Approved For Release 2005/01/27 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000200190035-0

The provisions of the original bill, allowing jurisdiction to be ceded to State agencies in appropriate cases, may need clarification; but I am somewhat concerned that the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois could invite evasion in States more dedicated to segregation than to equality of opportunity.

Therefore, while the existing language with regard to giving the State agencies full authority in the fields where they now operate is entirely satisfactory to me, and I believe protects those State agencies; yet if we are to make a change, we must be very careful not to change it in such a way that any State could evade the salutary and essential purposes of the act by simply setting up some kind of a commission that did not mean anything.

I can also understand the concern expressed by the Senator from Illinois about middlemen, as he puts it, initiating complaints, and about the requirement that those complaints be originated only by the person aggrieved. But I am more concerned about the victims of discrimination who are unable to protect their own interests because of intimidation or reprisal or some other reasons, which is a real threat in some communities.

I believe safeguards must be provided for such situations. Nor do I see, offhand, any justification for a 2-year delay in the timetable for the application of the act, as is proposed by the distinguished minority leader.

The original bill already provides a period for adjustment which, it would seem to me, should be adequate in States that are acting in good faith.

Some of the amendments suggested are of a technical or minor nature, but to the extent that they make the bill more effective and more uniform in operation, I would expect they would be unobjectionable.

While no decisions have been made with regard to the matter, certainly the proposals, regardless of any differences which we may have over particular amendments, are a welcome confirmation of the commitment of the distinguished minority leader to the principle of equal opportunity in employment, and I believe are to be commended in that respect.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi for allowing me to intervene at this point.

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday, 500 leaders of 2 dozen important American Jewish organizations drew up plans for a long-term effort to combat Soviet religious persecution. The conference which drew support from the entire country and from religious, labor, and humanitarian organizations, is an important manifestation of the growing concern in the United States at the mounting degree of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. The conference drew up an 18-point appeal to the Soviet authorities to put an end to discrimination on religious grounds and to restore the cultural and religious rights of members of the Jewish faith behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, the United Nations charter calls upon all nations to honor the religious and cultural rights of minorities. Not only as a leader of the free nations of the world, but also as a strong supporter of the principles of the United Nations, the United States has a particular responsibility on this issue. It is not enough for the U.S. State Department to reply, "No American citizens are involved; we cannot interfere."

This is an issue of worldwide humanitarian concern and I strongly urge the Government of the United States to give its strong backing to these efforts to promote human rights and religious toleration within the Soviet Union. This conference was an important effort which deserves nationwide interfaith backing.

GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, an editorial, published in the April 6 issue of the Evening Star, pays high tribute to Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The editorial is eloquent, and makes a valid point about the General's recall from Korea. I wish to read the editorial into the RECORD, because I believe it would be of interest to the people of the United States. It is entitled "General MacArthur," and reads:

GENERAL MACARTHUR

A significant measure of the man is that he was graduated from West Point in 1903 with a scholastic average (98.14 percent) that has yet to be equalled there. But Douglas MacArthur, dead now at 84, was gifted with something more than academic brilliance. He had a touch of wide-ranging genius in him. He had a style, a presence, a personality, an eloquence, a forcefulness of mind, a strength and grace of spirit, that set him apart.

History will record, first of all, that he was a truly great military leader—inspired and inspiring. In the First World War, though he was unprecedentedly young for such a responsibility, he commanded the famous Rainbow Division. And in the Second World War, after having set other precedents as the most youthful this and that (including Army Chief of Staff), he became commander of all our Armed Forces, land, sea, and air, in the far Pacific. Then followed his masterful island-hopping strategy that pushed the Japanese back and back. Next came Nippon's total surrender, and his assumption of the role of proconsul in charge of the occupation.

In this role General MacArthur won the affectionate and almost reverential regard of the Japanese people. With a personality and a physical demeanor well tailored to the task, and with his sure knowledge of Asia's problems and psychology, he switched from the role of conqueror to the role of reconstructor, setting in motion revolutionary changes that have since transformed Japan—much for the better. When he left that country, after having been impetuously fired by President Truman from his proconsul's job and from his command of United Nations forces in Korea, upward of 1 million residents of Tokyo turned out to pay him a fond and tumultuous farewell. Nothing could have better proved the excellence of the job he had done there for America.

There probably will be never-ending historical speculation over what might have happened to our world if General MacArthur's counsel had been followed in the Korean war. The counsel was simply this: Deny the Chinese Reds the privileged sanctuary beyond the Yalu River; bomb them; shatter their centers of power; smash China proper. President Truman, with the advice of his chief military and political associates, decided that such a course would involve the grave risk of precipitating a global nuclear war. Today, with the benefit of Dr. Hindsight's judgments, it seems probable that Mr. Truman's decision—a fateful one—was grievously wrong.

As for General MacArthur, in his address to Congress after his dismissal in 1951, he summed up his views in these words: "I know war * * * and nothing to me is more revolting. But once war is forced upon us, there is no alternative than to apply every available means to bring it to a swift end. War's very object is victory, not prolonged indecision."

And at another point he described himself as a "soldier who tried to do his duty as God gave him the light to see that duty." He did it superbly well. It may be a long time before another of his caliber comes our way.

THE COLD WAR IN AMERICAN LIFE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on March 25, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], delivered an address on the floor of the Senate that may prove to be the most important address of 1964. It represents the kind of vigorous realism that is urgently needed in today's world.

The great danger to the people of the United States and to the peace of the world is that our attitudes and policies may become so rigid that we are unable to modify our course to meet changing conditions.

Senator FULBRIGHT, from his long years of study and observation of international affairs, has put the spotlight on a number of areas where our policies seem not to coincide with the realities of the world.

The Senator from Arkansas has now delivered a second major speech which builds on the earlier one. Speaking on April 5 at the University of North Carolina 1964 Symposium, "Arms and the Man: National Security and the Aims of a Free Society," Senator FULBRIGHT devoted his remarks to the theme, "The Cold War in American Life." I strongly urge every Member of Congress to read and ponder this important address.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE COLD WAR IN AMERICAN LIFE

(Speech by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, delivered at the University of North Carolina 1964 Symposium: "Arms and the Man: National Security and the Aims of a Free Society")

The Constitution of the United States, in the words of its preamble, was established,

Approved For Release 2005/01/27 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000200190035-0

Approved For Release 2005/01/27 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000200190035-0

among other reasons, in order to "provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty." In the past generation the emphasis of our public policy has been heavily weighted on measures for the common defense to the considerable neglect of programs for promoting the liberty and welfare of our people. The reason for this, of course, has been the exacting demands of two World Wars and an intractable cold war, which have wrought vast changes in the character of American life.

Of all the changes in American life wrought by the cold war, the most important by far, in my opinion, has been the massive diversion of energy and resources from the creative pursuits of civilized society to the conduct of a costly and interminable struggle for world power. We have been compelled, or have felt ourselves compelled, to reverse the traditional order of our national priorities, relegating individual and community life to places on the scale below the enormously expensive military and space activities that constitute our program of national security.

This of course is not the only change in American life brought about by the cold war. There have been many others, some most welcome and constructive. Directly or indirectly, the world struggle with communism has stimulated economic and industrial expansion, accelerated the pace of intellectual inquiry and scientific discovery, broken the shell of American isolation and greatly increased public knowledge and awareness of the world outside the United States. At the same time, the continuing world conflict has cast a shadow on the tone of American life by introducing a strang of apprehension and tension into a national style which has traditionally been one of buoyant optimism. The continuing and inconclusive struggle, new in American experience, has in Walt Rostow's words, "imposed a sense of limitation on the Nation's old image of itself, a limitation which has been accepted with greater or less maturity and which has touched the Nation's domestic life at many points with elements of escapism, with a tendency to search for scapegoats, with simple worry, and with much thoughtful, responsive effort as well." [1]

Overriding all these changes, however, good and bad, has been the massive diversion of wealth and talent from individual and community life to the increasingly complex and costly effort to maintain a minimum level of national security in a world in which no nation can be immune from the threat of sudden catastrophe. We have had to turn away from our hopes in order to concentrate on our fears and the result has been accumulating neglect of those things which bring happiness and beauty and fulfillment into our lives. The "public happiness," in August Heckscher's term, has become a luxury to be postponed to some distant day when the dangers that now beset us will have disappeared.

This, I think, is the real meaning of the cold war in American life. It has consumed money and time and talent that could otherwise be used to build schools and homes and hospitals, to remove the blight of ugliness that is spreading over the cities and highways of America, and to overcome the poverty and hopelessness that afflict the lives of one-fifth of the people in an otherwise affluent society. It has put a high premium on avoiding innovation at home because new programs involve controversy as well as expense and it is felt that we cannot afford domestic divisions at a time when external challenges require us to maintain the highest possible degree of national unity. Far more pervasively than the United Nations or the "Atlantic community" could ever do, the cold war has encroached upon our sovereignty; it has given the Russians the major voice in determining what proportion of our Federal budget must be allocated to the military and what proportion, therefore, cannot be made available for domestic social and economic projects. This is the price that we have been paying for the cold war and it has been a high price indeed.

[1] W. W. Rostow, "The United States in the World Arena" (New York: Harper & Bros., 1960), p. 451.

At least as striking as the inversion of priorities which the cold war has enforced upon American life is the readiness with which the American people have consented to defer programs for their welfare and happiness in favor of costly military and space programs. Indeed, if the Congress accurately reflects the temper of the country, then the American people are not only willing, they are eager, to sacrifice education and urban renewal and public health programs—to say nothing of foreign aid—to the requirements of the Armed Forces and the space agency. There is indeed a most striking paradox in the fact that military budgets of over $50 billion are adopted by the Congress after only perfunctory debate, while domestic education and welfare programs involving sums which are mere fractions of the military budget are painstakingly examined and then either considerably reduced or rejected outright. I sometimes suspect that in its zeal for armaments at the expense of education and welfare the Congress tends to overrepresent those of our citizens who are extraordinarily agitated about national security and extraordinarily vigorous about making their agitation known.

It may be that the people and their representatives are making a carefully reasoned sacrifice of welfare to security. It may be, but I doubt it. The sacrifice is made so eagerly as to cause one to suspect that it is fairly painless, that indeed the American people prefer military rockets to public schols and flights to the moon to urban renewal. In a perverse way, we have grown rather attached to the cold war. It occupies us with a stirring and seemingly clear and simple challenge from outside and diverts us from problems here at home which many Americans would rather not try to solve, some because they find domestic problems tedious and pedestrian, others because they genuinely believe these problems to be personal rather than public, others because they are unwilling to be drawn into an abrasive national debate as to whether poverty, unemployment, and inadequate education are in fact national rather than local or individual concerns.

The cold war, it seems clear, is an excuse as well as a genuine cause for the diversion of our energies from domestic well-being to external security. We have been preoccupied with foreign affairs for 25 years, and while striking progress has been made in certain areas of our national life, the agenda of neglect has grown steadily longer. We can no longer afford to defer problems of slums and crime and poverty and inadequate education until some more tranquil time in the future. These problems have become urgent if not intolerable in an affluent society. It is entirely reasonable to defer domestic programs in time of an all-out national effort such as World War II, but in the present cold war it is not reasonable to defer our domestic needs until more tranquil times, for the simple reason that there may be no more tranquil times in this generation or in this century.

In the long run, the solution of our domestic problems has as vital a bearing on the success of our foreign policies as on the public happiness at home. We must therefore reassess the priorities of our public policy, with a view to redressing the disproportion between our military and space efforts on the one hand and our education and human welfare programs on the other. We must distinguish between necessity and preference in our preoccupation with national security, judging our military needs by a standard which takes due account of the fact that armaments are only one aspect of national security, that military power, as Kenneth Thompson has written, "is like the fist whose force depends on the health and vitality of the body politic and the whole society." [2]

The single-minded dedication with which we Americans have committed ourselves to the struggle with communism is a manifestation of a national tendency to interpret problems in moral and absolutist terms. We are, as Louis Hartz has pointed out, a Nation which was "born free." [3] Having experienced almost none of the anguished conflict between radicalism and reaction that has characterized European politics, we have been virtually unanimous in our adherence to the basic values of liberal democracy. We have come to identify these values with the institutional forms which they take in American society and have regarded both as having moral validity not only for ourselves but for the entire world. We have therefore been greatly shocked since our emergence as a world power to find ourselves confronted with revolutionary idealogies which reject the faith in individual liberty and limited government that has served our own society so well.

Because of these predilections, the cold war has seemed to represent a profound challenge to our moral principles as well as to our security and other national interests. We have responded by treating Communist ideology itself, as distinguished from the physical power and expansionist policies of Communist states, as a grave threat to the free world. The cold war, as a result, has been a more dangerous, costly, and irreconcilable conflict than it would be if we and the Communist states, confined it to those issues that involve the security and vital interests of the rival power blocs.

The ideological element in the cold war, reinforced by the moralist tendencies of the American people, has also had the effect of making the world conflict a much more disruptive element in American life than it would be if it were regarded primarily in terms of its effect on our national security. To an extent, the issue between the Communist and the free worlds is moral and ideological, but ideas and principles in themselves threaten no nation's vital interests except insofar as they are implemented in national policies. It is the latter, therefore, that are our proper concern. To the extent that we are able to remove the crusading spirit and the passions of ideology from the cold war, we can reduce its danger and intensity and relax its powerful hold on the minds and hearts of our people.

The fears and passions of ideological conflict have diverted the minds and energies of our people from the constructive tasks of a free society to a morbid preoccupation with the dangers of Communist aggression abroad and subversion and disloyalty at home. The problem did not end with the McCarthy era of a decade ago nor is it confined to the neurotic fantasies of today's radical right. The cold war malady affects a much broader spectrum of American society. It affects millions of sensible and intelligent citizens whose genuine concern with national security has persuaded them that the prosecution of the cold war is our only truly essential national responsibility,

[2] Kenneth W. Thompson, "Christian Ethics and the Dilemmas of Foreign Policy" (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1959), p. 70.

[3] Louis Hartz, "The Liberal Tradition in America" (New York: Harcourt Brace & World, Inc.), 1955.

Approved For Release 2005/01/27 : CIA-RDP66B00403R000200190035-0