaper accounts of the streams flowing on golden beds and the mountains sparkling with nuggets.

In 1901 the drug clerk quit his job to go to Alaska and get rich. He sneaked rides in freight cars to get to the West. Often he cajoled brakemen and conductors, and enjoyed the luxury of caboose accommodations as he wended his way through the farm country of the Middle West.

At Great Falls, Mont., he worked in a drug store for 9 months, concluded that he ought to get a pharmacist's degree if he was ever to advance in the drugstore business and headed East to earn a degree in pharmacy.

In 1907, Loussac went West again; this time with a few dollars in his pocket and a pharmacist's sheepskin.

"Zac," as he became known throughout the Territory, could never resist the urge for new adventure. A life of quiet security had no attraction for him. During the next 10 years he found himself in and out of Alaska three different times, each time going north to get rich with some new discovery of gold only to return to Seattle broke and discouraged.

A summer prospecting for gold on the beaches of Nome convinced the young pharmacist that that was not the life for him. Therefore when fall arrived and he was offered a trading post in Unalakleet, Zac made the deal without seeing the property. He caught the next boat for Unalakleet and found the flourishing business establishment consisting of a 10 by 12-foot shack, in which there were 15 cases of Carnation milk; 1 red fox skin without a tail; a celluloid cribbage board; 2 silk tents; and a gross of whiskey glasses, but no whiskey. Recognizing a bad bargain, he shipped out as a steward on the next steamer for Seattle, waiting table and washing dishes to pay for his passage.

Loussac lived on 10 cents a day that winter in Seattle. Part of the time he slept on a mattress in the back of a hardware store.

Zac's capacity for making friends wherever he went kept alive his zest for living. It seemed too that he was destined to continue meeting Alaskan enthusiasts who lured him North time and again. Among his many experiences of going into business and going broke in various Alaskan towns, perhaps one of the most colorful was his stay in Iditarod in 1910. Even the trip down the river from

Dykeman had its share of human drama. He was one of 30 passengers who had to get out and walk in the water to pull the boat over shallow spots. It took them 3 days to go 90 miles. They were almost chewed alive by mosquitoes. One man got lost and went insane wandering through muskeg and swamp.

When "Zac" finally got to Iditarod, he and Jimmie Fay, with whom he had previously been in business in Haines, pitched a tent and set up their drugstore. They took in between \$20 and \$40 a day. Prices were inflated because of the scarcity of goods and the difficulty in transporting them that far during the brief shipping season. For example, a pound of epsom salts would sell for \$1; a whisk broom was \$1; in fact, most any item which would sell for a dime in Seattle, would bring a dollar in Iditarod. Two ounces of opium or spirits of camphor to cure cholera in a horse would sell for \$20; it was \$3.50 in Seattle.

When winter came they stayed comfortable in their tent by covering it with boards. Fay sold his interest to "Zac" and returned to Haines. The following April, fire leveled the entire business district of Iditarod. "Zac" lost everything. He had no insurance. The local banker had so much confidence in "Zac's" business ability, however, that he built him a two-story building and loaned him \$12,000 to buy new stock. Thus "Zac" was back in business better and deeper than ever before in his life. All would have been well had not the miners decided to give up their claims and leave for a new gold strike in Ruby. This meant bankruptcy for the remaining businesses. The following year, the Yukon Gold Co., a New York outfit, got millions out of the ground around Iditarod.

It took Loussac 10 years to pay off his indebtedness as interest rates were so high in those days that it actually meant paying almost twice the amount of the debt. After coming to Anchorage in 1916 and going into the drug business here, he again went into debt to the local banker, at one time as much as \$40,000. In fact, it was not until 1939 that he was completely out of debt for the first time since 1900.

Anchorage was but a tent town on the banks of Chip Creek when Loussac setup his drug business. Besides owning two drug stores, he was one of the organizers of the Evan Jones Coal Co., one of Alaska's major coal sources. He was always active in civic affairs. At one time he was deputy grand arctic chief of the Arctic Brotherhood, an exclusive men's club made up of pioneers. It is no longer in existence.

Early in his drug store career in Anchorage, Loussac adopted the slogan "We've got what you want when you want it." He gained a reputation for being a wide-awake, progressive merchant. He used to run a daily newspaper ad entitled "Loussac's Daily Gossip" with a subhead "Cents and Sense." For several weeks at the beginning of a new year, he would title his column "Full Speed Ahead," and proceed to tell what a wonderful past year he had had and how he anticipated the new year would be even better.

He was continually offering special services to his customers. For instance, in the early days when business was not as brisk as it became during World War II, he would provide a writing desk, paper, and envelopes without charge for anyone wanting to drop into one of his drugstores to write a letter; a Toledo weighing scale on which they could learn their weight free of charge; a free delivery service; a mail service which guaranteed to send out an order the same day it was received. Customers were invited to come in and play the latest phonograph records. He shipped in fresh cut flowers regularly, which was a luxury in the preaviation days.

Loussac served three terms as mayor of Anchorage. He is a past president of the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce, the Rotary

Club, Igloo No. 15, Pioneers of Alaska, and a member of the Masonic Lodge. He has been a member of two territorial boards—pharmacy and housing authority.

Marriage was an experience which Loussac postponed until 1949.

Being a connoisseur of the fine arts, Loussac began collecting Sydney Laurence oil paintings while the artist was a resident of Anchorage.

In 1946 Loussac founded the Loussac Foundation to promote recreational, cultural, scientific, or educational activities in the Anchorage area. He hoped it would help keep people in Alaska.

In setting up his foundation, Loussac said: "The people of Anchorage have been good to me. Everything that I earned came from here and I want it used here."

ARTICLES ON VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, several worthwhile articles pertaining to Vietnam have recently come to my attention: two from the March 10 issue of the New York Times; a column by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post; an article by Mary McGrory, from the Washington Evening Star; and a column, by Drew Pearson, entitled "Vietnam Fallacies."

I was especially interested in the dispatch from Saigon, which appeared in the New York Times, which began:

Evidence collected here indicates that both North and South Vietnamese Communists have become aware that talk of proposed peace negotiations could undermine the spirit of the Vietcong.

Those in this country who deplore talk of a negotiated settlement should take such reports from Vietnam into account.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1965]

VIETCONG, FEARING FOR MORALE, TRIES TO COUNTER TALK OF PARLEYS

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, March 9.—Evidence collected here indicates that both North and South Vietnamese Communists have become aware that talk of proposed peace negotiations could undermine the spirit of the Vietcong.

In a broadcast yesterday on the arrival of the U.S. Marines at Danang, the National Liberation Front, the political base of the South Vietnamese Communist guerrillas, warned:

"The U.S. imperialists cannot expect to use military pressure to defeat us at a political conference."

The front added that it would defeat the Americans, "even if one or two hundred thousand U.S. aggressive troops dare land on our territory." The front added that the struggle could take "10 or 20 years."

Analysts in the U.S. mission in Saigon said the opposition to negotiations had been a recurring theme since the last air strikes against North Vietnam, a week ago.

On one level the Communists were answering Western press commentators who have conjectured that the air attacks were aimed at making Hanoi more receptive to meaningful talks.

But both the front and the Hanoi radio broadcasts are often used to inform political cadres in isolated sectors of South Vietnam of Communist policy direction.

American interpreters of North Vietnamese propaganda accept as genuine the Com-

munists' stated opposition to a negotiated settlement.

They cite the adamant statements of the last week as further proof of the view expressed in Washington that Hanoi does not seek the kind of talks advocated by France, the Soviet Union, and other nations.

The analysts here have even noted that in the last several days Communist broadcasts have omitted the phrase "Thuong Thuyet," the Vietnamese words for negotiation. Instead they talk about "settlement" or "final solution."

The morale factors among its troops has also disturbed the South Vietnamese Government as reports of impending peace talks have circulated.

In a conference of South Vietnamese diplomats held today the tone was militant. The official Vietnamese press summarized the view of the meeting as pledging "no compromise with aggression * * * no international solution that is not endorsed by the Vietnamese Government and people."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1965]
FOREIGN AFFAIRS; VIETNAM—WHY PARIS
DISAGREES

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—Before departing for Vietnam it is worth examining France's position on the crisis, a position founded on cold analysis even though we don't accept its tenets or conclusions. The essence of this French analysis is that China will never admit an American military presence on the Asian mainland.

THE FRENCH VIEW

Paris' viewpoint may be summarized accordingly: Although the Chinese have not yet reacted dramatically to U.S. bombardments of North Vietnam and prefer to avoid direct military confrontation with the United States, there may well be riposte at unexpected points and sooner than Washington anticipates. Thus, for example, there could be a spread of the "revolutionary warfare" fungus to Thailand and the Philippines, which for years we have deemed secure.

The French, who have long if unhappy experience in the Far East and who still maintain extensive services there, including an embassy in Peiping and a "trade mission" in Hanoi, are convinced there are in fact two Chinese policies. These sometimes conflict as applied on a short-term basis.

Ideologically, China pushes outward in all directions, seeking to establish preeminence in the world Communist movement through propaganda and subversion but nationally, Chinese tactics are more prudent and wish to avoid any confrontation that could lead to major war. Thus, at this juncture, while Peiping hopes ultimately to extrude Western influence from Asia (including both America's and Russia's), it privately cautions extremists among its own friends.

COLONIAL EXPERIENCE

The French attitude is undoubtedly marked by their own sad terminal experience with Asian colonialism. Nevertheless, they think the United States deceives itself and endangers world peace by insisting on protecting South Vietnam, whose population wants only an end to fighting; that Russia could be genuinely helpful in neutralizing South Vietnam and ultimately in helping North Vietnam pry itself loose from China.

This objective was perhaps frustrated by Washington's decision to bomb North Vietnam while Soviet Premier Kosygin was in Hanoi, trying to enhance Russia's influence there at China's expense. Paris insists Kosygin was forced by U.S. actions to adopt a sterner public position than he had intended.

FACTORS IN FRENCH RECKONING

If the present crisis can cool off a bit, France still conjectures there are factors that

might permit a negotiated settlement on acceptable terms. It sees China worrying about increased Soviet influence in Indonesia—again at Peiping's expense. China cannot give Sukarno the kind of weapons Russia provides as he accelerates his campaign against Britain.

According to this French theory both Peiping and Hanoi would be willing to negotiate on Vietnam and neither would insist on departure of American troops from South Vietnam until after a peace conference had arranged its neutralization. The only Communist precondition, it is argued, is that U.S. bombings of the North must cease before negotiations start.

Paris reckons North Vietnam would accept a genuinely neutral South Vietnam and would like to work out economic and customs arrangements with such a state, developing unofficial contacts similar to those between West and East Germany and only contemplating unification as an eventual dream. It also feels China would much rather persist with long-range subversion and penetration programs in southeast Asia than chance outright war.

PATTERN OF LOGIC

How accurate an estimate this is cannot be judged. Washington discounts many of these assumptions and feels that if French counsel were now pursued it could lead to disruption, collapse, and ultimate communization of southeast Asia all the way to Singapore. Nevertheless, whomever history proves right, there is a pattern of logic in the French analysis. The transatlantic disagreement on this issue is deep seated and genuine. And Paris is convinced that, unlike Cuba, Vietnam is not a vital U.S. concern.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post]

THE NEOISOLATIONISTS

(By Walter Lippmann)

A respected colleague of mine, Mr. Richard Wilson who writes for the Washington Evening Star, suggested the other day that many of us are returning to the isolationist views of Senator Taft and of President Hoover. This, if I may say so, is like saying that a man who has cut back from being an advanced alcoholic to being a moderate drinker is a teetotaler.

Yet it is true that there is an affinity between the old isolationists and what are now being called the "neoisolationists." Similarly, there is an affinity between being a teetotaler and a moderate drinker; both of them regard habitual drunkenness as a dangerous evil. The old isolationists believed that the vital interests of the United States, the interests for which the country should go to war, lie within the boundary of the two oceans. They regarded a military commitment across either ocean as unnecessary and unwise.

Their opponents in the 1930's, the interventionists of the Second World War, believed that the Atlantic Ocean was not a strategic boundary but was in fact the inner sea of the Atlantic Community. The Atlantic Community—which was regarded as including Australia, New Zealand and the Philippines—was approximately coterminous with Western civilization.

The issue between the old isolationists and the old interventionists was strongly debated. However, the two took it for granted, regarded it as a matter of course, that American military commitments were to serve only the vital strategic interest of the United States.

After the Second World War there broke out the cold war with Soviet communism. A new strategic doctrine, known as the Truman doctrine, was put forward. It said, or was understood to say, that the spread of communism anywhere on the globe, and not

only into Western civilization, should be resisted, if necessary, by American arms.

Now there is a case to be made for the globalists. It is true that the loss of any territory on earth to a hostile Communist power is against our interests and in some measure diminishes our security. We would certainly be safer if all the nations of the earth agreed with us.

The opposing conservative view today is that while we have important interests on the Asian and African Continents, they are not vital interests which would justify a unilateral American commitment of our military forces. In these areas, which are beyond the limits of our strategic interests, the sound policy is to rely on collective security. Thus, we should not involve ourselves in a war in Asia where Americans, and as a matter of fact Americans only, fight Asians.

The neoisolationists, who regard the whole Western society as a vital American strategic interest, are a long way from being the isolationists of the 1930's. But they have common differences with the globalists. They view certain regions on the Asian and African mainlands as places where we have interests but not vital interests. There the neoisolationists believe in working with and through the United Nations and other collective organizations.

Let this be misunderstood, let me say that this argument is entirely and solely about military intervention. It is not about economic assistance, technical assistance, the Peace Corps, cultural exchanges. It is about where and when, and where and where not, American fighting men should be sent to intervene unilaterally.

[From the Washington Evening Star,
Mar. 5, 1965]

VOICE CHIEFS CHAFE AT CURSES

(By Mary McGrory)

Henry Loomis, departing director of the Voice of America, made a farewell speech that had a special meaning for the people he left behind.

Everyone present in the departmental auditorium knew what he meant when he said in the course of his lengthy remarks: "The Voice of America is not the voice of the administration."

This point has been at debate since the Voice was first heard some 20 years ago, and the controversy has heated up since the intensification of the war in South Vietnam.

Oldtimers in the Voice say they are going through a period almost as bad as the McCarthy era and—in a way—worse, as in those days, the Voice pretended to be little but a propaganda arm.

In 1960, under President Eisenhower and after much study, the agency finally received a charter which gave it the green light to be candid and objective in the manner of the British Broadcasting Corp.

But since the raids on Pleiku, say Voice officials, they have been chafing under the heaviest censorship in their history. No dispute over handling of news has arisen, but every commentary must be cleared with the policy department of the Voice's parent agency, the U.S. Information Agency, before broadcast.

The USIA has the benefit of advice from the State Department and the White House, and Loomis said in his speech that the Voice's problem is not just to communicate with different cultures, "but with the rest of the Government."

Voice officials have given up trying to reason with State Department policymakers who think Voice commentary should be as authoritative as a statement by the President or the Secretary of State.

Others "downtown" think, according to Loomis and his associates, that nobody in foreign countries will know that something

ch 22, 1965

has happened if it is not mentioned on the Voice. In vain, they have pointed out that in many nations the listener has his choice of national radios.

Last week brought two clashes within the agency over how the difference of opinion on our South Vietnam policy should be reflected.

For a daily roundup of worldwide editorial opinion, the Voice included a critical, front page editorial in the Paris newspaper *Le Monde*. It was deleted downtown.

Again, a critical portion of a New York Times editorial, calling for a Presidential statement on Vietnam policy and advocating negotiation, was edited out of a Voice broadcast.

"We are getting so afraid to be honest, we can't even reflect any diversity or discussion," said one Voice veteran.

On another recent occasion, there was disagreement over how much of Senator THOMAS DODD's proadministration speech on Vietnam should be carried, as against how much of Senator FRANK CHURCH's antadministration speech.

A background broadcast had been held up for several days until CHURCH's critical speech was answered, and then the voice was instructed to call it not a debate but a discussion.

"We're getting like Radio Moscow" said one Voice official. "That is precisely what they do. They never quote unfavorable editorials."

The Voice has not been permitted to send out any background commentary on negotiations for fear it will be misinterpreted as a sign that they are coming. Loomis and others think the Voice has built up a reputation for objectivity and credibility that guards against such misunderstandings.

"Some people think the Voice in a national emergency should be a tactical weapon," says Loomis, "but we think we should be a strategic weapon, building up a confidence over the long haul."

Everyone agrees that the Voice was first "bent" during the Cuban missiles crisis of October 1962, when the administration quite frankly managed the news. But that was quickly over. People at the Voice are now disturbed about the heavyhanded propaganda line that has been in effect the last month.

So Loomis' speech was much appreciated. Only, as one of his listeners said, "I wish it had been made by somebody other than a retiring director."

[From the Washington Post]

VIETNAM FALLACIES: JOHNSON INHERITED SITUATION IN WHICH U.S. INSTEAD OF FRANCE IS IN TROUBLE

(By Drew Pearson)

There are three important fallacies to be considered regarding the Vietnam crisis which President Johnson inherited.

1. We contend that we are in South Vietnam at the request of the popular government, to protect freedom. This is pure bunk. The government has changed so often that no one can keep track of whether Big Minh, Little Minh, or Minnie Mouse is in power. There have been 14 changes of government since January 30, 1964, which is an average of one government per month. The government is of the military, by the military, and for the military, and Vietnamese civilians have no illusions about it.

2. We believe that the best way to stop Vietnamese fighting is by retaliatory raids against the North. There are many indications that this also is pure bunk. First, the North Vietnamese are led by Ho Chi Minh, a tough guerrilla fighter who battled against the French for 8 years and defeated the ream of the French Army, totaling 380,000

men, backed by \$4 billion of American money. Ho now has an army of 270,000 men and if he wants to move south our bombing raids would never be able to halt him. History shows airplanes cannot find troops on foot in the jungle.

However, it is highly doubtful that Ho could call off the Vietcong war against us in South Vietnam even if he wanted to. You have to remember that the Vietcong were part of the force that also fought for 8 years, with implacable will, to get the French out of Indochina, and we have merely substituted ourselves for the French. The Vietcong are equally determined today to get all white men out.

After the French evacuated Indochina under the terms of the 1954 Geneva agreement, there were approximately 90,000 Viet-Minh pro-Communist guerrilla fighters left. They became the Vietcong. Already tough revolutionaries, they are now doubly effective because they have seized new, modern American arms.

American intelligence shows that very few of the Vietcong infiltrated down from the north until last year. It is estimated that in 1964 between 4,000 and 5,000 men moved in. Therefore, Ho Chi Minh would have little control over them, even if he wanted to yell uncle as a result of the United States retaliatory raids.

Our intelligence also shows that the Vietcong is composed of about 35,000 hardcore fighters, plus 65,000 militiamen—a total of about 100,000. This is enough, given support from the countryside, to engage in hit-and-run operations indefinitely.

3. The United States has told our allies privately that we are ready to negotiate a settlement in Indochina but that we want to negotiate from strength. Unfortunately, the longer we remain in South Vietnam the more our strength deteriorates.

When we had 1000 American advisers in Vietnam, as in the early days of the Eisenhower administration, we were probably stronger than today. President Kennedy boosted the number of Americans to 20,000 and President Johnson has raised the total to 23,500, but we are in a weaker position to negotiate because today the Vietcong occupy about two-thirds of the country.

The real problem of strength is the local South Vietnamese Government, and the more the generals concentrate on their own personal ambition rather than the welfare of the country, the weaker becomes our strength to negotiate.

WHAT NEXT?

The above three points are the heart and soul of the Vietnamese problem. What, therefore, are the alternatives facing the United States?

They are: To place the matter before the United Nations Security Council, which has never been given the Indochina problem in the past; or to continue bombing farther and farther north.

In the latter event, the Communist world is in an extremely strong position to retaliate in four widely separated areas:

1. Ho Chi Minh can move with his well-trained army from the north.

2. The Red Chinese could move in on the islands of Quemoy and Matsu, which lie only 3 and 12 miles respectively from their coast, and take them fairly easily, since most of the U.S. 7th Fleet is tied up in the Gulf of Tonkin.

3. The Chinese could accelerate hostilities in Korea where South Korea is still protected only by a truce.

4. If the Russians wanted to enter the picture they could exert a squeeze on Berlin with another blockade, thus requiring the United States to divide its attention between Asia and Europe.

These are some of the problems the State Department is beginning to pose for the White House now that Secretary Rusk has recovered from his illness.

The alternative of putting the crisis before the United Nations would put the Russians in an extremely awkward position as to whether they ought to use the veto. The United Nations would probably call for a cease fire and appoint a commission to study the situation.

The best long-range hope for the United States in Indochina is Titoism. Ho Chi Minh could be another Tito if we don't drive him into the hands of the Chinese as we have been doing. It is important to remember that the Thais, Vietnamese, and Burmese have hated and feared the Chinese for centuries. If given a chance for independence they don't want to come under the domination of the Chinese dragon.

These are not happy alternatives, but this is the situation which the Johnson administration has inherited from 18 years of erosion.

THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, recently I addressed the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts. A fellow speaker on the association's program was Charles H. Stoddard, Director of the Bureau of Land Management, who has been building up increased cooperation between the soil conservation districts and his agency.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stoddard's very illuminating address be printed in the RECORD, for it contains information on Bureau of Land Management activities and policies of wide interest.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT ACTION TOWARD COMMON GOALS

(Remarks by Charles H. Stoddard, Director, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior, before the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Portland, Oreg., Feb. 10, 1965)

Just about a year ago, at your Kansas City convention, I was honored with your Distinguished Service Award. I accepted that plaque with mixed feelings of pride and humility, and hung it prominently over my desk in Washington. That was a rash act. For a year now that symbol of achievement has been on display; but I've been able to see it, too, and it's been a daily reminder of what hasn't been achieved, of what a tremendous job lies ahead.

With that sword of Damocles over my conscience, I put in a busy year. Today, I'd like to review with you the progress we've made over the past year; more importantly, perhaps, let's try to see where we're heading.

PARTNERS IN PROGRESS

I use the word "we" advisedly, meaning by it not the "we" of the Bureau of Land Management, nor even the "we" of BLM-SCD relationships. I mean "we conservationists and land administrators, we—all of us—responsible for lands and resources. Whether we work for the Government or for ourselves, whether our organizations are public or private, our basic goals must be the same. They will be, if we approach our work from the standpoint of what's good for America.

My theme today is "cooperation." In the context of public land management, that

means organizations working as allies, to fulfill the promise of these lands. And even those of you not directly involved in this work are affected by it because, like all our people, you are shareholders in this land.

Like "conservation" itself, "cooperation" can be used as a pious means to uncooperative ends. Even among men of good will, great injustices can be done in the name of good causes; and in land management, that cause is too often the defense of private land against public interest, or of public land against private interest.

Let me say now that BLM does not accept this state of affairs. Our work is predicated on the belief that there is no real difference between public and private lands—only the incidental one of who holds the title.

In the long run, titles are irrelevant. When a water table falls, it doesn't matter who owns the surface—the important thing is to get it restored. Erosion and fire attack land without consulting ownership records; and all of us lose when one of us loses soil. The real question is, "Who can do the best job of meeting the Nation's resource and recreational needs?" And there is no blanket answer, ideals and prejudices notwithstanding.

Who can do the job? The job begins with this question, and this is where public and private interests begin to merge.

In the West, where BLM administers 175 million acres of public domain, the question is crucial. On the vast stretches of public land, far from urban centers which might need land to accommodate growth, the Federal Government must shoulder the responsibilities of protection, of resource production, of managing the land in accordance with modern-day needs. The Government must operate effectively where other sectors of the economy cannot. Since these large blocks lie adjacent to private lands, they must be managed as an integral part of the local economy.

But we also have numerous public tracts intermingled with private, local government and other Federal lands. These are the critical areas. Here the programs of all landholders must be coordinated. To ignore this need—to allow one segment of the land to deteriorate while replenishing others—is to hamstring the whole works. In our jigsaw land patterns, one ill-fitting piece can ruin the whole picture.

This is our concept of cooperation. Let me describe now how BLM is putting the concept into action.

NEW LAWS FOR A NEW ERA

For a starting point, let's go back to last September, when the President signed into law three bills with far-reaching effects on public land administration: Public Law 88-606, which establishes a Public Land Law Review Commission; Public Law 88-607, the Classification and Multiple Use Act; and Public Law 88-608, the Public Sale Act.

Along with other new conservation laws, these reflect a new congressional awareness of the vital role conservation must play in our society. They are part of the unmistakable mandate for conservation Congress gave us last year. And although overshadowed by such dramatic legislation as the land and water fund and the wilderness bill, their effects may be even more significant.

In passing them, Congress may have had these words of the President in mind: "For a century we labored to settle and to subdue a continent. For half a century we called upon unbounded invention and untiring industry to create an order of plenty. The challenge of the next half century is whether we have the wisdom to use that wealth to enrich and elevate our national life, and to advance the quality of our American civilization."

Let's review these bills:

The Public Land Law Review Commission Act begins by setting forth the policy of Congress: that the public lands of the United States shall be "retained and managed or disposed of, all in a manner to provide the maximum benefit for the general public." This rather bland statement has great significance. For the first time, Congress has indicated that some of the public lands administered by BLM may stay in public ownership. The only indication of intent up to this point has been the Taylor Grazing Act, which authorized management "pending their final disposition." By leaving tenure open, that phrase also left the possibility of effective long-term management in doubt. It remained so until this policy statement opened the door to retention.

Over the next 4 years, the Commission will review the laws governing public land administration, plus the policies and practices of administrators. It will survey present and future demands for this land, gather necessary data, and recommend changes necessary to carry out the policies set forth in the act.

While the Commission deals with new policy, the Classification and Multiple Use Act is a vehicle for experimenting with new tools. It requires the Secretary to "develop criteria by which he shall determine which of the public lands shall be disposed of and which shall be retained and managed." It then requires the Secretary to use these standards in classifying the land for retention or disposal, and to manage the retained areas under multiple use and sustained yield principles.

The act states that lands shall be disposed of when they are required for the orderly growth and development of a community. The closely related public sale law permits sale of lands for this purpose, on condition that the community has appropriate zoning regulations in effect. On this score, by the way, House Interior Committee Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL made the intent of Congress clear when he said: "The burden is now on the local communities to act affirmatively in establishing comprehensive zoning regulations where they do not already exist. The development of many western communities depends upon making lands available for non-Federal use. Whether they will be offered for sale under this legislation is now squarely up to the communities themselves. It is not sufficient that a token zoning regulation be enacted; it is necessary that it be forceful and enforceable. Failure of local government agencies to act responsibly and constructively can only result in creating the impression that the Federal Government must retain control over public lands after they have passed from Federal ownership."

Let me comment here that your districts can play an important part in community growth under this act. As local communities prepare to acquire land, you can encourage them to zone not only to insure "orderly development," as the law requires, but to think of conservation and wise use as the paramount values.

In 10 of our Western States, the country is authorized to plan and zone land, to regulate land use, to protect the land from damage by conflicting uses. Most States also authorize soil conservation districts to apply the necessary land treatment measures, and to encourage conservation. All the requirements for teamwork are at hand; now it's up to us to carry the ball.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE

Now the onus is on us—all of us concerned with public domain. The work we accomplish now will very likely influence the Commission's report and resulting legislation. We—our generation—is challenged to fulfill the promise of our resource heritage.

BLM's first step in this direction was to develop classification standards, the yardsticks by which we can measure the relative values of public or private ownership for any given tract. I said this was a first step—but before taking it we had to do some preliminary groundwork.

On the ground, this consisted of inventoring the public lands, finding out what we had. We found that the land falls naturally into four general categories, three for management and one for disposal.

The management categories are:

1. Areas with the best-blocked land patterns, which can be encircled by a boundary and given a name. The land pattern in these units runs about 70- to 80-percent public land, except for several checkerboard areas. We expect these areas to remain under BLM multiple-use management.

2. Fragmented land pattern areas which are highly valuable for recreation, among other uses, and require Federal management.

3. Specialized areas, such as game ranges and key recreation areas.

The single transfer category includes scattered and intermingled lands which are not suited to continued Federal control, but could be better used if transferred to local ownership, under the public sale law, as need for community development.

Now, there was another phase of groundwork, and this had to take place in our organizational heart. It had to do with changing attitudes—laying aside the hidebound ideas that would obstruct change; rising from the rut of outmoded traditions. In many ways, this was the more challenging task; but certainly those who accept leadership in a changing world must be willing to change themselves. I think our actions will reflect our efforts to do just this.

For example, we're now laying our proposed classification standards before the people who will be most affected, and asking for their opinions. We're going to involve these people right from the beginning—not only to give fair consideration to all interests, but to draw on their knowledge of the land and its best uses. After the criteria become regulations, the public will again be consulted on how they affect specific tracts. Only then will classifications take place. We are, in other words, inviting our multiple publics to participate in our multiple-use decision-making process.

At the moment, the guidelines look like this:

Land would be transferred from Federal ownership if it's needed for orderly community growth (residential, commercial, or industrial), if it has high agricultural value, or is suited to such public uses as parks or public buildings.

Values ranging from mineral production to wilderness would be grounds for retention. So would such conditions as the need for public multiple-use management, unstable soils needing special protection, long-term investments required for resource development, esthetic qualities that should be preserved, and the need for land to support management programs on adjacent acres.

Gentlemen, in offering policy proposals for public consideration, we ride no white charger to the outer limits of democracy. We are, in fact, exercising the will of Congress—public hearings are required by the Classification and Multiple-Use Act. But the attitude that no agency can do its job independently of those it seeks to benefit, that management is more a matter of people than of land—this has taken on a new significance in our operations, and given us new impetus.

It is one way we are responding to the President's call, early last year, for "creative federalism," which he said will require "new concepts of cooperation." We want to weave this thread through all our programs, into a firmer fabric of cooperative work.

March 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5327

Boy Scout"), and Dr. Harold Richards—are all truly great men. I may be prejudiced, but I feel that Harold E. Brooks of Armour & Co. is one of the truly great. He is the man who laid out the Fox College plan for selecting students, a broad course of subject content with high graduation standards—truly a great plan for success. He is the man who set up a formula that would guarantee a 100 percent placement of all our graduates during that dark period in our history when there were 15 million unemployed out of a work force of 85 million—no small achievement.

Naturally, out of 3,300 Fox College graduates of the past 33 years, there are many who approach greatness. A number of these graduates are, today, members of the clergy, both Protestant and Catholic. Yes; there are great teachers and leaders in the other professions among the Fox College graduates, and as you would expect, a great number of outstandingly successful business people, operating with honor and high service. However, I rather suspect that if history accords any one of these 3,300 Fox College graduates with achieved greatness, it will be Eddie Kapelinski, of the Richard's Paint Co. History has rated Abraham Lincoln as the greatest man of the 19th century. History may rate Winston Churchill as the greatest man of the 20th century. However, it is too early to say. The greatest man of the 20th century may still be in one of our classrooms today. But of this I am sure, America's future greater needs will call forth greater men.

Probably the No. 1 person on my list of great men is Dr. Lubera—never found wanting over a 30-year period—always said the right thing at the right time, and always did the right thing at the right time. Believe me, Dr. Lubera, as the educational director of Independence Hall Association, it is a real pleasure and a great privilege for me to present this most deserved and well-earned citation.

This Day-day, H-hour citation reads thusly:

"D-DAY H-HOUR CAREERS CITATION TO
DR. THADDEUS J. LUBERA

"For his dedicated years of distinguished service to education.

"For his immeasurable contribution to the lives of thousands of young people.

"For his invaluable contribution to the growth, development, and success of hundreds of business and industrial firms and professional organizations in which his graduates are rendering high service.

"For his extensive contribution to the social and economic welfare of his community.

"For his instilling a deep appreciation and reverential gratitude for our American heritage in his students as expressed in their acceptance of the challenge of active American citizenship.

"For his exemplary qualities as a true gentleman and a kindly neighbor."

OVERINVOLVEMENT OF UNITED STATES IN EX-COLONIAL REGIONS OF THE WORLD

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on February 17, I spoke on the floor of the Senate suggesting that the United States had become overinvolved in the ex-colonial regions of the world, including the area which was formerly French Indochina. I was pleased to see that George F. Kennan expressed similar thoughts in his recent Walter E. Edge lecture at Princeton.

I greatly respect the foreign policy judgment and experience of Ambassador Kennan. A career Foreign Service officer, he served with distinction as Chair-

man of the Policy Planning Council in the State Department, as Ambassador to the Soviet Union and later, as Ambassador to Yugoslavia. He helped to author the containment policy in Europe toward the Soviet Union which the United States followed after the Second World War. As well as having practical experience in dealing with the Communist countries, he is also one of the most noted scholars in the field of Communist-Western relations, and the author of many books and articles in this field, including the noted work "Russia and the West Under Lenin and Stalin." Professor Kennan is currently engaged in scholarly research at Princeton University.

In his recent lecture, Kennan made two comments which I think of as valuable guideposts for our policy in the ex-colonial world:

There is one thing we might usefully bear in mind. The surest way to invite a strong and effective Communist involvement in situations of this nature is to involve ourselves heavily, particularly in a military way.

Later in his address, Ambassador Kennan remarks:

I can think of nothing we need more, at this stage, than a readiness to relax; not to worry so much about these remote countries scattered across the southern crescent, to let them go their own way, not to regard their fate as our exclusive responsibility, to wait for them to come to us rather than our fussing continually over them. The more we exert ourselves to protect them from communism, the less the exertion they are going to undertake themselves.

In his lecture Ambassador Kennan wisely cautions us to remember our relations with the other nations of the world when determining United States policy in Vietnam. As he points out, it would scarcely be to our advantage to help heal the Sino-Soviet split by driving Communist China and the Soviet Union back together again.

I ask unanimous consent to have Ambassador Kennan's lecture, entitled "A Case for Sparing the Spurs: Forcing Russia's Hand on Big Issues Could Push Kremlin Into Siding With China on Vietnam," published in the Washington Post of March 7, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 7, 1965]

A CASE FOR SPARING THE SPURS—FORCING RUSSIA'S HAND ON BIG ISSUES COULD PUSH KREMLIN INTO SIDING WITH CHINA ON VIETNAM

(By George F. Kennan)

(NOTE.—The following is excerpted from the recent Walter E. Edge lecture at Princeton University by the former Ambassador to the Soviet Union and to Yugoslavia, an authority on world communism.)

Moscow is faced today with Chinese pressures of the heaviest possible sort which not only demand an immediate deterioration in Russia's relations with the West but obviously have as their concealed aim the provocation of actual hostilities between Russia and the West at the earliest possible moment.

The Soviet leaders are well aware of this. They understand its dangers. They propose, I am sure, to resist these pressures to the best of their ability. But there is one area of

world affairs where they are extremely vulnerable, where the Chinese have important tactical advantages and where the Soviet leaders can be, and are being, pressed constantly into positions and actions that compromise their relations with the United States in particular. This is the area of the so-called anti-imperialist movement.

What is involved here is the question of leadership among the various anti-Western and anti-American political forces now competing for ascendancy in the newer or less developed countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. To the extent that these conflicts, these so-called anti-imperialist struggles, are highlighted before world opinion; to the extent that they engage the attention of the great powers and become theaters and testing grounds of great-power rivalries; to the extent that it becomes impossible for the Soviet Union to ignore or remain aloof from them, Moscow sees no choice but to come down strongly on the anti-Western side, even at the cost of damage to its relations with leading Western countries.

ITS ONLY FUTURE

One may well ask why this should be so; what importance these new countries have for Moscow that could justify so costly a reaction. I can give you only a partial answer, because I myself believe this reaction to be exaggerated, oversensitive and not fully warranted even by the political self-interest of the Soviet regime. Nevertheless, to a certain extent one can see and understand, if not approve, its rationale.

In Europe and North America, the Communist movement, as a dynamic advancing political force, is dead. If it has a future anywhere, it is in these developing areas and particularly in the new states, where firm political traditions and institutions have not yet formed; and here the possibilities, from Moscow's standpoint, lie less in the prospect of creating real Communist systems (for this, the prerequisites are lacking) than in the possibility of dominant influence being exerted from some Communist center over these inexperienced regimes; of their being developed as instruments of major Communist policy in the game of international politics.

Moscow believes—Moscow is almost obliged by doctrinal conviction to believe—that these anti-Western forces, euphonistically referred to as the anti-imperialist ones, are bound to be generally successful, politically, on the local scene, at least in the struggle against Western influences; and noting the fumbling, ineffective quality of our own response, I must say I think they have some reason for this belief, insofar as it is we Americans who are primarily involved at the Western end.

The great question, in their view, is: Which Communist center is to preside over these various victories and to reap the various fruits? To abandon this field of political contest, or even to neglect it, means, as they see it, to present it on a silver platter to the Chinese. For this, they are not prepared.

DANGEROUS INDIFFERENCE

Their foreign relations operate in three great areas: the world Communist movement, the underdeveloped and new nations and the Western World. In the Communist movement, their position is already under heavy and effective Chinese attack. Their relations with the West, while valuable to them, cannot, at this historical juncture, at any rate, be expected to carry the entire burden of their international position. A Soviet foreign policy based exclusively on relations with the West would practically undermine the rationale for the maintenance of Soviet power in Russia itself.

Aside, therefore, from the fact that they regard the governments of the new nations as their natural and traditional clients, the Soviet leaders cannot afford, for wider rea-

sons, to stand aside from the struggle for predominance over them. Any such passivity could easily be made to look like indifference to the prospering of the Communist cause generally and would at once be exploited by the Chinese as a means of discrediting Soviet policy and completing the destruction of Moscow's influence and leadership in the world Communist movement.

And beyond that, it would risk the loss of access to this entire theater of international politics, where a continued Soviet presence could alone make the difference between effective Soviet participation in world affairs and a total and ruinous isolation.

In summary, then, we have before us, in the person of the Soviet leadership, a regime subject to strong compulsions toward better relations with the West, yet conscious of having an extremely sensitive flank in Asia and Africa which it can protect only at the expense of its relations with the West; walking a very narrow tightrope among these conflicting pressures; vacillating, weaving this way and that; responsive to the shifts in the world scene; its behavior, for this reason, in part the product of the way we ourselves play our hand and in this sense susceptible in some degree to our influence.

PEIPING'S DIRECTION

Two possibilities now present themselves. One is that our relationship with Moscow deteriorates; that Moscow, as a consequence, finds it necessary to hold more closely to Peiping in order to compensate for the loss of its Western card; that Moscow then throws itself even more frantically and, having little to lose, even more recklessly and wholeheartedly, into the anti-imperialist struggle, heedless of the effect on Soviet-American relations, coming to regard as its major objective not the preservation of an effective balance between the Chinese and ourselves as factors in Russia's external situation, but rather, successful competition with the Chinese for leadership in the political struggle for our destruction. This alternative would not satisfy in all respects Chinese desiderata, for the Chinese-Soviet rivalry would continue to be operable in many forms. But it represents in general the direction in which the Chinese, as well as many neo-Stalinists in the Soviet Union, would like to see Soviet policy move.

I would militate for increased unity throughout the Communist bloc as well as for sharper and more uncompromising tactics toward the West. It would compound the effectiveness of the forces now marshaled against us. It is difficult to see what ultimate conclusion it could have other than a world war.

The other possibility is, of course, a continued improvement of Russia's relations with ourselves. This is one that would strengthen the hands of both powers with relation to the Chinese. The Russian hand, because the value of the Soviet alternative to the acceptance of Chinese pressures would be enhanced; our own hand, because the intensity of the forces ranged against us would be reduced and because Soviet interests might even work in many ways to reinforce our own position.

In drawing the picture of these alternatives, I should like to avoid the impression that they are absolutes. There is nothing I can conceive of, short of a world war, which could throw the Russians entirely into the Chinese camp. Conversely, any improvement in Russia's relations with the West should not be expected to go so far as to produce any total break with Peiping.

What I am talking about here are tendencies rather than finalities; but they are tendencies of great importance, and the fact that neither would be likely to be carried to a point of absolute finality does not obviate the enormous significance that attaches to the choice between them.

We should recall at this point that the present unhappy state of our relations with China, hopelessly anchored as it appears to be in the circumstances of the moment, should not and must not be regarded as a final and permanent state of affairs. The Chinese are one of the world's great peoples, intelligent and industrious, endowed with enormous civilizing power and with formidable talents, cultural and otherwise. It is wholly unnatural that the relations between such a people and our own should be as they are today.

Dismal as are the immediate prospects, we must look forward to the day when we come to terms in some way with the prevailing political forces on the Chinese mainland. This, however, like any other adjustment of international relations, will take bargaining and compromise; and if the final relationship is to be a sound one and to bear weight, both sides must have a reasonable bargaining power when they finally sit down to accommodate their differences.

Only if the Soviet Union is kept in the running as an independent force in world affairs, enjoying and valuing a constructive relationship with the West and thus being not solely dependent on the Chinese connection and not helpless in the face of Chinese demands—only if these conditions prevail will we have a chance of working out our long-term relationship to China on a basis reasonably satisfactory to ourselves. A well-ordered relationship with Moscow is, in other words, essential to the constructive and healthy adjustment of our long-term relations with China.

If, in place of the preservation and encouragement of Russia's independent role, we force the Russians back into a closer relation with the Chinese, or even into an intense and exclusive competition with the Chinese for leadership in the destruction of our world position, we will not only intensify the effectiveness of the forces ranged against us at this particular moment but we will complicate greatly, and not to our own advantage, the problem of the eventual composition of our difference with both the Russians and the Chinese.

If this view be accepted, it becomes, as you see, an urgent requirement of American policy to ease in every proper and constructive way the relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States. This has nothing to do with fatuous one-sided concessions designed to win gratitude on the Soviet side. As one of my Foreign Service colleagues used to say, you can't bank goodwill in Moscow, and I would be the last to advocate anything of that sort.

But what you can do is to hold out to Moscow a plausible prospect of accommodation in those issues that are theoretically susceptible of solution in this way, and avoid the accenting of those that are not. This, as I see it, means serious effort on our part to provide a reasonable basis for accommodation in the great issues of Germany and of nuclear weapons control—in those issues, in other words, that affect primarily the European theater and are central problems of Russia's relationship with the West; and at the same time to deemphasize wherever possible conflicts that fall under the Communist category of the anti-imperialist struggle, conflicts in the face of which Moscow, when its hand is forced, is bound to come down formally on the anti-American, if not the pro-Chinese, side.

It does not appear to me that American policy of recent years stacks up very well in relation to this requirement. I have not seen the evidence that we have done all we could do to find agreement with the Soviet Union in matters of Germany and disarmament.

Needless irritations, such as the Captive Nations Resolution and various antiquated

trade restrictions, are still permitted to impede the development of Soviet-American relations. And our present involvement in Vietnam is a classic example of the sort of situation we ought to avoid if we do not wish to provoke in Moscow precisely those reactions that are most adverse to our interests. It is largely as a consequence of these strategic errors that we find ourselves in the dangerous and unpromising position we occupy today.

It will be asked of course, particularly in connection with the problem we now have on our hands in Vietnam, what else we could do than what we have done in situations of this sort.

I would be the last to generalize about such situations, or to suggest that a hands-off policy is everywhere possible and desirable. But there is one thing we might usefully bear in mind. The surest way to invite a strong and effective Communist involvement in situations of this nature is to involve ourselves heavily, particularly in a military way.

Where we lay off, the road may be open, ostensibly, to Communist intrigue and penetration (it is usually open, no matter what we do) and there may well be takeovers by political forces that make a pretense of Marxist conviction and look to Moscow or Peiping for economic aid and political support. But this is not always so intolerable to our interests as we commonly suppose.

The less we are in the picture, the less is there any excuse for actual military intervention on the part of the Communist powers and the greater are the chances for rivalry between Moscow and Peiping for political predominance in the region concerned. But in the absence of a Communist military presence, and where this Chinese-Soviet rivalry exists, the local regimes, whether nominally Communist or otherwise, are almost bound to begin to act independently in many ways—to develop, in other words, Titoist tendencies.

And this is not always the worst solution, from our standpoint. It is harder for either Moscow or Peiping to interfere extensively with a regime that calls itself Communist than with one that does not. And since we have not engaged our prestige extensively, the situation affords to the Communist powers no such opportunities for political gains at our expense as those the Chinese and North Vietnamese Communists are now reaping in Vietnam.

I can think of nothing we need more, at this stage, than a readiness to relax: Not to worry so much about these remote countries scattered across the southern crescent, to let them go their own way, not to regard their fate as our exclusive responsibility, to wait for them to come to us rather than our fussing continually over them. The more we exert ourselves to protect them from communism, the less the exertion they are going to undertake themselves.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY SPEECH BY SENATOR MANSFIELD ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AND VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on St. Patrick's Day I delivered a speech in Chicago to the Irish Fellowship Club. The speech deals primarily with foreign relations and particularly with Vietnam. In the latter connection, there are set forth three suggested general principles whose universal acceptance would appear to me to be the first step to the restoration of peace in Vietnam and its maintenance throughout southeast Asia.

There is also reference in the speech to the reappearance in force of late of such words as "isolationism" and "inter-

March 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

5329

nationalism" in public discussion of foreign policy issues. These terms, in my judgment, are not conducive to intelligent understanding of the grave issues which confront the United States in Vietnam and elsewhere, issues which should be considered freely on their own merits and without the brands of disdain being applied either way. The Nation requires deep thought and thoughtful ideas on foreign policy, not synthetic labels. There is no automatic virtue in either pure old-fashioned isolationism or internationalism, if, indeed, they were ever very pure. If either is pursued willy-nilly, on the assumption that there is, we are likely to wind up in the same place—in a self-isolation or in an isolated internationalism. So I would hope that we would recognize that resolution of the complex problems which face us in the world is not going to be obtained with either of these outdated remedies. Our task is to think through those problems through the process of reason and discussion and arrive at answers which, whether they result in doing less or more abroad in specific situations, are, nevertheless, attuned to the needs of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech I delivered be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY, 1965, SPEECH OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD, DEMOCRAT OF MONTANA, GIVEN BEFORE THE IRISH FELLOWSHIP CLUB AT THE SHERATON CHICAGO HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 1965

Where change is greatest in our lives but where we do not see it or sense it so readily is in the world beyond our borders. It is to that world and our relations with it that I would address your attention for a few moments.

I do not think it inappropriate to introduce a serious note on a day usually given to conviviality. It ought not to be forgotten that the man—the saint—who is honored here, tonight, walked in a world which was neither pleasant nor carefree. Rather, it was a deeply troubled age in which the rock which had been Rome had crumbled. It, too, was a time of change. It was a time of chaos, born of ignorance and arrogance, of superstition and suffering. It was a time when an isolated and bucolic Ireland was at last being stirred into upheaval by a birth in a stable many miles and three or four centuries away.

And, tonight, I would remind you that St. Patrick's Day comes, not only to Chicago and the United States but to Saigon, Vietnam, and throughout a troubled southeast Asia. In that distant region, halfway around the world from this city, there are those who will also celebrate this day. But the green they will wear will be the camouflage green of jungle warfare. In that region, too, there is the chaos born of ignorance and arrogance and of superstition and suffering. There is upheaval and change—immediate and incipient, in Vietnam and throughout southeast Asia. A region of immense size is involved. It is a region larger than the United States and composed of as many human beings as live in our country plus many millions more.

There, too, the rocks of stability have crumbled in these years of our times. The peace of the ricefields and the quiet of the jungle have been shattered. A culture of many cultures, a politics of many politics, a people of many peoples have been caught up

in the fury of a vast upheaval. This upheaval is not necessarily what many of the inhabitants may have sought. But whether sought or not, they are engulfed by it and they must live with it and work out their own destinies within its dimensions.

Into this vast change in Vietnam and southeast Asia, our own Nation has been projected. It is a recent involvement which, for a long time, was scarcely perceptible. Indeed, it is difficult to grasp the rapidity and the extent of our involvement in southeast Asia without having had some firsthand experience with it from the onset. When I first visited southeast Asia a dozen years ago, I had to check a map to be certain of the capital cities of the more remote nations. And the maps often did not agree, so little interest was there in that part of the world at the time. When I visited Laos in 1953, I found two Americans—two Americans—two Americans—in the entire country and both on official assignment. When I visited Saigon in that same year, there were scarcely 100 Americans in all of Vietnam, including the North.

Now, a dozen years later, the number of Americans in Vietnam—in South Vietnam alone—is in the vicinity of 30,000 and, according to the latest reports, there are, even now, requests from Saigon for the assignment of additional U.S. Army troops. The need for American personnel in order to prevent a collapse in South Vietnam has increased steadily in the past 4 years. It has increased drastically since the unfortunate and distressing assassination of the one Vietnamese leader who had managed to maintain a measure of stability in South Vietnam—the late President Ngo Dinh Diem. In place of his steady hand, there has been a succession of hands produced by coup-on-coup in Saigon.

Many of us who have witnessed this growing involvement over the years have been deeply concerned by it. That is no secret. I, personally, have expressed that concern many times in the past. Yet the fact remains that three Presidents in succession—Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson have found no satisfactory and persuasive alternative to it. And so far as I can see, the prospects now are that the American involvement in Vietnam will deepen further before it lightens.

Let me say, in all frankness, that I do not know when and on what terms the conflict in Vietnam will end. I can tell you that the President has no intention of permitting it to end in a sudden and abject withdrawal of American forces. But I am persuaded, to, that it will end at some time as all conflicts eventually end, at a conference table. It is significant that such public opinion polls as have been taken reflect the same view. A vast majority of the American people express support, both, for the military measures which the President must take and the hope for an end of this conflict.

In short, the American attitude, insofar as it is reflected in these indicators, was formulated originally by the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. He expressed it—as he knew so well how to express—the dual sentiment which resides in the heart of America. We will do, as Americans, whatever needs to be done to insure justice and the national tranquillity. But we will not glorify war as an end in itself. In Vietnam, we do not desire the sacrifice of a single life beyond what may be necessary to bring about an equitable solution.

There are those who say "let us withdraw" which we will not and those who say "let's get it over now" which is not a prescription for victory. It is an invitation to an extended war which will take us on a road that leads ever deeper into Asia. It may come to that in the end, no matter how

we seek to prevent it, no matter what forbearance and restraint we may practice. That, no man can foretell. But I can tell you that the President of the United States who bears the terrible responsibility of decision, whose finger is on the nuclear trigger, has not hearkened to the siren call of easy victory in Asia, or anywhere else. In this respect, President Johnson carries the same burdens as his predecessors, the late John Fitzgerald Kennedy and Dwight D. Eisenhower. And all of them have recognized, under the weight of these burdens, the necessity for prudence and restraint.

There are no quick or easy answers to the difficulties in southeast Asia. But there are solutions—just solutions—if all concerned face the realities of the situation in Vietnam. And the sooner all concerned recognize these realities and are prepared to begin an earnest search for these solutions, the better. The natural jungles of Vietnam are extensive enough without adding to them the manmade wastelands of war. The lot of the people of Vietnam—north and south—is bitter enough without the acrid additions of a spreading and deepening conflict.

The President has no choice but to continue on the course now being followed unless those who have engaged us are prepared to face these realities. And from the point of view of our own national interests, it is essential that we consider what it is that has prompted us to make and to continue to make the sacrifices of life and resources which we have borne in Vietnam. I would point out to you, that current estimates place that cost at \$2 million a day, not to speak of the priceless lives which have been spent and will be spent. These costs are not declining; they are rising. I would point out to you, further, that by far the largest single expenditure of foreign aid goes to Vietnam.

I do not want these sacrifices and, particularly, the sacrifices of lives to go on 1 day longer than necessary. I know that you do not want that either and I am certain that the President does not.

But neither do we wish—any of us—to abandon, half down the road, a burden which was lifted in the interests of freedom and in our own security.

That is the only context in which a just peace can be sought in Vietnam. And it is in that context that I ask you, tonight, to consider the principles of our national interests in that remote region and with the vast changes which have occurred, in Asia and in the world during our lifetime.

As a first principle, I would suggest that we seek no colonies, or bases or any other permanent American establishment in Vietnam or on the southeast Asian mainland; and what we do not seek for ourselves we will oppose for any other outside power.

Second, I would suggest that we seek, not to dominate, but to live in an equitable peace and in a peaceful commerce and communion with all the people of southeast Asia; and what we seek for ourselves we recognize as the right of others to seek for themselves.

And, third, I would suggest that we are prepared for an end to the use of force throughout Vietnam at the earliest date consistent with the right of the peoples of that region to determine their society for themselves, free from the terror and aggression which has plagued them for too many years. What we are prepared to forgo, we insist that others must also be prepared to forgo.

So far as I can see, that is all we seek in Vietnam and southeast Asia and that is all we should seek in good conscience and in good sense in that remote situation.

I wish I could tell you that Vietnam is all that need intrude in the way of inter-

national concern on this pleasant gathering tonight. But I cannot, in all honesty, omit reference to the changes which are occurring in Africa and, notably, in the Congo. There, too, in remote and little-known places, a new era is emerging from beneath the crumbled stability which heretofore was imposed from without. The colonies are gone or almost gone. In their wake has appeared a churning mixture of nationalism, tribalism, racialism, democracy, communism, Islamism, and Christianity. And the whole is heated with the immense and oppressive poverty of the millions of people who inhabit the continent.

Here, the American involvement is, as it once was in Indochina, minimal, and scarcely perceptible. Here, too, there are those, including myself, who have expressed a concern over the years that the involvement in Africa might deepen beyond what was necessary and appropriate. Here, too, as it is on the Asian mainland, the American interest is limited. Here, too, if can be nothing more than support of African freedom in stability and of peaceful commerce and communion with the peoples of Africa.

There was hope, not so long ago, that the United Nations would provide an avenue through the quicksands of African change into an era of peaceful relations. There was a hope, not so long ago that the United Nations would provide a buffer to insulate the emergent nations from the clashing interests of outside powers. But that hope foundered in what transpired in the Congo. And it has been assailed, again, by the organizational disarray and the financial difficulties of the United Nations. So I would say to you, tonight, that unless there is a rebirth of capacity in the United Nations to deal with these matters, the United States, along with other nations, is likely to be plunged more deeply and more directly into the affairs of the African Continent. The world may well face in Africa in the near future what it now sees in the critical confrontation in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

The situation which exists elsewhere in the world is neither as grim as that in Vietnam and southeast Asia nor as ominous as that of the Congo and Africa. The danger signs remain in the Middle East, to be sure. The division of Berlin and Germany and the division of Korea are reminders of the unfinished business of past wars which at any time may demand final resolution.

But, there is another side of the coin. In Latin America, for example, the Cuban experience—shattering as it was—has not been repeated elsewhere. The Alliance for Progress which was set in motion by the late President Kennedy has been continued with vigor under President Johnson. It has been, by all reports, most effective and most helpful in assisting the republics to the south to strengthen their stability and to accelerate their progress. Some of the Latin American nations, notably Mexico, have scored enormous economic advances. And as this progress has become manifest, our commercial and other relations with that nation have benefited greatly.

In Western Europe, there has been a sustained stability and economic advance. On the other side of the Continent, the eastern Europeans are obviously exerting a greater degree of independence than at any time in recent memory.

These changes for the better are of immense importance to all of us. Western Europe is no longer as it was, scarcely 15 years ago, totally dependent on us for its survival in freedom. Eastern Europe is no longer automatically responsive to the call of Soviet command. Indeed, even Albania, not to mention Yugoslavia, is capable of ignoring that call and others, if they cannot yet say "no," can at least say, "yes, but—"

For us, these changes infer the need for continuous adjustment in our policies within the basic design of our relations with Europe. I am hopeful that we will retain a close communication with Western Europe and, to that end, do whatever can be done to close the unfortunate breach in warmth and understanding which has opened with France. At the same time, I would also hope that we might continue to lighten the burden of expense for the defense of Western Europe which we have borne in a somewhat one-sided arrangement since the end of the war. And the same would apply in the matter of foreign aid, at a time when Europe is generally in a good position to share these costs in a more equitable fashion.

And I would suggest, finally, that if we are to make the adjustments which are necessary in this era of change that we abandon, at last, the clichés of isolationism or internationalism. Neither can meet the needs of the Nation in these critical times. There is no turning back the clock. But neither is there any virtue in keeping the hands of the clock ahead of the actual time.

It is not isolationism or internationalism to consider the principles of a just peace in Vietnam even as we pursue the bitter conflict in which we have become involved and with which we must stay until that peace is achieved. It is commonsense and sound national and international interest.

It is neither isolationism nor internationalism to consider other means—through a restored and reorganized and financially stable United Nations, if that is possible—to avoid a series of Vietnams in Africa. It is commonsense and sound national and international interest.

It is not isolationism nor internationalism to consider ways of diffusing the burdens of responsibility and costs which we still carry, largely in a one-sided fashion for the defense of the West and for foreign aid at a time when we are in balance-of-payments difficulties and Europe has a greater capacity than heretofore. It is commonsense and sound national and international interest.

These, then, are the thoughts which I would leave with you tonight. And I would ask you for patience and trust of the President, whose burdens are great as are those of any President. I would ask you to think through these immensely difficult questions of foreign relations so that you will understand what it is that confronts him. I would ask you, even when you differ with him, to appreciate that he is acting, as God gives him the capacity, in the interests of the people of the Nation and for the peace and security of all of us.

THE U.S. PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, not so long ago I was in the hospital. I have been in and out of many hospitals. There must have been five or six since last October. Every time I went there and every time I got out feeling pretty good I contemplated the research and the progress we have made in the field of medicine and pharmaceuticals.

How grateful I am that through the years there has been a concern for the health and welfare of all peoples who are a part of our Nation and that through our free enterprise system miracles have been developed to bring comfort and longevity on this earth of hope and anticipation. How often do we Americans fully realize and appreciate the advantages that are ours today because those before us cared, those of our time care and act, and have contributed to the health measures that

have expanded the average span of life over 10 years since 1930?

In 1930, the life expectancy of our people was 59 years. Today, in 1965, it is in excess of 69 years; and, for all I know, it has probably gone over the 70-year mark—great testimony to America, to its scientists, and to those who are in the healing arts and related professions.

The Empire Trust letter published by the Empire Trust Co. of New York City, entitled "The U.S. Pharmaceutical Industry—The Business of Living," reveals a history of progress in medicine in this Nation uncomparable to any other nation on earth, which not only lengthened the average span of life of its citizens, but also brought physical and mental comfort, fast recovery, saving of lives, and material savings to individuals, all to the benefit of industry and Government. Many people in various professions and walks of life have made incalculable contributions to the health and welfare of all our people—children and adults alike—which includes researchers, manufacturers, and the pharmaceutical industry. May these partners in "the business of living" be ever challenged for greater works.

I ask unanimous consent that this factual article be placed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY— "THE BUSINESS OF LIVING"

(Harassed from within and without, this vital contributor to our economy continues to do more for the health of mankind than does any other industry in the world.)

"Accused of cynical opportunism, embroiled in legislative and jurisdictional controversy—the U.S. pharmaceutical industry has become the subject of attack and rebuttal, claim and counterclaim to an extent perhaps unparalleled in the recent history of any other American industry.

"The pharmaceutical manufacturing community is not without blemish. Like every other business community, it too, is plagued by some irresponsible corporate citizens, whose malfeasances have been increasingly attributed to the industry as a whole. As a result, the industry's magnificent achievements—its monumental role in the prevention, cure, treatment, and alleviation of disease—have become obscured in the public mind.

"This letter, therefore, is issued in the public interest . . . because the products and the problems of this vital industry affect every one of us—literally where we live"—GRINNELL MORRIS, president

On the wall above the white-jacketed pharmacist his diploma from the College of Pharmacy of Columbia University is dated 1930.

"When I was a student, we had basically three primary ingredients to work with. Aspirin, phenacetin, and caffeine. Then, depending on the prescription, we combined these in various formulations with codeine, quinine, and belladonna. That's all we had for over half—well over half—of all the prescriptions we filled, 30 some years ago.

"My older brother remembers the influenza epidemic of 1918," he went on. "He saw his best friend at school on Friday, and the following Monday his friend was dead. . . . Today people get flu shots—but no influenza vaccine in those days."

"The first real breakthrough was the sulfa drugs," his colleague joined in. "Then