

DATE

April 30, 1965

Of course, there is deep concern over the risks—but what are the alternatives? Some of those who most regularly and loudly criticize our present course of action, have presented no viable and practical substitute courses. They tell us only that the path we take is the wrong one.

There is a curious obsessive pattern to this philosophers' debate, not unlike those ancients of the Sanhedrin, who pondered and agonized over the meanings of the Bible.

So perfectly could some of these men spin their abstractions that they refused to be confounded by realities.

So it was with the rabbi who said that he was sure that God's law would always make a piece of bread fall with the buttered side up.

When a colleague proceeded to test him by dropping a piece of buttered bread, the servant watched it fall face down to the earth and then with a triumphant smile said, "But you buttered it off the wrong side."

And thus it is today.

If Secretary of State Dean Rusk produces evidence of systematic aggressive acts by Hanoi since 1959, the critics say the United States refuses to recognize a civil war when it sees one.

If Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara displays confiscated weapons which betray their origin from the powers to the north, the critics say most of the insurgents are South Vietnamese using American arms.

And, say the peace-at-any-price critics, all the United States could lose by pulling out of Vietnam would be a little prestige—something easily repaired in a few years' time.

Mr. President, there is more than prestige involved—it is no less than humanity.

Ambassador W. Averell Harriman, who knows as much about the struggle for men's minds as anyone, says the issue at stake is the "outward thrust of communism."

And, says Ambassador Harriman, the outward thrust must be checked in southeast Asia just as it was in Europe.

Ambassador Harriman said recently:

The Communists firmly believe that what they call wars of liberation will be victorious for them.

They also believe those wars are something we cannot deal with. I look upon what is happening in South Vietnam as an ultimate expression of what the Communists intend to do in this respect.

Mr. Harriman suggests, and I agree, that it may take a long time to convince the Communists they cannot win in Vietnam—but the firmer we are, the shorter that time will be.

Communist strategy thrives on the proliferation of dissent at home.

I do not suggest for a minute we should halt all discussion of our national goals and objectives in Asia, but I believe any critic of our leadership should weigh the responsibilities he takes.

I point out that peaceful coexistence is part of the Communist arsenal.

Would our abrupt withdrawal from Vietnam bring peace or only the illusion of peace?

CRISIS IN VIETNAM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the political alchemists among us have a wondrous scheme for southeast Asia.

All we have to do, they say, is recognize that we must have an accommodation with Red China in Asia and presto— instant peace.

The pressure will vanish in Vietnam, we will no longer have to battle a war in which we are deluding ourselves, and peace-loving America will be drawn back from the edge of the chasm.

But, Mr. President, in my judgment, that talk is arrant nonsense, a concept of certain theorists as circular as the belief that base metal could be transformed into gold.

I was heartened Tuesday by the fact that President Johnson, at his new conference, demonstrated with magnificent firmness that U.S. leadership will not be swayed from within by an anxiety neurosis, and that it will not depart from what I believe to be the best and most productive path to peace in Vietnam.

President Johnson said:

From Munich until today, we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats—and more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of lasting peace.

Overwhelming evidence exists—from those brave men serving in South Vietnam to our citizens at home—that the majority of Americans subscribe to the President's clear leadership.

I subscribe to the policies he enunciated—that we discuss without conditions, the path to peace with any government—but that we will not retreat.

The Gallup poll shows that by a ratio of more than 2 to 1, the American people approve of the Government's handling of the situation in Vietnam.

April 30, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SEN

There are many Kremlinologists who think that Russia's apparent moves toward a détente in recent years are only an effort to induce a relaxation of tensions, even a national euphoria, and that our inability to recognize this could prove fatal.

Would Asian communism be any less likely to use such a stratagem?

I do not say that communism is a monolithic foe and that we must react like Pavlov's dogs to any Communist move.

But, let us not mistake our carefully controlled air responses to North Vietnamese aggression as anything akin to total U.S. involvement in that conflict, either.

All that we have done so far—from the replies of our forces in the Gulf of Tonkin to the recent air strikes—has been carefully controlled—measured.

Ninety-five percent of the troops engaged in field missions are South Vietnamese troops—there are 450,000 of them, to 32,500 of our officers and men.

Certainly the commitment of the South Vietnamese people, despite terrorist attacks on the civilian population and sustained military casualties of heavy proportions, should tell us that here is a people with a will to fight.

As President Johnson said to us:

I think that if the enemy there believes that we are going to stay, that we are not going to tuck our tails and run home and abandon our friends, I believe in due time that peace can be observed in that area.

Perhaps, we should remind our colleagues here at home—and perhaps General de Gaulle as well—that a nation founded in liberty's name does not readily abandon its friends, even when the risks are great.

A convenient amnesia is not something which the United States can afford at this critical juncture of history.

Perhaps France can forget who came to its rescue twice in this century, but the United States cannot and will not forget its pledge to freedom.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT RE DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the recent marches, sit-ins, and other demonstrations that have disrupted the conduct of government in counties, cities, and even entire States make it apparent that our public officials must have some effective and legal protection from the demonstrators, who seem determined to continue a campaign of harassment.

The law-abiding residents who as taxpayers must pay the bill caused by these demonstrators are also entitled to a means of relief. The innocent private citizens who must suffer inconveniences and the dedicated public officials who must do their work are entitled to the assistance of the U.S. Attorney General in the protection of their right to perform their duties without unreasonable harassment. If it is proper to provide by law that the Attorney General must throw the full weight and assistance of

his office into the effort to secure for some people the right to vote—as under this bill a petition by 20 persons would do—then it is proper to provide by law that the Attorney General must throw the full weight and assistance of his office into the effort of public officials and private citizens to secure the right to live in peace and perform their duties.

This amendment simply provides that the Attorney General, if requested to do so, must assist State, county, and local government officials to do the same thing the Attorney General did when demonstrators invaded his office—that is, throw them out so he “could get some work done.” Both the Attorney General and the White House have recognized that demonstrations interfere with and prevent the orderly and efficient accomplishment of work. This was admitted when demonstrators were ordered removed from the Attorney General's office and from inside the White House.

Under this amendment, the Attorney General would be compelled to come to the assistance of public officials of any political subdivision when persons who have not been denied the right to vote and are not residents therein, nevertheless storm into an area and create strife and discord; and interfere with public officials in the discharge and performance of their duty, including the registration of voters.

In brief, this amendment simply imposes upon the Attorney General the duty, when he is requested to do so, to see that the rights of all individuals are protected.

The necessity of adopting this amendment is underscored and emphasized by the recent statement of Martin Luther King that he felt he was under no moral obligation to obey laws with which he did not personally agree. He, in fact, went so far as to say that he had a moral duty to violate any law which he did not morally approve.

It would be a mockery of justice for us to provide that the full weight of the Federal Government must be thrown behind an individual who has openly stated that he will not obey the law if he does not agree with it, and at the same time refuse to give the assistance of the Federal Government to those who want to obey the law and are anxious to discharge their duty to enforce and apply the laws.

The proposed voting rights bill, if it passes, will give to the Attorney General every legal and necessary authority to secure the right of every citizen to vote. It goes so far in giving him this authority that it violates the Constitution, and I am opposed to its passage for the reason that it tramples upon constitutional principles. I shall oppose it with all my strength. But the hard facts are that 66 Senators have signed this bill. That is only one vote short of the necessary votes to invoke cloture. If it is passed, the Attorney General will be empowered with more authority than has ever been given to one individual in the history of this Government. I am opposed to giving one man the power that is given the Attorney General under the terms of this bill, but if he is to have such power, he should be compelled to use it in the protection of all

that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 305.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Dag Hammarskjold International Foundation, the American Association for the United Nations, the State of California Dag Hammarskjold Memorial Grove Committee and numerous cooperating groups including the Save-the-Redwoods League are carrying forward the proposal for a Dag Hammarskjold Memorial Redwood Grove; and

Whereas the life of Dag Hammarskjold was in concordance with the deep and pervading majesty of the redwoods, among which we find spiritual refuge and gain a more profound realization of his own thought that "we each have within us a center of stillness surrounded by silence"; and

Whereas Dag Hammarskjold, until his death on September 17, 1961, served eight years as Secretary-General of the United Nations, carrying on his widely significant and courageous search for world peace; and

Whereas by their very grandeur the giant redwoods imbue us with a stronger realization of human dignity, tolerance, and state-ness so characteristic of Dag Hammarskjold's life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that it is appropriate to designate a grove of redwood trees as selected by the State of California, as the Dag Hammarskjold Memorial Redwood Grove.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 305).

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the name of Dag Hammarskjold is a most gallant, illustrious, and courageous name which will live forever in history.

Dag Hammarskjold devoted his life to the pursuit of peace with justice for all mankind. Americans will join the peace-loving nations of the world in recalling the majesty and dignity with which Dag Hammarskjold conducted the business of the United Nations, undaunted by taunts, oblivious to threats, fearless of criticism, heaped upon him by those who sought to weaken and damage, if not indeed to destroy, the "town meeting of the world." He was not, nor could he be, intimidated by those who sought to scuttle peace. Quite literally, Dag Hammarskjold gave his life to the cause that he so devotedly pursued.

It was my great honor to be appointed by the late President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, to represent the Republican Party, as a member of an American delegation which flew overseas from this city, and which was led by the then Vice President, now the President of our country, to represent America at the final rites held in Uppsala, Sweden, at which the free nations of the world gave their last, tearful salute to the memory of this gallant man, struck down in the prime of life.

That recollection to me is a poignant one, as I saw the delegations from dozens of free countries, all in their native garb and costume, gathered together in the

magnificent Lutheran Cathedral for the state funeral of Dag Hammarskjold.

This resolution indicates it is the sense of Congress that it is appropriate to designate a grove of redwood trees, selected by the State of California, as the Dag Hammarskjold Memorial Redwood Grove.

I believe the resolution represents a fitting indication of the high and never-ending esteem in which the men and women in the legislative branch of our Government, representing the American people, continue to hold the memory of a profoundly dedicated human being who labored unceasingly for the great cause of honorable peace among all nations.

I know that every other Senator will join me in voting for the approval of this resolution.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the distinguished Senator from California's offering the resolution honoring a great patriot who served with distinction and honor and, as a matter of fact, gave his life in the interest of peace.

It happened that I was in Stockholm, Sweden, on the very day it was announced that he had been selected Secretary General of the United Nations. I shall never forget the enthusiasm that swept the people and the press stories, to the effect that one who had given so much service would give even greater service to the cause of peace. It was natural for me, having a Swedish background, to be proud of his services. During my service as a delegate, I viewed the plaque in the United Nations commemorating the services and memory of Dag Hammarskjold.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 305) was agreed to.

WHITE HOUSE BRIEFING ON DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be given the necessary time to read a 2½-page statement.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, President Johnson called to the White House this morning for a briefing members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, Armed Services Committees, and Foreign Policy Committees. He briefed these Members of Congress with the press present on the most recent developments in southeast Asia and the Dominican Republic.

The President stated that under present law, he is authorized to transfer funds already appropriated in the defense budget to the unexpected financial defense needs of the war in southeast