

again. The example of Minute Men at Concord was not just a figure of speech.

When the Communists rolled into South Korea in June 1950, almost all reservists quietly began to get ready. The actual callup, of course, caught most everyone with things undone. But there was a general acceptance of inevitability of the call. There was no surprise element left.

We knew a bit more about the enemy, too, and the necessity for service. One basic advantage was that we were returning to something we knew a bit about. Fear of the unknown was no longer a factor.

Now your citizen soldier is more literate on world affairs than ever before. He knows more about a world shrunken in size by aircraft and missiles. He knows more of his own country's place in this world and understands clearly just whom his nation's enemies are. He has grown up, discarding that insular, provincial feeling of long ago.

Personally, he is no more ready to pull up stakes and go into active duty than he ever was, and some of those same things he always intended to do still wait. For various reasons he has worn the cloth and did it freely with full understanding that he is vulnerable. Only this time he knows more about why.

He also is unhappy about the state of the world. He has seen endless talks fail to settle unrest or stop the enemy from grabbing more real estate and massed peoples who were weak or unprepared. He has seen the growing critical threat to this Nation through misuse of men and resources and knows the last chips are down.

He is far better prepared psychologically and patriotically for definite action than either the national administration or Pentagon brass rate him. He is a beef eating man now—not a child on pabulum.

Your citizen soldier who has seen war wants no part of it for adventure's sake or any other reason except the basic one—if that's the only way to have a real peace then let's get on with it—standing erect and unafraid. That's the way a free man should live.

PIGGYBACK FREIGHT RATES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, perhaps a million letters, and thousands of editorials have been written on the so-called piggyback issue that is pending before the Committee on Commerce. This problem has been the subject of numerous hearings and Congress has been barraged by a million letters, more or less, in behalf of the various participants in the controversy. The struggle is between the trucklines and the railroad lines over the question of selective discriminatory and destructive rate cutting. It was left, as usual, to the good old St. Louis Post Dispatch to come forth with the most concise and most clearcut explanation of the issue in the problem with which the Committee on Commerce now struggles. Because of its clarity and its interest to Members of Congress, I ask that the editorial from the St. Louis Post Dispatch, dated Monday, July 10, 1961, be printed at this point in the Record. I thank my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Florida, for his courtesy.

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

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch,
July 10, 1961]

PIGGYBACK AND THE ICC

In approving the existing rail piggyback freight rates, the Interstate Commerce Commission puts itself in the extraordinary position of sanctioning for the railroads what it had denounced in strong terms for the trucking industry. Its decision is reported virtually certain to be taken into the courts, which will no doubt want to examine closely this contradiction.

The core of the controversy is the piggyback carriage of automobiles. What is revolutionary about the rail rates on automobiles is the fact that they are flat charges in dollars and cents a carload regardless of the weight or value of the freight being hauled. When truck carriers applied for permission to establish rates on the same basis, the ICC said only last year:

"The weight and value of the automobiles to be transported are ignored. Thus, a luxury-type automobile with greater weight would be transported at the same rate as an economy-type automobile with lighter weight. It is just and reasonable that a higher-valued automobile with greater weight should pay a higher rate per hundred pounds than smaller, lower-valued automobiles."

If that is indeed "just and reasonable" as the Commission says—and has been the philosophy of regulated ratemaking throughout its history—"then how in the name of justice can the Commission give its blessing to the same method of ratemaking by the railroads?" the trucking industry asks. It's a good question, and one to which the ICC has yet to give an answer, if there is one.

Under the rail piggyback rates which the Commission has now approved, these topsyturvy conditions prevail: The heaviest and most expensive cars move at the lowest charge per hundred pounds, the lightest and least expensive at the highest charge. It costs 60 percent more per hundred pounds to ship an economy car, the Falcon, than it does to ship a luxury car, the Cadillac, which weighs twice as much and sells for more than twice as much. A carload of lower priced automobiles valued at \$20,000 must pay the same freight as a carload of higher priced cars valued at \$80,000.

The railroads are entitled to reap full advantage of the new equipment and handling methods they developed in order to win back the automobile-carrying business they had previously lost to the trucks and barge lines. Insofar as this equipment and handling represent a real saving of transportation costs the Nation as a whole will benefit from it. But the ratemaking process for this type of freight must obviously be equitable and must conform with principles of a sound national transportation policy. It will be interesting to see how well the courts find the ICC has served those principles in its piggyback decision.

WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT CUBA?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on Monday the President administered the oath of office to two officials, and set the stage for what could be a bright new era in inter-American relations.

The officials, Robert Woodward, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and De Lesseps Morrison, U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States, were charged with a serious responsibility.

For they will serve, in effect, as the custodians of our Latin American policy. To them falls the job of mending fences which are sadly deteriorated. I wish them outstanding success.

Theirs will be the task of restoring confidence among our neighbors in the determination and good will of the United States.

Theirs will be the task of convincing Latin America that we cannot and will not stand by inactive while the hemisphere is burrowed through by a conspiracy that would destroy us all.

To achieve any success in a trying and grueling test they must use every reserve of intelligence, determination, and dedication, realistically applied.

For this is not a job for hollow men and indifferent bureaucrats, but a test for those who would rise to the challenge of leadership.

On March 13 of this year, President Kennedy, speaking to a small group at the White House, stated:

I propose that the American Republics begin a vast new 10-year plan for the Americas, a plan to transform the 1960's into an historic decade of democratic programs.

Then he asked for a "vast cooperative effort, unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose, to satisfy the basic needs of the American people for homes, work and land, health and schools."

With these words, the President of the United States launched the Alliance for Progress, a plan of great breadth and scope, which seeks to free millions of Latin Americans from the bonds of poverty, disease, squalor, and misery. I endorse the aims of Alianza Para El Progreso, and regret it has been so long overdue.

In 10 years in the Senate, I have spoken some 200 times about Latin America and its basic needs. Once to plead—in vain—for "a new approach to Latin America to eliminate the conditions of poverty and illiteracy in which the seeds of communism bloom and flourish."—June 6, 1954.

Another time to decry the fact that our Latin American relations were being "brushed off with glib phrases * * * and noble-sounding cliches."—February 25, 1954.

And still another time to warn that "Latin America is beset with gigantic problems which must be met and solved if the hemisphere is to remain secure"—January 11, 1955.

But these words and similar warnings by others went unheeded as the United States hurried off to tend to crisis upon crisis in other parts of a troubled world.

World War II ended on August 14, 1945. On August 15, when our attention was focused on our own recovery and the problems arising from Europe's devastation, we put on the shelf the Good Neighbor Policy and in so doing opened the door to communism in Latin America at a time when its millions of people were engulfed in the greatest social and political upheaval in their history.

Meantime, the Communists have been at work steadily and patiently, to undermine country after country and the very structure of the Inter-American system itself. Lest we forget, it was Nikolai Lenin himself, who said in 1923:

First we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands.

Thirty-eight years later, in 1961, Harold Mills, the Associated Press correspondent in Havana until he was ousted with all the other American reporters, said:

Communism will have a hold on much, if not all, of Latin America in 3 years if the Castro regime remains in power in Cuba.

Dr. Pedro Beltran, Prime Minister of Peru, one of the ablest and wisest men in the Western Hemisphere, a man who has fought, suffered, and been jailed in defense of freedom, said on March 22, 1961:

Communism is gaining ground in our own hemisphere, before our very eyes. If the United States does not step forward now with dynamic leadership to meet the unceasing conspiracy, on our own shores, of the Soviet Union and Red China, Latin America is lost. And if Latin America, with all its 200 million people is lost, so also is the United States.

He added:

But would it not be tragic if the United States won the Congo, secured Berlin, triumphed in Laos, Ghana, and the Islands of Quemoy and Matsu, while in the end a victorious Communist thrust for power took place in the heart of its own hemisphere?

Let no one be mistaken. Communism's shock troops have launched their attack on the entire hemisphere and have won their first beachhead.

I ask, What do we do?

To my mind the answer is simple. We make a decision to meet threat with action.

In a speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 20, President Kennedy said:

Cuba must not be abandoned to the Communists. And we do not intend to abandon it either.

With these words, President Kennedy pledged the liberation of 6 million Cubans.

On May 2, the State Department, through an official spokesman, stated that Cuba is "certainly a member of the Communist bloc."

This statement explicitly recognizes that there has been Communist intervention in this hemisphere.

The question now arises as to what provisions the Western Hemisphere has made to protect itself and to cope with this type of alien penetration.

During the past century and a third, a great body of international law has been assembled by the American nations to preserve the political and physical integrity of the hemisphere.

The cornerstone of this body of law is the Monroe Doctrine, enunciated in 1823. This is nothing more or less than an expression of the principle of self-protec-

tion applied to the United States and the Western Hemisphere.

In more recent years, as the operative facility of the inter-American system was developed, a series of pacts have been drawn up by the nations of the hemisphere for their mutual protection.

The integrity of the inter-American system was pledged by the Rio treaty—Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance—in 1947, whose signatories joined together to prevent and repel threats and acts of aggression against any of the countries of the Americas.

The hemisphere system was buttressed in 1948 when 21 nations joined in the Act of Bogota to charter the Organization of American States to achieve peace for the American states and to promote their solidarity, to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their independence.

In 1954, by the terms of the Caracas resolution the intervention of communism in the hemisphere was specifically prohibited by a crystal-clear resolution which declared:

The domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extra-continental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties.

Article 6 of the Rio treaty recognizes that there could be aggression without armed attack as was the case of Castro's seizure of power in Cuba, and it provides that—

If the inviolability of the integrity of the territory of the sovereignty or political independence of any American state should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extra-continental or intra-continental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression, or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent.

Article 8 of the Rio treaty spells out what sanctions can be imposed against an aggressor nation in the hemisphere—

Recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or complete interruption of economic relations or of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, telephonic, and radio-telephonic or radio-telegraphic communications; and use of armed force.

The law of the Western Hemisphere, embodied in these three mentioned pacts, is ironclad.

The violation of this solemn Rio treaty by the Castro government, by observation, by self-confession, by definition, is clear.

And the enforcing and punitive actions against Castro are demanded by application of the most basic structure of international law, *pacta sunt servanda*, obligations must be kept.

But we are faced with the hard and yet indigestible fact that even though

our hemispheric political community, the OAS, is doubly armed to move against the intervention of communism and pledged to take action, no unified action against the self-proclaimed Red regime of Fidel Castro has been forthcoming.

In all candor, I do not expect such action to take place in time to halt the spread of Castro communism beyond the explosion point.

That being so, what can the United States alone do to protect itself and the hemispheric system?

This is the course which I recommend:

First. The U.S. Government should withdraw its recognition of the Castro regime as an act of honor, for its own security, and because the Castro dictatorship does not comply with the principle of properly constituted control of Cuban territory.

In international law effectiveness as a requirement of recognition should be based on the expressed or implied will of the people, and clearly that requirement is not fulfilled if the control is based on sheer force, subjugation, or terrorism.

The arrest by Castro's police of 250,000 civilians at the time of the ill-fated Cuban liberation attempt is clear enough evidence that he rules by terror.

His contemptuous May Day proclamation that he would allow no elections is a fair standard by which to measure the popularity of that rule.

On January 3, 1961, the U.S. Government formally terminated diplomatic and consular relations with Castro's government. We should now go one step further and withdraw recognition, for there is an important difference between severance of diplomatic relations and the withdrawal of recognition. The first is merely a disapproval of the conduct of a state or government, while the second deprives the government acted against of the usual prerogatives of an international personality.

The right to confer recognition of a nation and to withdraw recognition is, of course, an act of unilateral nature, which the United States can exercise at any time.

To withdraw recognition of Castro's government would eliminate the danger of legalizing the Cuban situation by acquiescence, or implied acceptance, give Latin American nations the opportunity to repudiate Castro by withdrawing recognition of his dictatorship, and give heart to those Cubans who still believe in freedom and work and fight for it.

Second. The U.S. Government, having repudiated Castro's regime, should then formally recognize a democratic Cuban Government in exile.

Having done so, we can then offer assistance to the government in exile, if it seeks, our help, without violating either our own neutrality laws, or the body of hemispheric law prohibiting interference. Other Latin American nations, which recognize the exile government can then deal directly with an organized anti-Castro force.

During World War II the United States recognized a number of so-called exile governments of European countries overrun by the Nazis and maintained an ambassador near them in London. The

exile governments were those of Poland, Belgium, Netherlands, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Greece.

In some instances—Poland is an example—the exile government was made up of individual leaders drawn from a number of sources, since most of the Polish Government ministers were captured by the Nazis and Reds.

During World War I a Czechoslovak National Council was formed for the purpose of waging a war of independence for Czechoslovakia, then a part of Austria-Hungary.

On September 3, 1918, the United States recognized this Czechoslovak National Council as a de facto government.

During the same war the Poles formed a Polish National Committee for the purpose of attaining an independent Poland. On November 1, 1918, the Polish Army was recognized by the United States under the supreme political authority of the Polish National Committee.

Presently there are official Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian legations in the United States, since our Government has not recognized the incorporation of these nations into the U.S.S.R.

The 100,000 or more Cuban refugees who have fled Castro's rule of terror and the patriots still within Cuba constitute a body of dedicated freemen from whom Cuba's government in exile could be formed.

No event in history has more endangered the structure of our hemispheric society nor the security of the individual member states than the capture of Cuba by a band of Communist interventionists.

If the integrity of the hemisphere means anything to us, and from history we see that our foreign policy has been built upon international recognition of Western hemispheric freedom and unity, then we cannot continue to recognize an interventionist Red dictatorship.

The cardinal principle of our hemispheric policy must be this, restoration of hemispheric integrity through the destruction of Communist intervention.

Again let me draw the parallel between Cuba under Castro and Red China under Mao Tze-tung. To us, Red China is an outlaw government. Why should we recognize Castro as being any more representative of his people's true wishes for self-determination than Mao? They are brothers in subversion, allies in arms.

For it was Castro who put the use the cynical dictum of Mao Tze-tung that "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

It was Che Guevara, Castro's chief lieutenant, who took Mao's primer on guerrilla warfare, translated it into Spanish, and distributed it by the hundreds of thousands of copies all over Latin America, as the opening attack in the battle to promote Red-style revolution across the continent.

It was Mao Tze-tung to whom Castro appealed on April 27 for support against "U.S. aggression."

For us to continue our recognition of Castro indefinitely will be to give a semblance of legality, as a fait accompli, to the myth that Cuba today is a properly constituted state.

It would be fitting for the United States to withdraw its recognition of the

Castro dictatorship on July 26, the date on which Castro, the bogus champion of social reform, will offer his enslaved people more false promises of a bright new world and give them in reality only new links for their chains.

Let the United States take the propaganda offensive.

Let the free people act first, rather than react to some rigged stunt, staged by Castro stooges.

Let us, on July 26, say to the people of Cuba, "We do not recognize your enslavers; we recognize those who will liberate you."

Let us, on July 26, say to the people of Latin America, "We renounce this Cuban tyranny; come join us in the fight for freedom."

Let us, on July 26, say to the whole world, "We renounce Fidel Castro. He is not a chief of state. He is a Caribbean buccaneer."

Third. The imposition of rigid sanctions against Castro's Cuba by the Organization of American States, as authorized under article 8 of the Rio Treaty.

Sanctions should be imposed to the maximum extent agreed upon by a majority of the members of the OAS.

Fourth. We must seek concerted action by at least some of the American States to enforce the provisions of the treaties which bind all of us against communism.

Postwar Russia won a sobering series of victories in Europe, the capture of the Baltic nations, the takeover of Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany, the subversion and domination of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania.

Finally the Western European democracies were stirred to defensive action and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization—NATO—was framed in 1949 with strong U.S. support. The defense of Europe and the freedom of Berlin rest on NATO's shield.

In 1959, eight Asian and European nations and the United States formed the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—SEATO—to unite against the Red's assaults in the Pacific. Today SEATO's armed forces are the free world's strongest bulwark in Asia.

Already eight Latin American States have broken diplomatic relations with Castro.

I propose that we seek cooperation with these republics and any others who would join us, in issuing a manifesto of Cuban liberation, declaring that we intend to honor our treaty obligations by extirpating communism from the Western Hemisphere.

I propose that we take the lead in forming the signers of this manifesto into a NATO-type security force—an Inter-American Treaty Organization—to carry out our pledges for mutual protection.

If we are ready to fight communism in Europe and Asia with billions of dollars and millions of men, should we be less willing to repel a Red invasion which threatens us at our very doorstep?

Castro has said that America is "doomed to lose" in Latin America to

the Communists because "you Americans fight with dollars and we fight in the field of ideas."

Let us prove him wrong.

Let us help those who seek our help in gaining a better life, while preserving their freedom and human dignity.

Fifth. There is another course open to us. I hope we do not have to resort to it, but I think we should be courageous enough to admit that it exists, and to consider, most seriously, its exercise if the Communist onslaught forces our hand.

I propose that if all other measures fail, the United States, acting unilaterally, for its own self-protection, liberate Cuba and destroy the armed bastion of communism in the Western Hemisphere.

It is a dangerous fallacy, I believe, to assume that only by seeking to wipe out illiteracy and poverty in Latin America, rectify tax abuses and speed land reform—all admittedly fertile breeding grounds for communism—we will be able to stave off communism. That takes time—3 years, 5 years, probably 15 or 20 years.

The hour is too late for that. Castro has won in Cuba and his agents have made dangerous inroads in half a dozen Latin American countries. To attempt to defeat them immediately with long-range social and political reform programs, no matter how effective these programs are, will not work. The short fuse on the powder keg has already been lighted and is burning fast. We do not have time to empty the keg grain by grain.

The President recognized the danger that a specious interpretation of the policy of nonintervention might bring about when he stated on April 20:

Should it ever appear that the Inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction; if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are to the security of our own Nation.

Let me quote from a letter written by a distinguished Cuban professor-in-exile, Herminio Portell Vila, on the much-confused subject of nonintervention.

Dr. Portell-Vila can speak with some authority. He was one of seven Latin American delegates who drafted the famed Non-Intervention Pact of Montevideo in 1933. In a letter to the Washington Evening Star, he puts it very clearly:

The nonintervention pact has been violated by the Communist International. We (who drafted the pact) never wanted to put a stop to the military and diplomatic intervention of the United States in Latin America, as practiced up to 1933 (only) to open the way for the intervention of the Soviet Union in Latin America that we have today. The case of Cuba is quite clear. There we have the intervention of Red China, openly flouting the principle of nonintervention.

He went on to say:

Furthermore, all the sanctimonious respect for the [nonintervention pact] fails to take into consideration that Inter-American treaties against intervention did not stop at Montevideo in 1933 but were reas-

served in Lima, in Havana, in Panama, in Washington, in Rio de Janeiro, in Bogotá, in Caracas, and in Santiago de Chile as recently as 1959, all the time stating that the republics of the two Americas were against intervention by the totalitarians of the right and the totalitarians of the left and should oppose it. Those who did not oppose Communist intervention in Hungary, Indo-China, Greece, Tibet, and so forth, by the Soviet Union and by Red China now present themselves as the champions of non-intervention when there is Soviet and Chinese intervention in Cuba.

We know little of the Latin American mentality if we believe a supposedly sacrosanct policy of nonintervention means 200 million people want us to sit idly by while the Communists carry out Castro's promise "to convert the cordillera of the Andes into the Sierra Maestra of the hemisphere."

President Mario Echandia, of Costa Rica, an outstanding democrat, has called for replacing the principle of non-intervention with "collective and disinterested action by the OAS."

A few days ago, eight leading news editors from Bolivia visited me in my office. They volunteered the opinion, and it was unanimous—that the United States should take the initiative in driving Castro communism from the hemisphere.

They recognized that Castro's first targets in his plot to subvert and communize the nations of the Americas would not be the powerful United States, but the troubled and beset nations of the hemisphere.

They pointed out that the vocal, highly disciplined Communist minority in Bolivia grows stronger every day, thanks to the continuing success of its leader, Castro.

They know that only the United States can serve as the rallying force for those Latin nations who wish to defend themselves and their hemisphere from communism.

We cannot base our Latin American policy, nor any other phase of our foreign policy, on popularity polls. We must base it upon principles of common interest, mutual beliefs, self-protection—courageously executed.

Eric Sevareid, the distinguished radio newsman and columnist, who, I believe, described himself several years ago as a liberal, wrote recently:

They (the Communists) must love the liberals with social-worker mentalities who do not grasp that illiteracy, low wages, concentrated landownership, and so on are not social problems but integral parts of a system of life and therefore enormously resistant to quick change by anything less than the "totalitarian disciplines" the same liberals abhor. They must love the liberals who assume that because a Marshall plan worked in modern Europe, a similar plan can work among those regimes of Latin America where statistics are a wild guess, where trained economists hardly exist, where economic planning is finger painting, where, as between countries, there is very little background of communications, normal trade or even intellectual interest in one another.

The gamesmen in the Kremlin must smile in their sleep as they realize how deeply ingrained is the American illusion that a ton of wheat can offset a ton of Communist artillery shells, that a squad of Peace Corpsmen is a match for a squad of guerrilla fighters.

Frightened people in a score of desperate countries want to be on the winning side, but not necessarily the moral side; and we

have to start winning soon. We are going to lose in several more places before we do. We may as well face the fact that we will also lose in places we cannot afford to lose, until and unless we are willing to fight, no matter the reproving editorials in the *Manchester Guardian*, no matter what the temporary backlash of world opinion may be.

The relations between nations are not the same as those between individuals. We can afford to lose everything except respect for our strength and determination. Lose that, and Khrushchev won't bother to sit down and talk again even to say "No."

Mr. President, what are the consequences if we fail to act?

What would be the results to the United States if 200 million people living in 20 nations which stretch across a continent twice as large as ours were swept into the Soviet sphere?

What would happen if Latin America's \$4 billion-a-year trade with the United States, vital to our economy, were diverted to the lockstep Soviet economy?

What would happen if the flow of 35 strategic materials from Latin America—copper, quartz, manganese and the like—were diverted from U.S. factories and were channeled into Iron Curtain production lines?

What would happen if a deadly network of Red-dominated missile bases and air bases were to mushroom across Latin America?

The answers are obvious, frightening, and chilling.

Secretary of Defense McNamara testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee, on April 4, that there is the danger of missile attack on the United States from possible Soviet Union satellite missile bases in this hemisphere.

Can we not imagine how this possibility and danger to the United States would be enormously multiplied if the Soviets controlled, not one, but all the nations in the Americas?

The Secretary of Defense told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on June 14:

We have definite evidence that the Cuban Government of Fidel Castro is endeavoring to infiltrate the rest of Latin America.

General Lemnitzer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told the same Senate committee that the "large shipment of arms to Cuba from Soviet and Red China bloc countries could have only one purpose: To serve as a base for the export of revolution to South America."

And, according to an Associated Press story published in the *Washington Post* of July 13, "official U.S. sources" have admitted that at least 26 Mig fighter craft from the Soviet Union are now part of Fidel Castro's lethal arsenal.

There are, sadly, some among us, in high places as national advisers, opinion molders, and shapers of policy who have an abhorrence for taking the decisive steps that must be taken. They feel that resorting even to the idea of force is to abandon reason and logic. They have enshrined the concept that everything can be talked out—can be negotiated. They are befogged by the idea that all people, even the Communists, must listen to reason and must act in a reasonable manner.

It was this philosophy, this timidity, weakness, and indecision on the part of such nonactionist advisers, which

shaped our tragic policy regarding Castro and brought us the humiliation which is Cuba today.

The nonactionists belong to the cult of the status quo. Their motto is: Do nothing against the enemy today, for tomorrow he may go away. At every point in the world where world communism challenges us, they say, "This is neither the time nor the place for action."

To them Cuba is on the periphery of the United States, and therefore we should make no immediate plans to help in its liberation.

How can Cuba be on the periphery of the United States when it takes only 6 minutes to travel by jet from Cuba to Florida? How can Cuba be on the periphery of the United States when Cuba stands, only 90 miles from our shore, with a knife at our back?

Mr. President, the cult of the status quo is wrong. It would be nearly fatal to the cause of freedom if America—at the threshold of the gravest crisis in its history—were to be influenced by advisers and public figures who still have not learned the bitter lessons which the Communists taught the world in Poland, Hungary, the Iron Curtain countries, Laos, and Cuba.

Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer recently told a congressional committee:

We have been on the losing end for too long a time. We cannot afford to give up 1 more yard to communism—anywhere.

I applaud this statement and endorse it.

To show strength against Communist threats in Latin America, as well as in every other part of the world where our national honor, prestige, and our military position are endangered, is our best defense against the outbreak of a great war. We can achieve the peace we strive for, only through strength, determination, and courage to act when action is demanded.

Our danger is not a lack of strength, for we have the greatest striking force in history. Our danger is that our purposes may become confused and our goals become blurred, to be beguiled by the siren's plea to "wait just a bit longer—rest here awhile, before setting out on the journey."

But we cannot wait any longer. Our duty is before us. The path stands out clear. It is rocky and thornfilled. But our forebears crossed over it before us, and reached the glorious summit. We can do no less.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign, during the adjournment following today's session, the enrolled bill, H.R. 6874, authorizing appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.