

March 2, 1966

tem and opposed to unnecessary bureaucratic regulation. However, when I see a need for a new law it is promoted with equal vigor.

During the Christmas recess, several of my banking friends sent me a copy of a letter they had received from some New York promoter in which he offered to furnish them U.S. currency at a premium. This means he has been hoarding it and now endeavors to sell it to banks at a profit. I feel a law should be enacted which would prevent this while at the same time protecting the right of the legitimate collector. The letter was sent to the Johnstown Bank, Johnstown, Ohio, and follows:

PORT CHESTER COIN EXCHANGE,
INC., COIN WRAPPING AND DELIVERY SERVICE,

346 North Main Street,
Port Chester, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Your bank is facing a severe coin shortage at this time which will soon be compounded by the Christmas season demand. As you well know, the Federal Reserve is unable to meet your coin requirements now, and this problem will hamper you severely in servicing your customers' coin needs.

We are currently helping many banks and financial institutions around the country to solve their coin shortage. We can supply your bank with all the coins you need, shipped to your nearest commercial airport, air express collect. Shipments are made continuously from Monday through Saturday.

Rates, including delivery to Kennedy International Airport, are as follows:

\$1,000 in nickles-----	\$1,020.00
\$1,000 in dimes-----	1,020.00
\$1,000 in quarters-----	1,015.00
\$1,000 in halves-----	1,047.50
\$1,000 in silver dollars-----	1,300.00

Please call me at 914-939-9839 for prompt and courteous service and any further information.

Very truly yours,
PORT CHESTER COIN EXCHANGE, INC.,
MILTON SCULKY.

JAMES MICHAEL SILVERTHORN SPEAKS ON DEMOCRACY

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 300,000 school students participated in the contest, competing for the 5 scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The contest theme was "Democracy—What It Means to Me." The winner for the State of Ohio was James Michael Silverthorn, of 320 North Third Street, Coshocton, Ohio, and he will be competing for national honors.

Coshocton is very proud of Jim and I am very honored that he is from the district I am privileged to represent. He will be visiting Washington on March 8, 1966, and attend the annual congressional dinner of the VFW. I certainly wish him luck in the final competition and, win or lose, he has brought great honor to his school, his family, his State.

His prize-winning theme is excellent and I am including it with these remarks.

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By James Michael Silverthorn)

Democracy—a fine sounding word. Like motherhood, and baseball. And like most fine sounding words, it is so often used and misused it has lost virtually all meaning.

The standard, stock definition of democracy is "government or rule by the people." We give this pat definition when one is required, yet it means precisely nothing.

What good is democracy? How can it possibly work? Philosophers since Plato have asked those questions. Hitler said, "We spit in the face of democracy." How can we answer such challenges?

Well, it is really quite simple: democracy as defined, does not work. No large group of people, certainly no nation could possibly have a stable, well-run society under a government by the people. Indeed, the only governments today which claim to be the people's are those which make a mockery of the very concept of democracy—the People's Republic of China, the People's Republic of Poland.

No, pure democracy with all the people, with all their differing ideas and interests, having a continual voice, can never result in anything but chaos. But we in America have found a way, a method of having an established governmental authority, yet allowing the collective will of the people to remain supreme.

Our republican democracy does not lessen the responsibilities of the individual, it magnifies them to a sometimes terrifying extent. Suddenly it is not one's own wishes or will that matters, for decisions must be made for the common good, representatives chosen for all the people.

Still the basic democratic spirit behind it all remains. Democracy is not so much an exact means of government but a way of life, eyeglasses through which to see the importance of the individual.

Just before World War II, an American missionary was speaking to a Japanese police captain. The captain, scoffing at the missionary, looked out the window. Below was an aged peasant plodding along with a heavy burden on his back.

"You see him?" the captain asked. "He doesn't mean that to us," he spat out snapping his finger. "But give us a million like him, and he is important. The individual means nothing." So you see, is it so strange to say respecting individual importance is revolutionary?

Yet it works the other way, too. As individuals have formed the government, so they owe it their loyalty and respect.

Recently, a young man was stopped by a police officer on suspicion of drunken driving. When word reached the young man's mother, she went to challenge the officer. Publicly, she and her son attacked him.

News of this police brutality spread. Five days later, 34 people were dead and millions of dollars of damage had been done. The Watts district should always be a monument to the danger of public disrespect for proper authority.

It is easy to list the duties of citizens: voting, paying taxes, keeping informed. For us, students approaching adulthood, the duties are even more awesome. We must prepare ourselves for future participation in our society. The preparation includes learning about our government, and more importantly gaining an acquaintance with the basic philosophy of Americanism.

But despite these facts, the basic requirements can be summed up in a few phrases. We as citizens are individuals with undeniable rights and must see others as individuals with the same rights. We as establish-

ers and maintainers of the government owe it our constant attention and participation. Mutual give-and-take is the only fairplay in the relationship between the government and the people.

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Republican policy committee, I would like to place in the RECORD an important policy committee statement on Vietnam which was adopted at our Tuesday, March 1, meeting:

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

The deep division within the Democratic Party over American policy in Vietnam is prolonging the war, undermining the morale of our fighting men and encouraging the Communist aggressor. It has confused the people in other nations about the American purpose and has led North Vietnam to believe that in time we may falter, that we do not have the necessary will or determination to win. As a result, the peace that this Nation and the free world seeks has been delayed, the fighting intensified, and the threat of a major war deepened.

In an effort to please the conflicting elements in the Democratic Party, the administration has had to dodge and shift. Its policy and position on Vietnam continues to be marred by indecision, sudden change and frequent reinterpretation. Under the circumstances, it is little wonder that the enemy has been encouraged, our friends dismayed, and the "national unity that can do more to bring about peace negotiations than almost any other thing" has been delayed.

We, therefore, call upon the President to disavow those within his party who would divide this country as they have divided the Democratic Party. Certainly, as the President has stated, "there is much more that unites us than divides us." However, as long as the party in power cannot agree on such basic issues as whether Americans should be in Vietnam at all, what our Nation is trying to achieve there and whether the right means are being used, there will continue to be uncertainties, misunderstandings, and fears about the war in Vietnam. America, indeed the world, is waiting for the President to take command of his party. Until this is done, the divisive debate will continue, the confusion will grow, and a peaceful solution will elude us.

Republicans are united in their support of the fighting men in Vietnam. We also support a policy that will prevent the success of aggression and the forceful conquest of South Vietnam by North Vietnam.

In addition, we believe that the people of South Vietnam should have an opportunity to live their lives in peace under a government of their own choice, free of Communist aggression.

Certainly, these objectives cannot be realized by admitting the Communists to a share of power in a coalition government. For this is "arsenic in the medicine," the "fox in the chicken coop." It would pave the way for a Communist takeover as surely as did the coalition governments in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Hungary. Moreover, it would make a cruel and indefensible mockery of the sacrifices of the fighting men in Vietnam.

March 2, 1966

sibility of the employer when the move involves a transfer from one permanent duty station to another at the request of the employer. A bill H.R. 10607 has been recommended by the President and was favorably reported by the Government Operations Committee of the House under which the Federal Government would reimburse such expenses to its employees.

The Internal Revenue Service has recently announced that reimbursements in these latter categories must be treated as taxable compensation; that is, the employer must withhold, and the employee must include the reimbursement in his income and not deduct the expense—see Revenue Ruling 65-158, published June 14, 1965, and TIR-754 published August 9, 1965. While the Service had taken a similar position in earlier rulings and cases, its previous attempts to enforce its position had been spotty, and the pre-1965 court decisions had been inconclusive—see statement on section 213 of the 1964 act, in Senate Report No. 830, 88th Congress, 2d session, page 71. The Service's recent announcements were precipitated by a court of appeals decision in its favor last April, on which the taxpayer sought—but the Justice Department opposed—review in the Supreme Court—see *U.S. v. Kenneth D. England*, 345 F. 2d 414 (CA-7), certiorari denied, January 1966, 34 U.S. Law Week 3242.

The latter categories of moving expenses—such as expenses of selling the employee's home at the old duty station and expenses while occupying temporary quarters at the new post for a limited period—are genuinely employer business expenses and not employee expenses. To treat them as taxable is grossly unfair to the thousands of employees involved, most of whom earn less than \$10,000 a year. It is also bad social policy, since it constitutes a drag on the mobility of labor and of industry.

Notwithstanding the large number of transfers that take place—an estimated 340,000 military personnel, more than 150,000 private industry employees, and 35,000 Federal civilian employees—the revenue impact of corrective legislation would not be too substantial. Thus, appropriate limitations can be placed on those eligible and the amounts to be excluded in each case. Furthermore, the entire issue is still being litigated and most affected employees probably have not been treating these items as taxable anyway, so the revenue loss should probably be viewed in any case as potential rather than actual.

A legislative solution is highly desirable. Without a prompt and definitive solution, employers are in a difficult position in not knowing whether they actually are required to withhold; employees, in not knowing whether they should report, and if they do report, in perhaps being forced to litigate; and the Service in attempting to achieve consistent enforcement.

A short summary of my bill, which is identical to H.R. 13070 introduced on February 24 by our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE), is set forth herewith.

In addition to the cost of moving the employee, his family, and household goods to the new place of work, which are clearly nontaxable under present law, the bill would exclude from the income of an employee who has worked for the same or a related employer for at least a year at the time of the transfer, reimbursements for reasonable expenses incurred by reason of the move in the following areas:

First. Travel for the employee and his wife to seek permanent quarters at the new location;

Second. Expenses while occupying temporary quarters at the new location for a period generally not to exceed 30 days;

Third. Expenses incident to the employee selling his home at the old duty station and purchasing a residence at the new location;

Fourth. Miscellaneous expenses directly connected with the move, but not to exceed the lesser of 2 weeks' pay or \$1,000 in the case of a family man with the maximum exclusion being reduced by one-half for an employee having no family.

Mr. Speaker, employees who are directed to move by their employers should not have to pay tax on expenditures which primarily benefit their employers. Passage of the bill would simply recognize this fundamental principle.

DEMOCRACY—WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this year more than 390,000 young Americans participated in the Voice of Democracy contest sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary. The theme this year was "Democracy—What It Means to Me."

The winning speech in North Dakota was presented by 17-year-old Charles Alan Collins, of Fargo, who calls upon his fellow students to concentrate on "what is right with America" rather than "what is wrong with America."

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of Charles Alan Collins' speech at this point in the RECORD:

DEMOCRACY—WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

What does democracy mean to me? I could write a book, and still not give the full answer, for the true meaning of democracy could never be confined to a printed page. It is a concept in the minds of men that defies limitations. It is a dream that has lived in the hearts of men for over 1965 years. It is that intangible "something" that gradually becomes a living part of each one of us.

It is that "something inside" that made the soldier in Vietnam hoist a small American flag just minutes before he went down under enemy fire. It is that "something inside" that made "Joe Smith, American" decide to be beaten to death rather than reveal a vital defense secret to the enemy. It is that "something inside" that made our boys who recently returned home on furlough from Vietnam say: "We want to go back and finish this job."

What is that "something inside"? Maybe it is the remembrance of the little things in life back home that have suddenly become terribly important—the smell of mom's homemade rolls, the pungent odor of dad's pipe, the arguments with sis over the car, the crowd at the pizza shop after the show, the many arguments over political issues—and suddenly they know that these represent a way of life that must be preserved.

Maybe this is why I, a 17-year-old who may soon be standing in their shoes, am taking a more appreciative look at these very same freedoms which I, too, am wearing too easily like comfortable old shoes. What can I, a lone high school student do about it? Much. I know I am only one, but I am one—and since a nation is no stronger than its weakest link, I must try to make my link as strong as possible. I can try to strengthen my own personal character and integrity.

I can support the rules of my school and town. I may not agree with all of them, but I will obey them as I know they represent the Democratic majority. I can learn more about my rights under the Constitution, but I must also remember that with these rights come certain responsibilities. I cannot complain about my constitutional rights if, in so doing, I would be denying these same constitutional rights to those about me. Knowing that the real war of the present is being fought for the control of men's minds, I must try to sharpen my mind by wide reading of current problems, by knowing well the political candidates, by more critical listening, and more careful evaluations. To these ends I am active in the high school debate program, the student congress legislative program, school government and local junior politics.

Along with my classmates I can encourage the use of justice and fair play in school affairs. We can vote to keep the Pledge of Allegiance in the school and encourage more respect for our flag. We can strengthen our school Americanism program. We can encourage our fellow students to think along the lines of "what's right with America," rather than "what's wrong with America." We can create interest in politics by setting up student polls at election time. We can emphasize the importance of maintaining the institutions of our Government which protect our life, liberty, and property—for governments do not preserve themselves—they are preserved only by the vigilance of those to whose guardianship they have been committed—and the price of freedom is eternal vigilance.

And when the defense of these freedoms calls for our draft numbers to be called, we can answer in the words of Daniel Webster: "I was born an American; I live an American; I shall die an American, no man can suffer too much and no man can fall too soon if it be in defense of the liberties and the constitution of his country."

NEW LAW NEEDED

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I was one who opposed the new coinage law because I felt that, despite the pronouncements of the liberal economist, Gresham's law would apply. It is rather obvious that it has. One of the side effects of this situation has been the improper trafficking in American currency by some unscrupulous individuals. I have a record which is rather clearly pitted against improper governmental interference in the free enterprise sys-

This apathy can be met in the same way as the external peril. First, of course, by a conviction in democracy, and secondly, by a knowing willingness to fight. If we, the youth, fulfill these, then no longer can it be said that, "Youth is wasted on the young." But, instead, it may be said that, "Ah, youth—what can you not do?"

However, we still must keep in mind that "democracy undefended and untended is democracy ended."

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTEN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to submit to the House certain observations with regard to the situation in Vietnam, to discuss some of the implications of the ideas suggested in recent days by the distinguished junior Senator from New York, and to make a proposal which I believe logically follows from Senator KENNEDY's contribution.

To start with, let me emphasize once again that, agonizing as the conflict is in Vietnam, I am in agreement with President Johnson that we cannot withdraw from Vietnam and let the Communists take over. I also salute the President for continuing to resist the pressure of those who would expand and escalate the war. I believe that, in pursuing a middle course between these two extremes, the President has the support, as the polls continue to show, of the great majority of the people of this country. The differences that exist among us are concerned for the most part with the question of what course to follow between withdrawal and an all-out effort to achieve a military solution, come what may. The President has repeatedly stated that he will continue to seek a peaceful settlement, and I am convinced of his profound desire to achieve that end. Nevertheless, I respectfully submit that, in spite of all the much publicized "peace offensive" of last December and January, the administration has not yet been sufficiently resourceful or flexible in its efforts to get negotiations started. In fact, recent developments create the impression that the administration is no longer giving much thought to the question of how to achieve a negotiated settlement.

In considering this matter, it seems pertinent first of all to examine the following crucial question: Why, in spite of all the efforts that have been made since last April to get discussions started, has Hanoi steadfastly refused to respond?

The question is the more puzzling because Hanoi has been under some pressure from nonaligned states, and presumably also from some Communist states, to agree to talks, and because the toll of the conflict on North Vietnam, as well as on the Vietcong, must be considerable. Peiping has every reason to prefer the continuance of the conflict, but the same cannot be said of Hanoi.

Why then the intransigence?

The first answer, which is obvious but nevertheless needs explicit recognition in these days of sloganeering, is that the Hanoi government has concluded that its interest would not be served by agreeing to talks, or, to put it another way, that the disadvantages of agreeing to talks outweigh the advantages.

Such an answer of course leads directly to the next question, why has the Hanoi regime arrived at that conclusion?

Here what evidence we have is scanty and unreliable—for even what leaders in Hanoi have told reporters and foreign diplomats may well not be the truth. But what does an analysis of the objective facts suggest?

One theory is that Hanoi chooses to continue the conflict because that is what Peiping wants and Hanoi is afraid of Peiping. While granting the truth of both premises, I cannot credit the theory. There is nothing Peiping could reasonably do to Hanoi other than public castigation, if Hanoi were to agree to negotiations. Indeed, Hanoi would have far more to fear from Peiping if Hanoi were devastated by a protracted and perhaps intensified war and thereby rendered hopelessly dependent on Peiping.

Another theory is that Hanoi is afraid it could not control the Vietcong if it were to agree to a cease-fire, especially since the Vietcong and its supporters would be afraid of being cut to bits by a vengeful Saigon government. Two comments are pertinent here: first, without support from Hanoi the Vietcong could not effectively keep fighting for long; second, Hanoi could agree to talk and at the same time refuse to stop fighting until effective arrangements had been made, presumably under international control, for protection of the Communists in the south from violent retribution.

The principal theory that administration spokesmen advance for Hanoi's intransigence is that Hanoi feels eventually the United States will get tired and quit just as France did, and that therefore time is on Hanoi's side. The administration says Hanoi is encouraged in this view by the antiwar demonstrations in the United States and by the criticism of U.S. policies expressed by prominent members of the legislative branch and others. It is hard to see how Hanoi could be so misled, in the face of the repeated commitments of the administration, the massive and continued buildup of our forces in South Vietnam, the lack of support for withdrawal shown in the U.S. public opinion polls, and the overwhelming support in Congress for money bills, such as the one passed by the House yesterday.

Nevertheless, there may be something to the theory. Being a totalitarian state, Hanoi may overestimate the importance of expressed dissent in the United States. Moreover, Hanoi may not distinguish between those who favor abandoning the struggle—a tiny minority—and those who believe we have not done enough to get peace talks started—still probably a minority, but a much larger one. Parenthetically, I must say that some writers and some administration officials have contributed to this confusion by their tendency to lump all

the critics together and by careless use of terms such as "the appeasers."

In any event, whatever the significance of this factor, it seems clear that debate and dissent cannot be shut off. If we were to have a formal declaration of war, the situation might be different, but I know of no responsible person who wants such a declaration. I do believe the situation could be ameliorated if those groups and individuals who are most critical of the administration's policies should make it clear in public statements that they do not approve Hanoi's refusal to agree to peace talks. As matters stand, these organizations, having totally refrained from any criticism of Hanoi, have allowed that regime to believe that they approve of its intransigence. A welcome contrast has been provided by the World Council of Churches, which addressed its criticism and its pleas to both sides.

Perhaps in this situation we do pay a price for our freedoms, especially for the intensely public airing of the issues which took place in the nationally televised Senate hearings. But it is a price we must pay or lose the essence of the very ideas we are fighting to preserve and protect. The Senate hearings were themselves a stunning example of democracy in action, and served to underline the fact that the differences are more on matters of tactics than of principle or national purpose.

I have no doubt that the administration is doing what it can to convey to Hanoi through all available communication channels the evidence that the United States is not going to get tired and quit. The evidence is there, in terms of historical examples of our staying power, and in terms of U.S. public opinion, as reflected in the Congress and otherwise. And Hanoi should get the message too—not in terms of a threat but in terms of a cool appraisal of the likely trend of American thinking—that, if there is to be a change in the present policy of limited military action, it is more likely to be in the direction of more drastic action than in the direction of withdrawal.

The pressures on the President today are probably stronger from the "hawks" than from the "doves." I would myself be strongly opposed to any expansion of the bombing of North Vietnam, especially of the cities, and I do not believe it would achieve our objectives, but in the process North Vietnam would suffer incalculable damage.

In our efforts, public and private, to convince Hanoi that we will not withdraw, that we will stay for years if necessary, we may be aided by the fact that so far Hanoi's "hawks" have been proved wrong, just as our "hawks" have been. Perhaps it is in the nature of hawks to overestimate the effectiveness of their own military strategy, and to underestimate the determination of the people on the other side.

So much for what Hanoi may see as the disadvantages of entering into negotiations.

Now, let us look at the other side of the coin, that is, the possible advantages, from Hanoi's point of view, of starting negotiations. The question Ho

March 2, 1966

Chi Minh and his advisers must ask themselves is: What would it be reasonable for them to expect they might be able to achieve through negotiations?

The quick answer is: Not much. On the public record, what we have offered them, in essence, is economic aid for North Vietnam and the opportunity to contest elections in the south. So far as the offer of economic aid is concerned—though I believe it is a sophisticated and indeed statesmanlike thing to do—it cannot be much of an inducement. It could be distorted to look very much like a kind of bribe, the acceptance of which would be virtually a humiliation, especially for a state which has been consistently trumpeting the superiority of communism. Moreover, Hanoi could not know how much such aid would amount to or how long it would last.

As to the attractiveness of elections in the south, even assuming international supervision would be provided, we need ask ourselves just one question: Would we be willing to accept the result of elections held in the north by the government of Hanoi, even under international supervision? Of course not. Then why should we expect Hanoi to see the problem differently, if elections were to be held in the south by the Saigon government, even under international supervision?

It is in this area—the need for providing Hanoi with a good reason for coming to the negotiating table—that I feel the administration's policy has tended to be sterile and unimaginative. And it is in precisely this area that I believe Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY, in his statement of February 19 and subsequent comments, has performed a real service.

His statement has been violently—and predictably—attacked in some quarters. In others, it has been dismissed with hasty and glib clichés that compare most unfavorably with the calm and well-reasoned quality of the statement itself. I would not have expected the administration to indorse the statement. That might well have been construed as giving away too much before the bargaining has even started. But I should have thought the administration might well have said, as Ambassador Goldberg and Mr. Moyers reportedly did, that these are all matters which would be subjects for discussion at the negotiating table. In still other quarters, Senator KENNEDY's statement has been misconstrued, deliberately or otherwise, and there has been confusion about what he actually said. Many commentators, I feel sure, never read the full text of his original statement.

In essence, Senator KENNEDY's basic position is threefold:

First. U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam is unthinkable;

Second. A military victory in Vietnam is not out of the question but presents staggering difficulties and dangers;

Third. If we mean what we say about wanting to get negotiations started, we must be prepared to give up something: We must be willing to accept the possibility that negotiations might result in some form of governmental arrangement in South Vietnam in which the dissident

elements there would have a share of power and responsibility. This result might come about through a single conference or many meetings, or by a slow undramatic process of gradual accommodation.

Senator KENNEDY fully recognized that there are risks involved in any system of shared power but he suggested that the risks could be made acceptable if we bring to bear sufficient skill and political wisdom to find the point at which participation—by the dissident elements in South Vietnam—does not bring domination or internal conquest and if the agreement arrived at is backed up by international guarantees.

He did not propose any specific or detailed arrangements. He never mentioned the word "coalition." He certainly did not speak of any attempt by us to impose a solution on the government or the people of South Vietnam. He stated:

We must be willing to face the uncertainties of election, and the possibility of an eventual vote on reunification.

And again:

We must insist that the political process go forward under the rigorous supervision of a trusted international body.

Thus it seems clear that the kind of system of shared power and responsibility he was talking about would be an interim arrangement, pending elections and the further development of the political process.

He fully recognized that the United States cannot proclaim in advance the precise terms of an acceptable political settlement and that we could not start the bargaining process by revealing all the concessions we might be prepared to make.

The key to Senator KENNEDY's whole statement, it seems to me, is his recognition of the fact that, if we are to persuade Hanoi to start discussions looking toward a peaceful settlement, we must be prepared to eliminate any reasonable fear that we ask them to talk only to demand their surrender.

Who can contest that thesis?

If others have ideas of how to make our proposal of unconditional talks appear more attractive to Hanoi, let them come forward and state them.

In the meantime, let us look carefully at what Senator KENNEDY has had to say on the merits, and not in terms of invective or clichés.

Shared power is not a new concept in our dealing with the Communist world. On a geographical or partition basis, we agreed to it for Germany and Korea. We shared authority with the Soviets in Austria and in Berlin; one arrangement was ended by a peace treaty, the other broke down and was followed by the Berlin wall, but neither arrangement ended with a Communist takeover. The same inconclusive result occurred in Laos; while the tripartite government there did not work; it did not end in disaster. In fact, the net result has been that the neutralist faction which started out pro-Communist has ended up pro-Western.

True, no government cabinet which included Communists has proved stable.

Czechoslovakia is the classic case, to which all point, of a total Communist takeover, but that takeover had the Red army behind it. In other cases, the collapse of coalition governments has not always favored the Communists. France, Italy, and Finland have all survived such periods. And recently in Indonesia, where Communists were playing a major role and apparently attempted a coup, the result has been a violent reaction against them.

I know—and I am sure Senator KENNEDY knows—that the Communists in Peiping and Hanoi would look upon any system of shared power as a device to enable them ultimately to seize total power. But does anyone think Hanoi and Peiping will give up their hopes of taking over South Vietnam if they are successfully driven out by force of arms?

Any course that we take involves risks, as Senator KENNEDY pointed out. And nothing that we could do—literally nothing, not even a nuclear flattening of every Chinese and North Vietnamese city—could guarantee for the long run the elimination of the Communist threat in the Far East and southeast Asia. So let us soberly and calmly analyze the alternatives that lie before us, and see whether the risks involved in the most promising feasible course can be made manageable.

It seems to me important—and I specifically propose—that the best brains in this country and elsewhere in the free world be mobilized to seek answers to the following questions:

First. What kind of governmental structure could be devised for South Vietnam that would permit the various dissident elements to play an appropriate role in the government and political life of the country, under a system of safeguards and checks and balances that would prevent one side or the other from seizing total control?

Second. What form of international supervision and guarantees would be most effective? Since the U.N. does not include either North or South Vietnam in its membership, a beefed-up International Control Commission might serve the purpose.

Third. What form of interim government could be established for the conduct of elections with sufficient impartiality to command the confidence and cooperation of all elements?

Fourth. What should be the nature of the elections and of the government to follow so as to provide the best chance of political stability in the future? My own guess is that only some kind of parliamentary government, with provision for proportional representation, would have a chance of being viable in a country such as South Vietnam which has never known democracy. The kind of winner-take-all, two-sided contest which is characteristic of our own presidential elections would be likely, it seems to me, to represent an impossibly explosive setup. It takes a rare strength of tradition for the losers in such a situation to accept the result peacefully. To my knowledge no new nation has yet succeeded in achieving this level of political maturity. Like dangers would arise in any

proposed referendum or other voting procedure in which the people would be expected to abide by the results—which might be close—of a once-for-all vote on whether or not to have a Communist government.

Such a study, it seems to me, should be carried out now, so that its results would be available in the event negotiations do get underway. The very fact that the study was in process might well be a factor to help induce Hanoi to start talking.

I am not suggesting that the U.S. Government should itself undertake the study, or even sponsor it. This might be construed as a commitment in advance to accept the recommendations.

Instead, I believe a private organization, such as the Ford Foundation, should undertake the work, either directly or through some other agency.

The participants in the study should include experts from other countries, such as Finland, India, and Italy, where Communists have played an active part in the political life of the country, and experts of southeast Asia and on the postwar history of Czechoslovakia. Quite possibly, actual responsibility for convening the experts and conducting the study should be left to an international institute or a university of international renown.

In proposing this study, I am well aware that the whole idea may be repugnant to the Government of South Vietnam. That Government, whether led by Premier Ky or another, will no doubt continue to press for total control of South Vietnam for itself, and will bitterly oppose settling for less. That the Saigon leaders clearly do not have the power to obtain this for themselves, even with unlimited aid from us in the form of equipment, materiel, supplies, and so forth, will not deter them. Saigon will hope, and indeed demand, that the United States assign whatever forces are needed to the task of accomplishing this objective.

While this desire on the part of Saigon is certainly understandable, that we should feel obligated to give effect to it seems to me fantastic. By no stretch of the imagination could our past commitments be so construed.

Essentially, our position vis-a-vis Saigon is an unassailably strong one. At any point that they do not want to agree to what we believe it necessary and desirable to do, we can always return to the system of aid which we followed for so long with Saigon, and which was sufficient in the case of Greece and Turkey in the crucial days after World War II, aid limited to supplies, materiel, and military advisers.

It is encouraging that we apparently have succeeded in persuading the Ky government of the importance of the nonmilitary side of our joint efforts. Recent press stories from South Vietnam indicate the depth of the problems, especially the persistence of systems of special privilege which the existing Government has been reluctant to abandon. We have given far too little attention to these matters before now, and the vari-

ous statements comprising the Honolulu Declaration are a good augury. The more successful these efforts are, the easier we will find it to hold fast the areas under Saigon's control and to expand those areas, and the stronger our position will be when negotiations start.

I know, also, that many Americans who are directly engaged in the bitter struggle in South Vietnam have developed such a profound hatred for the Vietcong, because of their cruelty and terrorist tactics, that they cannot conceive of negotiating with them or of according them any role in the future political processes of the country. But existing U.S. policy is one of desire to deal with Hanoi, and even to grant Hanoi economic aid after the conflict is over. Is Hanoi any less responsible for the horrors of the Communist tactics in the south than the officers and men of the Vietcong?

This is a case, it seems to me, where those who bear the brunt of the conflict cannot be expected to view in perspective the question of how best to achieve the totality of American objectives in southeast Asia. They may well, under the stress of hardship, danger, and ever-present tragedy, lose sight of what is in fact our goal.

I know that President Johnson wants to end the conflict, wants it deeply and fervently. I believe he would be eager to follow a new approach to achieve that end through a settlement that might be less than perfect for either side, but would achieve our essential objects: to bring the conflict to an end, provide stability in the area, and preserve the right of self-determination for the South Vietnamese people.

(Mr. UDALL (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleague from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] has, I believe, done us a great service by redirecting our attention to some of the more elusive yet vitally important realities which have thus far thwarted our efforts to move the Vietnam conflict to the conference table. He has suggested a creative line of thinking and a practical approach which deserves our consideration.

I would hope that the action of the Congress yesterday in authorizing supplemental defense funds for the maintenance of United States and allied forces now in Vietnam might relieve the air of crisis which has affected the tenor of discussion these past few days, and permit a more dispassionate examination of the question of where we go from here in Vietnam.

It is not necessary and, in fact, it is a disservice to the spirit of healthy public debate, to have every statement and every query on Vietnam judged in terms of whether it is critical of the President's policy. Our vote yesterday is indicative of the broad general confidence which an overwhelming majority of the Congress have in our administration. Among those voting for the authorization yesterday were many who still believe that

one of democracy's strengths is the freedom and desirability of questioning and examining alternatives.

I wholeheartedly agree with my President, and the overwhelming majority of the Members of this House in rejecting any thought of immediate withdrawal from Vietnam. Equally unthinkable to me are actions on our part which might precipitate a massive land war in Asia or the use of nuclear weapons.

Like my colleague from New York, I see the moment propitious for a fresh and more creative examination of how a negotiated settlement might be arrived at. The point of departure of any such study should be the recognition that Hanoi has steadfastly refused to talk with us. This is often explained that the Communists believe sooner or later we will get tired of fighting and will quit. It is equally plausible that the other side may not be able to see how, on the basis of our position and that of the Ky government, they can reasonably expect to achieve anything through negotiation.

There is, I fear, a tendency on our part to let the matter rest there—the other side will not talk, so we have no choice but to leave open the existing offer and apply greater military pressure.

I am not suggesting that we sweeten the pot for the Communists. I reject the idea that a desire to examine our position implies any lack of determination to defend our democratic principles or unwillingness to support our President, or our troops in the field. A desire to negotiate is not an indication of weakness; it is an expression of self-confidence. I believe the American people would rather reason than fight, would rather build than destroy.

While examining our position, we must continue to apply sufficient power to protect our forces in the field, to contain the Communist hold within its present limits and make credible our determination to meet force with force so long as that may be necessary. By our action yesterday, we assured the maintenance of our position of strength. This being the case, I wish to endorse my colleague's call for a more imaginative examination of the specifics of how Vietnamese elections might be arranged; who would conduct these elections; how they would be supervised; how the many—and I do not mean only the NLF—disparate political elements of South Vietnam could participate in the elections and what form of government might be devised to reflect the results of such an election—a government offering a promise of stability while satisfying the legitimate social and economic aspiration of the country. We, in this country, have a reputation for political ingenuity and I do not think we have yet done our best with this problem.

I am not suggesting any answers to the questions which I have raised, or to those raised by my colleague from New York. I simply mean to point out that within a more broadly based and creative study of the practical politics of the Vietnamese situation may lie an approach which could draw our adversaries to the conference table.

March 2, 1966

My colleague from New York is probably right in suggesting that this be done outside the official governmental context. Official and public examination of most of the proposals for future elections or governmental arrangements would immediately embarrass our relations with South Vietnam and might prejudice our future negotiating position.

May I then commend the gentleman from New York for his proposal, and urge its study by the Members of this House.

(Mr. ROSENTHAL (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM], for what I believe can be one of the most important contributions to a debate which has all too often descended to the level of generalization and subsequent distortion. The important thing about his remarks, I think, is that they are addressed to a real problem—to a problem and to a debate which is currently going on among responsible people anxious to see the war in Vietnam settled.

I have thought for some time that the principle unresolved question in our diplomatic policy has been, very simply: What kind of government are we really prepared to see emerge in South Vietnam, and what kind of initiatives are we willing to take in order to help set the stage for such a government? Implicit in this are certain fundamentally procedural questions. But these questions, particularly regarding the nature of a provisional political authority following a cease-fire, represent absolutely basic issues for a settlement.

They are all the more problematic because they have not been the center of attention. For example, we seem to have been very concerned about the role of the Vietcong in negotiations. Less attention, however, has been given to the role of the NLF in any provisional government prior to elections. Much has been said about the need for elections in South Vietnam. Little has been said of the auspices under which such elections would be held.

To matters like these, as I understand the gentleman from New York, responsible scholars must begin to address themselves in order to supplement and aid efforts by the Government. Very little thought has ever really been given to the issues of shared-power in provisional governments. We have no safe and secure models from which we can project problems. The closest possible analogy to Vietnam is the Government of Laos. But there are obvious and problematic contrasts which limit the utility of such an analogy. Our experiences with shared power and provisional government in postwar Europe cannot be too instructive. And of course arrangements in Germany and Korea will not teach us too much about settling civil disputes within a single country. There may well be useful precedents here for a partition of Vietnam and concomitant diplomatic arrangements. But the prob-

lem of establishing shared power between previously hostile forces in South Vietnam still remains relatively unique.

All the more problematic, as Mr. BINGHAM rightly pointed out, is the position of the present South Vietnamese Government. I have been convinced that we must not allow ourselves to be overly committed to that Government. Political institutions presently being established and consolidated by the Ky government will ultimately have to play a role in settlement and the establishment of provisional authority in the south. If these institutions become calcified in opposition to compromise and conciliation, we may be left with very few existing structures and modalities in which to work. Flexibility, in other words, is the keystone for any activity now which looks forward to a shared-power program in the future.

In a conference held in Washington at the end of January, sponsored by myself and seven other Members of Congress, particular attention was given to the problem of provisional government and the structure of elections. Two interesting suggestions were raised regarding the first issue. At the national level, it was proposed, an all South Vietnamese Government could be composed of representatives drawn from controlled geographical areas. Supervision of this division of power could be insured by a strengthened International Control Commission. On the local level, the Saigon government would continue to exercise authority of areas controlled by it, as would be true for the National Liberation Front and such largely autonomous groups as the Cao Dai, Hoa Hao, and some of the Montagnard factions. Temporary ICC control could be exercised in contested area. Another proposal was that the parties in conflict decide upon a cabinet in which portfolios of government could be divided among these parties. Within this context, the ICC could again be given supervisory powers, with perhaps a veto power over the activities of the most critical ministries.

I mention these proposals not because I am convinced that they are the most promising. I only want to point out that these are the questions that we ought to be talking about now. Part of the trouble of the Vietnam debate is that the very broad problems of policy have received attention often to the exclusion of those smaller considerations which actually constitute the most immediate policy questions facing the Government. In one sense this has been healthy. The country has been in need of a systematic foreign policy debate for many years. And Vietnam has given us the occasion for such a debate. On the other hand we cannot afford to lose sight of individual trees in our preoccupation with the forest.

This, I think, is the important contribution of Mr. BINGHAM's remarks to the House today. His suggestion that private foreign policy study groups begin to explore the tacky problems involved with structuring a settlement for Vietnam is of considerable importance—to the Congress and the country. And I hope the discussion we have been having

today will set a new tone for debate in the Congress. I hope we can begin to discuss the nature of the settlement that must ultimately come to Vietnam rather than the policies which have occasioned the need for such a settlement. Such speculation by Congress can be the healthiest possible contribution to the foreign policy of this country. The report which eight of us sponsored in January sought to move in this direction. The remarks of Senator KENNEDY have sought to move in this direction. And my colleague's contribution today has made such action all the more important and promising by having been so provocative and enlightening.

(Mr. EDWARDS of California (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM], for the thoughtful and perceptive remarks he has made today.

He has taken an important step that we in this House have failed to take. He is seeking and demanding a definition of the situation in Vietnam—a definition of our objectives and the means which we are using and will use to carry out these objectives.

I would like to stress two aspects of Mr. BINGHAM's presentation. First, he rightly emphasizes the need to take positive steps to guide the Vietnam conflict to the conference table. But in pressing for negotiations, the United States must not forget that it faces a problem of credibility: friend and foe alike are apprehensive. Our reinterpretation of both the 1954 Geneva agreement and the SEATO agreement has made even our friends skeptical of our word. We all know the history of Vietnam after 1954; we know that the 1956 elections scheduled for Vietnam were scuttled with our support when the Eisenhower administration decided that a non-Communist government could not win a majority. So how can we gain credibility for our present proposals for free elections? We must realize that the problem of credibility is a major one in bringing this conflict to the conference table. This calls for even greater care in defining and pursuing clear and consistent objectives.

This ties into a second aspect of Mr. Bingham's speech. He stressed "the need for providing Hanoi with a good reason for coming to the negotiating table." But we must also stress the need for providing both Saigon and the Vietcong with good reason for coming to the negotiating table. Here again we face a credibility problem. We must make our objectives clear to all parties to a possible agreement in Vietnam. Since negotiations must inevitably include Hanoi, Saigon, and the Vietcong, we must clarify our relations with all three of them.

I have stressed the need for a definition of our objectives and the means which we are using and will use to carry out these objectives. I have done so because the administration has persistently refused to provide an adequate and

March 2, 1966

consistent definition of our posture in Vietnam. As a result, we are faced with an array of paradoxes which have damaged our commitment to the freedom and independence of peoples throughout the world. We have been presented with a set of paradoxes which makes it very difficult to succeed in Vietnam; a set of paradoxes which has stimulated opposition to administration policy in Vietnam, and foretells a serious and bitter reaction to the commitments which many of our own people cannot understand.

We have the paradox of a democratic nation debating its most important political issue as hawks and doves—as if the how and why of Vietnam can be answered solely by supporting more or less guns, planes, and missiles.

We have the paradox of destruction outpacing development. Contrast the Declaration of Honolulu with administration requests of this Congress. First we hear of the importance of social and economic development in Vietnam. The supplemental foreign economic aid request passed last week designated \$275 million for Vietnam. But yesterday's supplemental military appropriation request designated \$736.6 million for military facilities within Vietnam alone. Thus 250 percent more American dollars will be used to remake the Vietnamese landscape for military purposes—for a war which will destroy the resources which we spend millions to develop.

We have the paradox of a new colonialism emerging from our goal of independence for Vietnam. We have proposed extensive economic aid for southeast Asia. But if we continue to rely solely on our own administration of these funds, and do not utilize international bodies such as the World Bank, we will have imposed a new form of pseudo-colonial domination upon millions of Asian people.

We have the paradox of our relationship to Communist China. We have refused to recognize Communist China and we have opposed her admittance to the United Nations. Yet in a recent speech, William Bundy of the State Department argued that we have had more contact with Communist China through intermediary channels in Eastern Europe than other countries have had through direct diplomatic recognition. Thus our national policy of not recognizing governments we oppose has given rise to the irony of diplomacy without diplomatic relations.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we can make a far better contribution to the world of ideas and the cause of American strength and unity if we recognize the need for clear thinking on the situation in Vietnam. Furthermore, our Government's speech and action must cohere in such a way that our own people and people abroad understand our position. We must dissolve the paradoxes of diplomacy without diplomatic relations, of destruction outpacing development, of a new colonialism amid the desire for independence.

In a quest for definitions of our objectives and the means to achieve our objectives, the administration and the Congress each have important tasks.

The administration cannot simply make public statements of its goals. It must explain facts which are too often hidden: are our actions achieving these goals? are the means we wish to follow the same as the means we have in fact followed? When we know the facts of our objectives in Vietnam today—when we know what in fact is being achieved under our present policy—we can and must engage in free and reasoned debate. The House itself must enter this debate, and not abdicate to the other body. The gentlemen from New York has realized this. He deserves the commendation of all those concerned with the strength of this House and this Nation.

(Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] for a carefully reasoned statement on a problem of the greatest importance. His statement is characteristic of the thoughtful approach he takes to the spectrum of problems facing the United States.

I would like to add a comment to the excellent analysis of the factors which may affect Hanoi's judgment on the desirability of negotiations.

The relationship between Hanoi and the National Liberation Front has been much discussed. Many officials of the U.S. Government have repeatedly stressed the role of Hanoi in stimulating, organizing, supplying, and directing the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front. But this does not give a complete picture of the relationship between Hanoi and the forces in the south. The strong political motivation of the Communist forces must be studied carefully.

If a political movement in one country decides to extend its influence into another country, the usual procedure is to send in people to proselytize and to organize on behalf of the ideas which the political movement seeks to promote. If the organizational effort is successful, a group in the second country comes into being. Its ideology, perhaps some of its leadership, and its tactics may continue to be guided by the forces in the first country. But the group in the second country still has an independent, viable existence. The relationship between the two groups is relatively stable so long as the tactics are agreed upon. But if the first group takes a new course, then the viable nature of the group in the second country suddenly becomes clear.

According to the figures of the Defense Department, approximately 200,000 of the Vietcong are from South Vietnam. These Vietcong and the National Liberation Front believe they are fighting for certain ideas. It would seem doubtful that they regard themselves simply as soldiers whose command loyalties run to Hanoi. Their persistence and their sacrifices could not be explained on this basis.

Thus there is the strong probability that as Hanoi has sought to organize in the South, it has at the same time created forces which, if not independent today, are potentially independent if Hanoi

shifts to courses which are incompatible with the primary thrust of those fighting in the South.

Thus, if Hanoi were to pursue a course of action which would seem to the National Liberation Front to thwart and make useless the years of sacrifice, there is doubt that Hanoi could compel acceptance of this course. But even more devastating, Hanoi would be regarded as abandoning an ally in the South to which it not only owed an ideological allegiance but which it had spawned.

The United States looks at its commitment to South Vietnam as binding. Then consider how much more deeply Hanoi must feel bound to the fortunes of those whom it sponsored in the South. Because this has been my rough analysis of this relationship, I have always believed that the hope that bombing in the North would drive Hanoi out of this conflict was doomed to failure. I believe furthermore that the bombing would force Hanoi into an even more active role in the belief that events in the South would have to be speeded up as the only way for Hanoi to obtain an end to the bombing.

On the other hand, pressure against the National Liberation Front and the Vietcong forces could bring about a settlement some day. It may be that regardless of what the United States does, the fabric of the South Vietnamese society is so torn and weakened that a successful effort against the Communist forces cannot be sustained. Whatever the settlement possibilities, however, communication directly with the National Liberation Front would seem to make more sense than to force Hanoi to act as broker with its interests not necessarily paralleling those of the Liberation Front.

In any event, these matters must be looked at with care and objectivity. The great stress which the United States places on the role of the North Vietnamese must not obscure the fact that our national interests require that we make our understanding conform to reality.

(Mr. TODD (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague, Congressman JONATHAN BINGHAM, for submitting a constructive proposal for bringing new thought to bear on possible basis of negotiation in Vietnam. Although the responsible officials of this Government are doing everything in their power to arrive at a cessation of the hostilities and a just peace, it may well be that our own deep concerns have prevented us from recognizing and exploring negotiating positions or avenues of approach which could lead to an acceptable termination of the fighting. Although there is no guarantee that his proposal would lead to such an avenue, the alternative of prolonged conflict, and uncertain result, makes this suggestion worthy of consideration and implementation.

I have come to know Congressman BINGHAM as a deeply thoughtful and responsible Member of the House, as a

great patriot, and as one who thinks well into the future as far as the security of the United States and the free world is concerned. His expressions today merit thoughtful consideration by all of us, and by responsible policymakers in the administration and elsewhere.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am happy to yield to my colleague from New York [Mr. DOW].

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, allow me to commend the gentleman from New York for his earnest and sincere effort to suggest a better way out of this dilemma in Vietnam, and a solution to it that does not involve a catastrophic war that may destroy all of us. I must salute every effort of this kind to arrive at a sane solution.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am happy to yield to my colleague from New York [Mr. RYAN].

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] both for taking this special order for a constructive discussion of Vietnam and for the farsighted proposal which he has made. The kind of study which he suggests will have to be made sooner or later—either now or while the parties are at the bargaining table. In the interest of peace in Vietnam I think it is far preferable that the study be commenced at once.

I also agree that there may be advantages to having this study made by sources outside the Government. They can bring objectivity and an open mind to the questions, and their conclusions will not appear to commit the United States to a particular policy. However, we also should note that this kind of study should constantly be going on within the State Department. If the Defense Department can sponsor studies of "war games," I do not see why the State Department should not sponsor studies of "peace games."

I also believe that both the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should sponsor in depth studies of vital foreign policy questions by outside task forces.

As I explained in my speech during yesterday's debate, there is an important policy debate going on within the Government. Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY did the Nation a great service when he focused attention on one of the key questions. Are we willing to engage in negotiations which may lead to a coalition regime—either before or after the elections—in Vietnam? If the concept of shared power is rejected out of hand, Hanoi may remain intransigent about negotiating. If we have any real interest in negotiations, then we must be prepared to look ahead and to consider what those negotiations may produce.

Mr. Speaker, I have a further reason for supporting my colleague's proposal. It points the direction in which our thinking about foreign policy should be leading us. We should, as he suggests, call upon scholars, and on diplomats from other countries, in trying to formulate foreign policy. Moreover, we should be looking to the future.

Too often this Nation's foreign policy has been responsive rather than comprehensive. We formulate policies to match crises. But we do not look to the future, or plan for the future.

In no area of the world has our thinking been more myopic than in the Far East.

Because of a lack of comprehensive understanding and planning we are involved in difficult dilemmas in the Far East which often adversely affect the achievement of our goals elsewhere in the world.

The study proposed today should help lead to a reappraisal of our Far Eastern policy and our approach to China which is the key to peace in Asia. In the long term a settlement in Vietnam will depend upon a viable, creative Far Eastern policy.

Senator FULBRIGHT suggested yesterday that we think in terms of a neutralized southeast Asia. President Johnson reiterated yesterday proposals for huge projects of economic development such as the Mekong Delta project.

Two years ago, on June 10, 1964, I suggested in a speech on the floor of the House that the administration consider a regional plan for southeast Asia. On that occasion I said:

A proposal to include North and South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and possibly Thailand in a regional agreement should be explored. Such an agreement would prohibit the signatory countries from joining any military alliances or attempting to overthrow the governments of the other parties to the agreement by subversion or direct aggression. A provision for resumption of trade might accompany such an agreement.

Mr. Speaker, now, more than ever before, there is an urgent need for fresh thinking and new initiatives. Scholars, foreign diplomats, businessmen, and economists should be called upon to help formulate them. The influence of their studies should stimulate a release of creative energy within the bowels of the Department of State.

Once again, I commend our colleague from New York for his important contribution to the dialog on Vietnam.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York [Mr. RYAN] for his comments and for his contribution to the dialog and to the debate.

Vietnamese Negotiations

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of discussion presently concerning negotiations over the Vietnamese war. Several proposals, including one made by the Soviet Union, have suggested that the Geneva Agreements

of 1954 serve as a starting point for any future negotiations. In light of these proposals and in view of the need for determining the position of the United States toward producing a political settlement in Vietnam, it is essential that we review what actually happened at Geneva and what effects these decisions had, in order that we may learn from the mistakes and triumphs of the past.

THE GENEVA AGREEMENTS

On May 8, 1954, the day after the collapse of the French garrison at Dienbienphu, delegates from the United States, Great Britain, France, the Soviet Union, Communist China, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, met at Geneva. The Geneva agreements can be broken into four parts:

First. The Vietnamese armistice was signed by the commander in chief of the French Union forces in Indochina and the North Vietnamese delegates. Vietnam was partitioned at the 17th parallel. To assemble their forces for evacuation, the Vietminh were allocated southern areas which they controlled in the Plaine des Jones, the swamps around Point Ca Mau, and the central Provinces of Quang Ngai and Binh Dinh. Both parties agreed not to bring in reinforcements or war materials. Maintenance of military bases by a foreign power and participation in military alliances were prohibited.

Second. The Cambodian armistice was signed by a representative of Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia, the commander in chief of the Cambodian national forces, and the Vietminh Vice Minister of Defense. Troops which had entered Cambodia from the outside, and all foreign elements in military formations or holding supervisory functions in political, military, administrative, economic, financial, and social bodies in liaison with the Vietminh military units, were to leave the country within 90 days. Local resistance forces were to be demobilized on the spot and integrated into the national community.

Third. The agreement in Laos was signed by a representative of the commander in chief of French Union forces and by the Vietminh Vice Minister of National Defense. Pathet Lao units were to move into the Provinces of Phong Saly and Sam Neua. The Laotian Government was to provide for special representation of these Provinces in the royal administration.

Supervision of these three agreements was entrusted to three International Supervisory Commissions (ISC) composed of representatives from India, Canada, and Poland. Among other duties, they were to prevent the entry of reinforcements and war materials.

Fourth. The Geneva Conference issued a final declaration calling for elections under international supervision throughout Vietnam in July 1956.

THE UNITED STATES AND SOUTH VIETNAM

Neither the United States nor South Vietnam signed any of these four agreements. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles had advised against the negotiations, feeling it would be disastrous for the French to negotiate while they were

in a very weak military position. Secretary Dulles believed that partitioning Vietnam would provide only a respite and would not lead the Communists to abandon their plans to dominate southeast Asia.

Before the Geneva Conference began, officials of the Saigon government warned that they would not accept agreements negotiated for them by the French. Nevertheless, the French completely bypassed the Vietnamese delegation to deal alone with the Communists.

EFFECTS OF THE GENEVA AGREEMENTS

The Geneva agreements never established the situation in South Vietnam. Many Vietminh soldiers never were evacuated from the south. The four Vietminh assembly areas are the main regions of Vietcong control today. At the end of February 1955, it was estimated that, with the exception of territory managed by religious sects, the Vietminh controlled 60 to 90 percent of the villages in South Vietnam. The Saigon government was to be responsible for the execution of some of the cease-fire provisions but it felt no obligation to comply, since it had dissociated itself from the agreements.

In North Vietnam, the ISC was unable to prevent the illegal entry of war material from China. Deliveries between July 20 and November 1, 1954, allegedly enabled the Vietminh to treble the number of their heavy units.

The agreements worked hardships upon North Vietnam, as well. Under the armistice terms the north was deprived of its traditional rice supply from the southern surplus. By January 1955, the food situation was so critical that rice had to be rationed. The previous year, President Ho Chi Minh had declared that the North Vietnamese foreign policy would be devoted to bridging the gap between China and the West. But the inability of France to provide assistance, the refusal of South Vietnam to trade, and the U.S. strategic embargo forced the abandonment of this policy. Instead, the Hanoi government became dependent upon economic aid from the Communist bloc.

In Laos, the Pathet Lao established control over their regroupment areas, demanding autonomy for these Provinces. In early 1955, fighting broke out again between Royal and Pathet Lao troops, despite efforts of the ISC to settle the arguments. The failure of the Geneva agreements to produce a settlement in Laos is best shown by the fact that it became necessary to convene a Geneva Conference on Laos in 1962.

Only in Cambodia were the Geneva agreements significant in producing a political settlement. The Cambodians had been allowed to negotiate their own armistice, rather than having it done by the French, as in Laos and South Vietnam. Foreign troops were not regrouped within Cambodia, as they had been within Vietnam and Laos. As a result, the armed bands were rapidly dispersed and the Cambodian Government has remained relatively stable to this day.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS

The lessons of Geneva have important implications for any future negotiations

on Indochina. One of the reasons why the Geneva agreements failed was that they were negotiated primarily by France and China. The viewpoints of the Vietnamese and Laotians were disregarded and the final agreements did not reflect their best interests.

As a consequence, they felt no obligation to adhere to the provisions. In any future negotiations, the Indochinese delegates must be allowed to play a major role, without the terms being dictated to them by the great powers. The Cambodian experience shows that a satisfactory settlement can be reached only if priority is given to the interests of the indigenous states.

The success in Cambodia also demonstrates that the Vietcong must not be allocated regroupment areas within South Vietnam, but regular units must be evacuated forthwith to North Vietnam; irregulars should be disarmed immediately and integrated into the national community.

THE NLF QUESTION

This procedure will be facilitated if the National Liberation Front is not accorded recognition as an autonomous group, although President Johnson has indicated that they may attend the conference as guests of the North Vietnamese. Disarmament and reintegration were simplified in Cambodia since the Cambodians refused to accord recognition to the Khmer resistance forces. This prevents the resistance groups from claiming that they are entitled to a particular part of the national territory or to special representation within the government.

Provisions designed to prohibit the introduction of war materials are unrealistic because of the geographical proximity of North Vietnam to China and the difficult terrain in this region, which make it impossible to enforce such provisions. The successful partitioning of Korea demonstrates that it is not necessary for the two sections to be disarmed in order to achieve a political settlement. As Prof. Hans Morgenthau stated in *Politics Among Nations*:

Men do not fight because they have arms. They have arms because they deem it necessary to fight. Take away their arms, and they will either fight with their bare fists or get themselves new arms with which to fight. What makes for war are the conditions in the minds of men which make war appear the lesser of two evils. In those conditions must be sought the disease of which the desire for, and possession of, arms is but a symptom.

Any realistic settlement must concentrate on these fundamental causes of war, not on its symptoms.

One of the fundamental causes of the present Vietnamese conflict is that North Vietnam is not a viable economic unit; thus, it has been forced into a position of economic dependence upon its traditional enemy, China. The North Vietnamese fear of Chinese domination provides a powerful motivation to their drive to gain independent strength by conquering the south. Any lasting settlement will have to take account of the North Vietnamese economy by allowing for trade between the agrarian south

and the industrial north. At Geneva, the North Vietnamese pleaded for the establishment of two economically self-sufficient units, but its wishes were rejected by the French and Chinese delegates who did the actual bargaining. This mistake must not be made again, for North Vietnam would rather fight than become a Chinese vassal.

Any future negotiations cannot be limited to the problems of Vietnam. It is essential that the following parties, at the least, be represented: the United States, China, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand. Thailand was not present at Geneva. Yet the bulk of the Lao people live in Thailand. Prof. D. E. Kennedy believes that Thailand fears a Viet-Lao combination more than she fears China. As the Laotian problem cannot be solved without Thailand's participation, so there will never be peace in Laos until the Vietnamese conflict is resolved. Ho Chi Minh Trail, the main Vietcong supply line from the north, runs through Laos. The problems of these five Indochinese states are interrelated and must be considered together.

The participants at future negotiations must provide ways of handling any refugee problems which result from boundary changes. The Geneva partition of Vietnam caused the flight of nearly 1 million refugees from the north to the south, whereas only about 30,000 had been expected. The north was deprived of a substantial part of its labor supply. The results in the south were haphazardly constructed villages and friction between the traditional population and the refugees. The refugee problem continues to be a source of instability.

The United States must not relinquish the right to continue economic and technical assistance for the South Vietnamese Government. The Geneva agreements failed to make any attempt at solving the disruptive social and economic problems of Vietnam. Before stability can be achieved in South Vietnam, steps will have to be taken toward integrating highlanders, religious sects, and overseas Chinese into the national community. The United States must be allowed to continue assisting the South Vietnamese in this task, as we have aided the South Koreans.

Finally, the parties to future negotiations must have every intention of enforcing their agreements.

In retrospect, it appears that the Western powers were not really serious about conducting the Vietnamese national elections in 1956 but agreed to this provision merely to placate the Communists. It is doubtful that elections would have stabilized the situation, given the cultural differences and traditional discord between North and South Vietnam, and the enmity between the Vietnamese and their neighbors, which would only be aggravated by a united Vietnam.

But, by agreeing to hold national elections without ensuring effective action toward this end, the Geneva signatories may have undermined whatever faith the Chinese and North Vietnamese had in peaceful bargaining, thus making it more difficult to achieve a settlement today.

The Geneva agreements were more significant in producing a victor's peace than a political settlement. Thus, they are valuable, not as a basis for future negotiations, but as a remainder, along with the Versailles Treaty, that peace conferences can do more harm than good unless they deal with the fundamental conflicts of interest.

TRADE WINDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, not many references are made to trade winds in the public press these days. Many of us have forgotten what they are. Yet if they were nonexistent, the Western world of the Americas might not have been discovered for hundreds of years. In which case the farms and factories and cities of the United States might still be a wilderness waste, and the military might and the productive capacity and the vast philanthropy of this Nation would still be a dream of mankind. Not that the United States invented any of these things, in a literal sense. But she has been a foremost exponent of them, and without her existence, the world would be a different place.

The trade winds, of course, are those air currents which move consistently from the Old World toward the New in the general latitudes of the Tropics of Capricorn and Cancer, respectively. Day after day they blow in a fixed direction and at constant speed. The voyager in his sailing ship could depend on them with as much confidence as he depended on the movement of the sun. Columbus knew about them and used them for his westward quest.

It is doubtful that he would ever have bucked the prevailing westerlies. And if he had, success would have been even more doubtful. The latitudes in which the trade winds were prevalent also account for the head start of the Spaniards and Portuguese in the exploration and settlement of the New World. To the sailing vessels of four or five centuries ago, the trade winds spelled the difference between a reasonable gamble and a foolhardy enterprise.

Today's mariner on the sea of politics, or the sea of business, or the sea of social change, longs in vain for some trade winds on which he could rely. If only there were some trends which were dependably constant, he could set his course upon his guiding star and lie down to sleep in peace upon the deep. Instead he finds his bark caught in the grip of the prevailing westerlies which dip and swirl and change with every passing second. He must adjust and readjust both his rudder and his sail to meet a new set of conditions which will only give way immediately to a still newer set of conditions. Assurance there is none.

The public, too, wants to be assured. Never in all history have so many been so anxiously concerned over what tomorrow may bring forth. They want to know if the weather will be favorable, if their business ventures will prove suc-

cessful, if inflation has at last set in, if taxes are going up or down, if the war in Vietnam is going to be escalated, if we are on the verge of conflict with China—everything. They have been deluged with so much conflicting opinion on every subject that they are no longer able to sift out the true from the false, the reasonable from the unreasonable, the probable from the possible. So they turn to authority—with a capital A—for the answers. The will to believe is overwhelming; but the capacity to believe may be something else.

In the midst of confusion, the idea seems to have gained credence that if only the right people would take a positive stand on important issues and hold firmly to that position, events would adjust themselves to desires. Public officials, in particular, are importuned to state clearly and categorically precisely what they will do under given conditions.

The general trend of public policy must undoubtedly be reasonably clear to those who are responsible for that policy. But a general trend is not sufficient to determine detailed action in the swirling rush of actual events. Only a part of the total outcome of what is done in a specific situation is under the control of any one official. Other factors enter the picture and have their effect on the final result. So in practice the skilled and intelligent navigator may find it expedient to sail south when he wants to go east. But just how this conforms to set policy may not be easy to demonstrate.

Admitting, then, the occasional—perhaps even the frequent—necessity to approach one's objective obliquely rather than directly, it is possible to set up constants in intention and in conduct on which the observer may rely. These constants are necessarily confirmed by experience. The electorate soon learns whether or not the elected official's actions conform to his words. Until he deludes them with specious promises, they are justified in believing that he holds true to the constants which he has asserted.

It seems desirable that the official should from time to time put into words the constants to which he pledges himself, not only for the purpose of assuring those from whom he asks votes, but for his own guidance in times of stress. For the winds of change are indeed tricky, and that which is foul easily takes on the semblance of the fair. The official may lose his course if he does not keep the chart constantly before him.

The conscientious legislator may be expected to commit himself to his constitutional duty of promoting the legitimate interests of all the people of his district to the best of his ability. The commitment loses its value as a guide to conduct when personal interest becomes involved in public interest. The public has a right to deplore such involvement, and to look with some distrust on the official whose involvement becomes evident.

No cause is of more importance to this Nation—and to all the nations of the world—than the reestablishment of the reign of peace, external and internal. Violence, organized and unorganized, is

the generating phase of a vicious cycle. Violence stops the production of economic goods on which well-being depends. Scarcity of goods produces privation and suffering, and these lead to tension and disorder, which in turn ends in more violence. A cessation of wars and tumults would permit men to devote their energies to constructive pursuits. The value to the United States of worldwide peace would have to be measured in billions of dollars, not to count the anxieties and human casualties exacted by war. No other enterprise that we have ever contemplated would cost as much as wars are now costing.

And yet it is an axiom derived from experience that peace is never the lot of the weak and submissive. The meek may eventually inherit the earth, but not in the age of the aggressor. We have never accepted the role of the aggressor. Much less have we been inclined to bow before him. While we search for practical routes to peace, the arts and sciences of this so humane and gracious a civilization, this way of life that has brought so much good to the world, must be kept secure under the protection of overwhelming military security.

In all times and places, organized society has consistently acknowledged its dependence on religion. A recent writer traces the slow development of democratic forms of government. A description of this development may be found in the writings of political thinkers. It is noted that: "The ancient writers may often have been uncertain about the gods, but they were not disposed to deny the divine authority over human society." As sophisticated reasoning was applied to political organization, the concept emerged that government was a compact between the rulers and the ruled, which compact could demand consistent obedience only when it was recognized as a sacred covenant of ruler and people involving a covenant of both with God. As fully democratic governments became the usual order in Western Europe, only a few attempts to dissociate religion from government are to be found, and the effort has never been completely successful, even in a Russia which professes atheism. Our own democracy was founded in an atmosphere of religion. Throughout its history our conspicuous leaders have "asserted in different accents a religious motivation in political ethics."

It does not seem to me inappropriate, therefore, for a modern-day Congressman to make a "new affirmation of moral and religious values in politics." This is not a time to reject the experience of the ages and assume that the Maker and Ruler of the universe is no longer interested in the affairs of men. There is still a distinction between right and wrong, and "righteousness exalteth a nation." Our ability to see the right is proportioned to our will to see it, and those that seek God diligently shall find Him.

Two related constants remain for verbal expression.

Instant preparations of all kind flood the commodity market. We have instant coffee and instant potatoes, and so on indefinitely. It may not be incon-

March 2, 1966

been fully advised of his rights and given full opportunity to assert those rights—rights intended for all, poor and ignorant as well as rich or intelligent. What I would not do is rely on the police to provide that full advice.

As a substitute for the advice of counsel, the proposal would establish elaborate provisions for warnings by the police. But these are illusory protections. As Justice Black said in *Von Molke v. Gilles*, "The Constitution does not contemplate that prisoners shall be dependent upon Government agents for legal counsel and aid, however conscientious and able those agents may be. Undivided allegiance and faithful, devoted service to a client are prized traditions of the American lawyer. It is this kind of service for which the sixth amendment makes provision."

Denial of counsel in the interrogation room poignantly illustrates the impact of many of these proposals on the poor. The Attorney General recently said on TV that "our historical concern with rights of defendants * * * [has] been concerned with protecting the innocent, largely, and to some extent with forbidding police practices which simply was [sic] felt were wrong in a civilized society." But, said the Attorney General, "the focus has suddenly changed in this debate from protecting the innocent to an argument of equality that says whatever the rich defendant has the poor defendant should have, and there's been rather a tendency to forget about whether there's innocence or guilt involved."

I would remind the Attorney General of the presumption of innocence; when the police are questioning a suspect, we don't know "whether there's innocence or guilt involved." It is to answer that question that we have trials. We don't arrest people we think are innocent, but we don't decide upon arresting a man that he is guilty. Moreover, I would willingly argue that one of the practices that are simply "wrong in a civilized society" is discrimination between rich and poor in the administration of criminal justice. The Bill of Rights was not designed solely to promote efficiency—conviction of the guilty and acquittal of the innocent. It was designed also to protect other values unrelated to, and sometimes inconsistent with, mere efficiency—such as privacy, decency, and equality.

We need to clarify what we mean by equality for the poor in the criminal process. We do not mean "equality of outcome." We ask only equal availability of all constitutional safeguards such as the privilege against self-incrimination, the presumption of innocence, the right not to be arrested without probable cause—and the right to counsel.

The Attorney General seems to divide these constitutional safeguards into two categories—those which protect the innocent, and those which preserve other values not necessarily related to guilt or innocence, such as the privilege against self-incrimination and the privacy protections of the fourth amendment. He would allow the poor only the first sort of safeguards. But if constitutional safeguards are important—and I think they are—every member of our society should have the benefit of all of them.

We have had other crises. And there have been efforts to curb our liberties in response to those crises. But as the Supreme Court said, in the context of a domestic crisis far worse than any we confront today: "These great and good men (who drafted the Constitution) foresaw that troubled times would arise, when rules and people would become restive under restraint, and seek by sharp and decisive measures to accomplish ends deemed just and proper. * * * The Constitution * * * is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men,

at all times, and under all circumstances."

Professor Kamisar has aptly said: "The issue is not whether we should give the poor and ignorant so many points because they are poor and ignorant; but whether, because they suffer from these deficiencies, we should deprive them of rights and privileges. * * * The poor are also the ignorant. If ignorance precludes one from exercising his rights, then for practical purposes he has no rights. As Justice Goldberg said in *Escobedo*, "We have * * * learned the * * * lesson of history that no system of criminal justice can, or should, survive if it comes to depend for its continued effectiveness on the citizens' abdication through unawareness of their constitutional rights."

I suspect that such proposals do not stem from any particular desire to discriminate against the poor. Rather, they may only reflect an opinion that our society can "live with" certain constitutional rights and privileges only if enough of its members fail to assert them. The effect of many proposals would be to institutionalize the inability of the poor and the ignorant to benefit from their rights vis-a-vis the police. The issue really comes down to whether we should further whittle away the constitutional protections of the very people who need them most—the people who are too ignorant, too poor, too ill educated to defend themselves.

But the proposals I have discussed have not been presented in this light. They have been presented as mere extensions of legitimate law enforcement techniques made necessary by the crime crisis. The danger is that the segment of the public raising the hue and cry about crime is beginning to support these proposals and may succeed in forcing their adoption.

More stringent enforcement of laws and more severe treatment of offenders have the superficial attractiveness of a simple answer to a troubling problem. Since the vocal members of the public are generally those who, in Professor Amsterdam's words, "imagine themselves always as potential victims of crime, never as potential victims of police investigation," they think any loss of rights is unlikely to affect them. They are probably correct, at least to begin with.

When we talk about arrests for investigation, lengthy police interrogation before arraignment, and the like, we are not talking about things that happen to you or me. We don't get arrested without probable cause and interrogated without counsel, because, to put it plainly, we don't "look" as if we would commit acts of violence and we do look as if it might not pay to trifle with our rights. Nor do we live in neighborhoods where the police make "dragnet" or wholesale arrests. Most of the people who do suffer such abuses are poor.

Often the police are the only part of government they ever see. Their persistent complaints of police brutality, whatever their factual basis, prove that the police and consequently the government have a deplorable image among the poor.

The debate over civilian review of complaints against the police is similar, in many ways, to the debate over providing counsel at the police station. Just as opponents of the right to counsel seem to be saying that our society can "live with" the privilege against self-incrimination only if most suspects are denied the information necessary to use it, opponents of civilian review seem to be saying that we can "live with" the limitations imposed on the police by the Constitution only if no outside agency checks to see whether they are observed.

This recalls the saying in the 1920's: "Prohibition is better than no liquor." Prohibition of unconstitutional police action must actually prohibit. Respect for law can be engendered in the people with whom the police deal only if the police obey the law.

A law-abiding policeman need never fear civilian review. His morale should not be lowered by the airing of citizen complaints; rather he ought to be encouraged by the increased community respect which can be expected when the public sees that the police are required to obey the law. A society whose citizens have rights must enforce these rights. Civilian review should not be denied for fear that it would require the police to operate within constitutional limits.

The Civil Liberties Union has played and has still to play an important role in protecting constitutional rights. You may well make it a part of your task to remind people that hopes for simple solutions of the crime problem are illusory and that, as Deputy Attorney General Ramsey Clark said last summer: "[C]ourt rules do not cause crime. People do not commit crime because they know they cannot be questioned by police before presentment, or even because they feel they will not be convicted. * * * In the long run, only the elimination of the causes of crime can make a significant and lasting difference in the incidence of crime." He also said, "Society can be protected without impairing the rights of the individual. Indeed it cannot be protected if those rights are impaired. The task is to boldly attack the causes of crime." We hope he convinces his associates soon.

WJ
Marine's Reaction to Vietcong Participation in Peace Talks

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF**

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a fine letter from a constituent who is now serving in the U.S. Marines. Although I have decided to protect his identity, his message is certainly worthy of serious consideration by all Members of Congress, particularly those serving in the U.S. Senate.

The letter which follows is commended to the attention of all Members:

FEBRUARY 19, 1966.

HON. SAM DEVINE,
 U.S. House of Representatives,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I was in your office last summer while in Washington (deleted) and we talked for several minutes about our Government's position in Vietnam. Pursuant to that, I have enlisted in the Marine Corps and am now stationed here at Camp Lejeune undergoing advanced infantry training.

Today I read the enclosed article from the Sunday Star concerning the comments of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY. In 1 day this article has become a major issue here. It is for this reason that I am writing this letter.

There are several thousand marines in training here; many with wives and children, some away from home for the first time; all soon to be heading in the same direction: Vietnam. They left their individualism at Parris Island and became an integral part of a strong fighting team—coated with honor, pride, and bravery. All are aware of the job to be done—why it must be done and we are now learning how to do it. The high temper of the spirit among the marines is surpassed only by their willingness to refund our coveted liberties and freedoms anytime, anywhere, against any enemy.

March 2, 1966

Now we have a prominent U.S. Senator asking for a coalition government with the Communists, recognizing the National Liberation Front. The big question here is, Why? Why must we fight and sometimes die in Vietnam and then turn around and give them any part in the formation of a government? If we negotiate on those terms now, it will only be a matter of time before history will surely repeat itself in some other country either in southeast Asia or another hot spot in the world. Then the marines along with the other services will again be called on to defend our commitments. Why can't we stop the Communists now, instead of playing hide and seek among the rice paddies?

I, along with any of my fellow marines, would be ready at a moment's notice to lay our lives on the line for our country, not because it is the honorable thing to do, but out of sincere love of country, pride, and our desire to maintain those freedoms that our forefathers have so bravely fought and died to preserve. Now we ask you, why must we bow to the "red line" in Vietnam, and commit ourselves to a coalition government which would certainly not serve the interests of the South Vietnamese people, and would certainly be short of our pledge to them that President Johnson has so often stated. Thank you for your time in this matter. I am looking forward to hearing from you soon.

CAMP LEJEUNE, S.C.

Let Us Stand Up and Be Counted for Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I recently received from a constituent, Miss Aldora Babcock, of Waverly, Iowa, a most interesting letter in opposition to present U.S. policy toward the friendly Government of Rhodesia. She speaks from experience, having spent time in Rhodesia.

In conclusion she says:

Our position in Africa needs Rhodesia; our interests are clearly on the side of the Ian Smith government. Let us stand up and be counted for sanity.

I agree, and I commend her letter to the attention of my colleagues:

WAVERLY, IOWA.

February 6, 1966.

Congressman H. R. GROSS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It comes with sickening sense to see how the Western powers, whether through ineptitude or by conscious design, are taking the first steps—by the economic sanctions they have imposed against Rhodesia—to throw that ruggedly realist little country to the wolves. That our U.S. State Department should take no more knowledgeable a line than to join in the "kill" with the British Labor Government is the most nauseating pang of all.

Our policy, as it stands, is an affront to an intelligent, humane, and responsible people who, out of background, are naturally like-minded allies with us; for they are a people who are similarly Western oriented in their outlook, cherish the same Anglo-Saxon heritage of free, self-governing insti-

tutions, the same Christian tradition, and whose ideological position in today's cold-war-dominated world is the same as ours.

I have been to Rhodesia and I know something about the aggressively realistic, self-reliant, and proud spirit of this modern-day, 20th-century state in the heartland of onetime darkest Africa. In the high standard of living achieved and the almost breathtaking technological advance registered (here are gleaming skylines of modernistically styled concrete and glass skyscrapers, department stores stocked with an amazing array of up-to-the-minute consumers goods, hydroelectric development projects transforming the countryside—and all this brilliant success story achieved, moreover, in the space of less than three-quarters of a century); the Rhodesians have done the incredible.

And what is it but white settler initiative and know-how and white capital that have spurred this march of progress and built up this modern-minded democratic society and forward-moving economy? While one would hardly claim that the initial motivations that impelled that first pioneer column were anything much other than an alert self-interest, it was as such, one can say, and according to those times, an enlightened self-interest, a rugged individualism that was to shape a way of life that was to benefit all classes and lift them—and this includes the native peoples as well—to progressively higher levels of well-being. Indeed, here in the central African bush, Rhodesia today stands out as a solid little enclave of modern civilization and the rule of law in what is otherwise the wider frame of indigenous backwardness and chaotic turbulence.

Americans, at least, should be impressed by the Rhodesian achievement, for Rhodesia's history closely parallels our own American epic. Here, too, rugged pioneers, by dint of hard work and sound principles have tamed and settled a wild land and built up a society whose constitutional framework provides potential recognition of equal rights and opportunities for all its multiracial peoples. That the blacks of Rhodesia are not being "victimized by a white minority," as the Afro-Asians and the world's sympathizing "bleeding hearts" are screaming, is demonstrated by the fact that the Rhodesian black nationalist leadership acted at the time to endorse the new liberal constitution of 1961—its deferred enfranchisement timetable and all.

Indeed, the Africans in Rhodesia were known to be a satisfied people until outside pressures were brought to bear and the Communist-oriented black revolutionary movement began spreading its venom and stirring up racial hatred. In their native townships, their housing was good; social services encompassed need of every kind; education and economic advancement were made available, as much as was budgetarily practicable what with a backward people that multiplies like rabbits; the able and aspiring found helpful encouragement.

The Rhodesian black is not "unconscionably exploited," whatever the misguided liberals and moralists who pretend their hearts bleed for the "poor, repressed African," have been ballyhooing. And that this is the case has been confirmed again in the current Rhodesian crisis by the refusal of the blacks to strike and rebel, though there has been plenty of outside pressure. They have remained loyal to the government.

Self-respecting, of high intelligence buttressed by fine humane instincts and Christian conscience, the white Rhodesians are also, one must add, a people who are practically and forthrightly realist in their politics. They are not afraid to call a spade a spade. Those flaming battle cries of the liberals—"self-determination," "one man one vote," "majority rule"—and all the other

pious pronouncements—they are honest enough to lose no time in debunking for the disarming speciousness and false idealism they represent. They know them to be unattainable ideals in the black people's present state of advance, and an experiment of dangerous precariousness if implemented in the present posture of the world.

And are they not right? Who profits if black majority rule comes too soon and, by reason of being too premature, founders into chaos and collapse and Rhodesia becomes another of the world's trouble spots for the East and West, in their desperate cold-war confrontation, to contend over and try to bail out? The Rhodesians are not a Bourbon dynasty clinging to a vanished order of things. Theirs will be an actively functioning multiracial-based state ultimately, but with the transition to majority control geared to a slower, more conservative tempo—all to the end that a hard-won civilization will not face needless exposure to the wanton forces of disorder and demoralization now unleashed in the world. Is not here the counsel of commonsense?

That Rhodesia is the keystone to the West's position in Africa is not an overstatement. As Rhodesia goes, so goes all of Africa. If the leftist attack on Rhodesia succeeds, the black revolution will next turn to Portuguese colonial Africa, and then to South Africa, until the whole structure that European colonialism built up in Africa will have toppled irrevocably. Africa will be lost to the West and with all that that means in access to its resources, strategic bases, and shipping lanes still open.

A moment of truth, therefore, faces America, for even now the black commonwealth nations are planning more extreme measures against Rhodesia even to an invasion of the country, which, while it will hardly succeed, is bound to force Prime Minister Wilson's hand in the Machiavellian role he is playing—trying to walk the tightrope between a pro-Rhodesian British electorate and the Afro-Asian pressure bloc. Timely and decisive action by the American Government could do something to arrest the desperately descending spiral.

Therefore, I hope that Congress, under its delegated power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations," will take the initiative in this session to remove the trade embargo the Johnson administration has imposed against this robust, objectively realist little country that stands on its own feet and asks no handouts of anybody. I hope, further, that it will restate and give vitality to another long-time American principle—non-interference in the internal affairs of another state—to the end that Rhodesia will be left alone to solve its own problems and to work out the slower transition of its backward peoples to full citizenship that it believes to be right, unhampered by punitive international action.

Our position in Africa needs Rhodesia; our interests are clearly on the side of the Ian Smith government. Let us stand up and be counted for sanity.

Very truly yours,

MISS ALDORA BABCOCK.

Dr. Bernard Braskamp

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, When Dr. Braskamp, our beloved Chaplain,

March 2, 1966

A1102

the idea this (saving silver coins) is one way to help them out.

I insert the entire editorial at this point in the RECORD:

THE DISAPPEARING HALVES

Miss Eva Adams, Director of the U.S. Mint, has reported to a congressional committee that 400 million of the Kennedy half dollars have disappeared.

She said the public seems to be hoarding these coins but she doesn't understand why because, according to her, for many, many years to come the coins will have no special value—there are too many of them.

But we also note there has been a heavy hoarding of the old half dollars, with Benjamin Franklin's image on them. And apparently a lot of the old-fashioned quarters are being stashed away.

This leads to some observations, of which Miss Adams surely is aware:

Americans can be quite sentimental about some things. They are especially sentimental about a popular young President who was assassinated. His image is on those half dollars.

Moreover, Government officials may preach about the coins having no extra value in years to come. They may be right. But we suspect a great many Americans simply do not believe this.

As a matter of fact, the half dollars now being minted are only 40-percent silver, compared to the 90-percent content in the old ones. New quarters and the dimes soon to be produced will be made of copper and nickel.

In the marketplace, the new coins are worth their stated values only because the Government says so. But the old coins are worth almost as much as their stated values in silver. The principal reason for minting the new coins was the shortage of silver. Anyone who thinks Americans can't add doesn't know them very well.

It has not been uncommon in the past for many of us to hide away a few coins for the grandchildren or great-grandchildren on the theory they would have rare-coin values by that time. Since we also are passing along most of our national debt to grandchildren and great-grandchildren, some Americans may have got the idea this is one way to help them out.

The Marines' Riverine Warfare Technique in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting developments in the fighting in Vietnam has been the emphasis on river warfare. The Marine Corps, with its naval tradition, has placed particular emphasis on this form of warfare. Because of the fairly far reaching implications of this new development—a throwback to procedures we knew more clearly in the civil war. I believe my colleagues will be interested in the following article by a distinguished naval expert, Mr. L. Edgar Prina, of the Washington Star, which appeared originally in the Sunday Star of January 23, 1966.

The article follows:

MARINES SEEK DOCTRINE FOR RIVERINE WARFARE

(By L. Edgar Prina)

Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps, is freshly returned from an inspection tour of Vietnam more convinced than ever that the United States and its allies must substantially improve their ability to wage what he calls "riverine warfare" if they are ever to pacify the country.

What is "riverine (river) warfare," a term which is very likely to be more and more discussed? The Marines define it as warfare which encompasses, "all operations conducted in a river environment," including "river navigation, crossing, defense and offensive in a delta, security of and along a river, patrolling and logistic support along a river route of communication."

Anyone familiar with the geography of Vietnam knows how vitally important, even dominating, are its waterways, the big Mekong and Red River systems and the many other smaller ones. As in virtually all underdeveloped countries, rivers are the principal arteries of communication and commerce in Vietnam.

The Marines know the importance of the inland waterways firsthand. All three enclaves presently occupied by elements of the 3d Marine Amphibious Force in Vietnam—Da Nang, Chu Lai and Phu Bai—are located in or near river delta areas.

PERFORMED HEROICALLY

Unhappily, too many miles of river and adjacent territory in South Vietnam are in the hands of the Communist Vietcong guerrillas. In addition to exploiting these arteries for military purposes, they tax the peasants and farm folk for using them—often taking a substantial amount of the food and goods in transit as payment.

The Pentagon has given lipservice to the idea of the importance of riverine warfare. But neither the men, money, materials, or brainpower has been devoted to the creation and outfitting of forces which could seize control of these waterways so that they could be used by our side for offensive operations against the guerrillas and for spreading government authority to new areas of the country.

This is not to say that the allies have done nothing. The South Vietnamese Navy has a River Assault Group (RAG), which attempts to keep some waterways open. It is a jury-rigged outfit which, while some of its units and U.S. advisers have performed heroically, is not one to do much more than scratch the surface of the potential. The RAG is a descendant of the old French Dinassaut (Division Navale d'Assaut) concept to provide armed transport and fire support along the rivers of Indo-China.

NEW RIVER BOAT

The U.S. Navy is going to make a contribution to the river effort by complementing the Vietnamese RAG with 120 new high-speed patrol boats. The first of these 31-foot, diesel-powered craft are expected to be on their way to Vietnam within the next several weeks.

Armed with .30- and .50-caliber machine-guns, the American-manned boats were built strictly for patrol and not for assault or gunfire support missions. Their water-jet propulsion systems (they have no propellers) will permit them to operate safely and speedily even in shallow inlets and backwaters.

The Navy is also building a new gunboat, the PGM-84 class, but it is to be used primarily for coastal operations.

A smaller craft, called Swift, is already in the war zone, but it, too, is engaged in coastal surveillance, checking on Communist smuggling and infiltration. Six of them are stationed at Phu Quoc Island, in the Gulf of Thailand. Fifty feet long and, as their name

suggests, capable of high speeds, the Swifts presumably could be used to handle some tasks on the rivers.

The naval high command, however, has not fought for the river warfare mission. As a matter of fact, except for a few energetic, relatively junior admirals, the Navy has shown precious little interest in it.

Greene, a leader in the effort to convince the Navy and the Defense Department of the opportunity to take a forward step by developing an aspect of counter guerrilla warfare which has been long neglected, concedes that U.S. military doctrine with respect to tactical operations on and along a river is inadequate. But he has done something about it.

Recalling how a group of bright, young field grade officers at the Marine Corps Schools in Quantico, Va., helped develop the landing force doctrine in the 1930's, a doctrine which served as the underpinning for our amphibious operations in World War II, the Commandant late last month fired off a new project directive to the coordinator, Marine Corps Landing Force Development Activities at Quantico, calling for creation of a doctrine for the conduct of riverine warfare.

HAVE CROSSING DOCTRINE

Greene's directive put the problem this way:

"What can be done to provide the 3rd Marine Amphibious Force and others with a doctrine for tactics, techniques, organization, and materials to continue operations in the riverine environment which their amphibious landing has located them, without degrading their capability to conduct amphibious operations?"

The coordinator won't have an easy time. He will have to come up with answers concerning the kinds of river craft and vehicles which will be needed; the relationship between the weapons and vehicles; river charts and reconnaissance methods; an evaluation of riverine environment and marginal terrain; a system for providing integrated mobility and firepower and logistic support.

The Marines have a river crossing doctrine. If the coordinator can develop one for operations along and on a river, it could be a major contribution to a successful prosecution of the war in Vietnam.

And, if the future is as grim as the present, it might be needed in counter guerrilla operations in other parts of Asia and in Africa and Latin America, the underdeveloped areas Communist China seeks to exploit in its grandiose strategic plan for encircling the northern half of the world.

Texas Senate Resolution 21

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
 OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS
 IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today, March 2, is Texas Independence Day. It is an historic day for Texans as well as men of liberty everywhere.

The same profound and intensive concepts of democracy and liberty that prompted the fathers of Texas to declare the State's independence some 130 years ago brings forth this expression of support for the Nation's efforts in opposing those who would deprive other people of their rightful claim to independence.

March 2, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A1101

died the House lost another one of its inspirations. It would be needless for me to say he was a devoted, able public servant because everybody knows that.

He had that happy facility, whether you were in bed ill or on your feet feeling fine, of making you feel better. He was truly one of God's great leaders. All of us will miss him much.

Our deepest sympathy goes to his loved ones in this, their hour of great loss.

Thirteen Million Sign for Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues a recent article on the supplementary insurance provision of the Medicare Act designed to cover doctor bills. It is written by John Troan and appeared in the February 14 issue of the Cincinnati Post and Times Star. Mr. Troan interviewed Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball, and the questions and answers provide some valuable and clear information about the voluntary insurance.

MEDICARE PICTURE: 13 MILLION SIGN FOR INSURANCE

(By John Troan)

WASHINGTON.—After months of foot dragging, Americans are flocking to sign up for the bargain-rate medical insurance offered by Medicare.

Social Security Commissioner Robert M. Ball says about 13.5 million persons past 65 have now enrolled for this supplementary insurance, designated chiefly to cover doctor bills.

By the end of the initial enrollment period next month, Ball expects 80 to 90 percent of the 19 million eligibles—between 15.2 million and 17.1 million persons to have signed.

Following is a question-answer interview on this subject with the chief of the Social Security Administration:

Question. Commissioner Ball, how many persons have signed up for the supplementary Medicare insurance?

Answer. So far about 13.5 million, 70 percent of those eligible. And there are still 7 weeks to go before the first enrollment period ends March 31, so I'm confident by the end of next month we'll have 80 to 90 percent of the 19 million enrolled.

Question. Who is eligible for this insurance?

Answer. Just about everybody over 65, regardless of whether or not he ever worked under social security and whether or not he intends to retire.

Question. How many have turned down this insurance?

Answer. Something over a million, or 6 percent of the total eligible. But many of those who have said no are changing their minds.

Question. What reasons do they give for turning it down?

Answer. Many of those who gives a reason say they can't afford it.

Question. How much does the supplementary insurance cost?

Answer. Three dollars for each individual past 65. The Government matches this premium, which means you're getting \$6 worth of protection for \$3.

Question. How is the premium to be paid?

Answer: If a person who is signed up is drawing a monthly social security, railroad retirement, or civil service retirement check, the amount will be deducted automatically from the check. Otherwise, the person will be billed by social security at regular intervals.

Question. What other reasons do people give for refusing the insurance?

Answer. Many have said—and this is generally a mistaken reason—that they don't want the supplementary insurance because they already have such coverage either through Blue Shield or Blue Cross or a commercial firm.

Question. But will the "Blues" and commercial companies continue such coverage after Medicare takes effect?

Answer. That's just it, most of them have made it clear they aren't going to duplicate for the aged what Medicare offers, and most are urging their policyholders to sign up. Some already have announced they are going to change coverage once Medicare begins.

Question. That's next July 1?

Answer. Yes. That's when all Medicare benefits except those pertaining to skilled nursing homes go into effect. The nursing-home benefits will not be available until January 1, 1967.

Question. Now Medicare is divided into two parts—

Answer. That's right: Plan A, or basic hospital insurance, and plan B, or supplementary medical insurance.

Question. Plan A will—

Answer. In general, it will offer up to 90 days of care in a hospital for each spell of illness, with the patient paying the first \$40 plus \$10 for each day after the first 60. It also will offer home-health benefits—in a patient's own home—following hospitalization. And in 1967, benefits in skilled nursing homes will be added.

Question. And plan B?

Answer: Primarily, it will help pay doctor bills—whether the physician renders his services in the patient's home, in his own office, or in a hospital, nursing home, or other institution.

Question. Any exceptions?

Answer. The biggest exceptions are drugs and long-term nursing home care—beyond that provided by the basic plan. Nor will the supplementary insurance cover routine physicals, inoculations, examinations for eyeglasses or hearing aids, or cosmetic surgery.

Question. How about dental care?

Answer: It won't cover dental care generally. But it will help pay for dental services in surgery on the jaw or other facial bones if this is required by accident or disease.

Question. Any other coverage?

Answer: If a person is treated outside a hospital for a mental, psychoneurotic, or personality disorder, the insurance will cover half of the bill up to a total benefit of \$250 a year for this purpose.

Question. Anything else?

Answer. If a person needs the services, in his own home, of a part-time nurse, a nurse's aid, a medical social worker, or a physical, speech or occupational therapist, the insurance will cover up to 100 visits a year by such health workers provided by a home-health agency.

Question. Isn't this home-health benefit the same as that offered "free" by the basic Medicare plan?

Answer. It's similar. But to draw a home-health benefits under the basic plan, the patient must first be hospitalized. To draw the benefits under the supplementary plan, there is no hospital requirement. Furthermore, if a patient needs home-health care after discharge from a hospital he can draw 100 visits a year under the basic plan plus 100 under the supplementary.

Question. What else does the supplementary insurance cover?

Answer. Diagnostic tests, including X-rays and laboratory tests, in addition to those offered by the basic plan; radiation therapy; surgical dressings, splints, casts and so on; rental of such medical equipment as oxygen tents and wheelchairs; artificial limbs, artificial eyes, braces.

Question: How about artificial teeth?

Answer. No. The plan won't pay for false teeth, hearing aids or eyeglasses.

Question. Does it cover the full cost of the benefits?

Answer. No. First of all, the patient is responsible for all services not covered by the plan—such as drugs and ordinary dental bills. In addition, the patient is responsible for the first \$50 of medical expense he incurs each year for services in which the supplementary insurance does apply.

Question. Does the insurance pay the balance?

Answer. It will pay 80 percent of the remainder—80 percent of what's left after the patient takes care of the noncovered expenses and the \$50 deductible.

Question. Will a doctor's full fee be figured into this?

Answer. Medicare will pay up to 80 percent of what is determined to be a "reasonable charge," based on customary and prevailing fees in the area. If a doctor bills Medicare directly, the "reasonable charge" must be his full charge. If he bills the patient, the doctor may charge anything he wishes but the patient will be reimbursed by Medicare for no more than 80 percent of the "reasonable charge."

Question. When should a person sign up?

Answer. Those who were 65 before January 1, 1966, must sign up before the end of the first enrollment period March 31.

Question. If they don't?

Answer. They'll have to wait for the next enrollment period, and pay a higher premium when they do sign up. For instance, if a person who reached 65 before January 1 doesn't enroll by the end of March he won't have another chance to sign up until October 1967; his insurance won't take effect until July 1968, and his monthly premium will be \$3.30 rather than \$3.

Question. How and where do I sign up?

Answer. If you still haven't been contacted, get in touch with your nearest Social Security office immediately.

The Disappearing Halves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, an interesting commentary on the increase of unofficial coin collectors in our Nation appeared in the Knoxville News-Sentinel on February 26, 1966.

The new collectors are not concerned particularly with the age of the coins, rather they are saving any quarters, nickels, or half dollars which were minted before 1965.

This editorial brings to mind the assertion of Thomas Jefferson that our national debt should not be left to be paid by the next generation.

The conclusion of the article gives one of today's answers to Jefferson's proposition:

Since we also are passing along most of our national debt to grandchildren and great grandchildren, some Americans may have got

In a word, transportation has become one of the social problems of our time.

President Johnson referred to it in his state of the Union message. "A new Department of Transportation is needed," he said, "to bring together our transportation activities. The present structure—35 Government agencies spending \$5 billion yearly—makes it impossible to serve either the demands of the Nation—the needs of industry—or the right of the taxpayer to full efficiency and frugality."

Britain, where transport problems are less gigantic but more concentrated than in the industrialized parts of the United States, has long had a Ministry of Transport. The British public have tended to identify it with roads—and Prime Minister Harold Wilson's recent appointment as Minister of Transport of a woman who does not have a driving license has produced snorts and guffaws from some Britons (particularly male drivers). But the putting of Mrs. Barbara Castle—for she is the lady in question—in the top job at the Ministry of Transport bespeaks recognition of the need for drive and reorganization and, above all, the British Government's determination to draw up an integrated transport plan for the United Kingdom.

Mrs. Castle was an undoubted success in the apparently not very glamorous or exciting Ministry of Overseas Development where Prime Minister Wilson appointed her after the 1964 general election. His decision to put her in charge of transport is—as the Economist said—imaginative. It stems from the same basic need as prompted President Johnson's announcement of a new Department of Transportation in the United States. All of us have a vested interest in the success of both moves, for all of us have a greater urge and opportunity than ever to get about—whether it be simply getting to work from the suburbs or more ambitiously getting away on vacation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 26, 1966]

TOO MANY COOKS

President Johnson in his state of the Union message put his finger on one of the major flaws in American transportation policy. Regulation is now divided among no less than 35 Government agencies, spending a total of \$5 billion yearly.

Such a fragmented approach, in the President's words, "makes it almost impossible to serve either the growing demands of this great Nation, or the needs of the industry, or the right of the taxpayer to full efficiency and real frugality."

Mr. Johnson's remedy would be to centralize all this supervision of airlines, railroads, trucking, and shipping in a new Department of Transportation. While Congress must await details of how this would be accomplished, the basic idea seems so logical and simple that the puzzle is why it was not done long ago.

Actually, the notion of such a Cabinet-level department has been kicking around Washington for years, but mutual suspicion and hostility among the powerful lobbies representing the various carriers and the struggles by bureaucrats to keep control over their little fiefdoms have successfully stalled action.

The result is a patchwork approach to the industry. Some modes of transportation must build their own depots while others use buildings erected at taxpayers' expense. Some carriers pay tax on fuel, others do not. Uncle Sam contributes to the cost of safety devices for one industry, while another receives no such benefit. And so it goes.

Putting all the regulators in one department will not automatically produce a ra-

tional, fair, and harmonious policy toward each segment of the industry. But it is the first step that must be taken to achieve such a reform. The public interest requires no less.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 19, 1966]

TRANSPORTATION AND MORE

The President's proposal to establish a Department of Transportation, a single agency that would coordinate the diverse programs and functions of the Federal Government, deserves the widest support. In fact, a good case can be made for broadening the scope of the new department to include communications and power.

There are obvious and compelling reasons for placing the Federal transportation agencies under one roof. The Federal Government is now spending some \$6 billion a year for motor highway construction, the subsidization of the merchant marine, inland waterway and harbor improvement and the regulation of railroads, airlines, and common motor carriers. But those dollars cannot be spent effectively, they cannot confer maximum benefits upon the taxpayers unless national goals are clearly specified and pursued through coordinated efforts. Neither logic nor necessity has decreed that the Federal highway and waterways programs must work to the detriment of the Nation's railroads as they do now.

But a perfunctory coordination of transportation activities, one that merely results in shifting autonomous agencies under one big, bureaucratic tent will accomplish nothing more than an increase in Federal employment. To cite a specific example, the new department is not going to be effective so long as the Interstate Commerce Commission, that sclerotic archetype of the independent regulatory agency, continues to establish minimum, not maximum rates and approve rail mergers without sufficient attention to the balance and efficiency of the total transportation system. The effective coordination of Federal transportation programs, to say the very least, will involve a political struggle.

But that struggle, which will be centered largely around the conflicting interest of different modes of transportation, is not likely to be protracted if the new department were to encompass communications and the transmission of power. The inclusion of the Federal Communications and Federal Power Commissions in a new Department of Transportation, Communications, and Power would make it possible for the Government to regulate virtually all the interstate public utilities in a uniform and equitable manner.

The inability of both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations to make headway in the effort to alter railroad rate regulation is but a foretaste of the opposition to the formation of a new department.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Pursuant to the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate H.R. 12752, which will be stated by title.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK**. A bill (H.R. 12752) to provide for graduated withholding of income tax from wages, to require declarations of estimated tax with respect to self-employment income, to accelerate current payments of estimated income tax by corporations, to postpone certain excise tax rate reductions, and for other purposes.

THE VICE PRESIDENT'S INFORMAL MEETING WITH THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have before me a most interesting article that appeared in this morning's Washington Post. The headline is "HUMPHREY Agrees To See FULBRIGHT Panel Privately."

The article states:

Vice President HUMPHREY agreed yesterday to a compromise plan to meet with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in private, informal session.

For the past 2 weeks HUMPHREY has rejected Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT's request that he meet with the committee in a more formal public session.

Under the compromise plan, HUMPHREY will meet with the committee this afternoon on the neutral ground of Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD's Capitol office.

FULBRIGHT's disagreement with another high administration official—President Johnson—continued to simmer yesterday.

The President refused to make public the testimony he gave to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 25, 1961, after he returned from an Asian tour which he made as Vice President. On Monday FULBRIGHT suggested that the President make the testimony public.

At a press conference yesterday, Presidential Press Secretary Bill Moyers said that Mr. Johnson had appeared before the 1961 committee meeting with the understanding that it "would be informal and private." Moyers said that the President "doesn't regard it as appropriate to change the rules 5 years later" by making public his testimony.

In another development, FULBRIGHT disclosed that the committee would resume public hearings on U.S. Asian policy next Tuesday.

The new hearings will center on Communist China. The first witnesses will be two university experts on China—A. Doak Barnett of Columbia University on Tuesday and Harvard's John K. Fairbank on Thursday.

My reaction to the story is: How absurd can we be?

I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and this morning I protested any informal meeting with the Vice President on neutral grounds in the majority leader's office this afternoon.

I do not care how many Senators, be they members of the Committee on Foreign Relations or not, want to meet with the Vice President any time they want to meet with him. However, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I do object and said so this morning, to this kind of fol-de-rol, to this kind of nonsense.

Mr. President, no one has defended more than I have—and I shall continue to do so—the matter of separation of powers and the right of executive privilege.

The Vice President of the United States does not have to come to any committee meeting that he does not wish to attend. He is completely protected by executive privilege. He can volunteer to come. It has happened in the past.

But, Mr. President, I am at a loss to understand this parliamentary nonsense. I should have thought that the Vice President, on his own initiative, would have asked for the opportunity to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee in open session, to discuss with the commit-

tee the trip into Asia that he took at the request of the President of the United States. That would have been a most appropriate forum in which to discuss it.

There are other forums, and the Vice President is using them, as he has a perfect right to do, and I am glad he is using them. He used the forum of the East Room of the White House the other morning. In fact, I think he used it on a couple of mornings, to meet with various Members of Congress. That is fine; I heartily approve of it.

He has announced that he is going to use forums across the country to discuss his trip with the American people. I highly approve of that. He has used the forum of nationwide television and I approve of that.

The Foreign Relations Committee has certain special responsibilities in the field of foreign policy. It has certain special prerogatives in that field, and has a responsibility to officially seek to take testimony from those who, in the opinion of the committee, are particularly qualified and competent to be of assistance to the committee by giving them their testimony.

The committee chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] was seeking to carry out that responsibility when he most respectfully suggested, the other day, that the Vice President meet with the Foreign Relations Committee in open, public session and discuss with the committee the trip that he had taken, and the many foreign relations problems that were raised by that trip.

When it became clear that the Vice President would not wish to meet with the Foreign Relations Committee in open session, the chairman of the committee most respectfully and properly suggested that he meet in executive session with the committee. When that was first suggested in our committee, I made it clear that it should be at the voluntary discretion of the Vice President, that we could not insist that he meet with us, but that we had the right to invite him to an executive meeting.

When the Vice President indicated, as I understand he did, that he did not care to meet the committee in public session or executive session, the matter should have been dropped. I do not think that it is fair, either to the committee or to the Vice President, to become involved in this hybrid arrangement, which is neither fish nor fowl.

Therefore, Mr. President, I made clear at the meeting this morning that I would not attend the session this afternoon, because I do not think that that session is in keeping with the separation of powers doctrine as far as a Senate committee is concerned, unless they were simply meeting as individual Senators, without any representation that it is a committee meeting. As far as I am concerned, there is no official Foreign Relations Committee meeting with the Vice President, and there cannot be, under the terms set forth in this press report.

There are some questions that the American people are entitled to have answered by the Vice President, but they are entitled to have them answered, in open session, where he can be asked on

the record questions about problems that are raised, for example, by a story that appeared in the Washington Daily News of February 25, by Walt Friedenber, entitled "South Korea Drove a Bargain With H.H.H."—meaning the Vice President.

The article reads:

SEOUL, February 24.—Vice President HUMPHREY ended his 2-week, 9-nation tour here with a bargaining session on terms for sending more South Korean troops to help fight in Vietnam.

The terms were not made public. It is agreed, however, that this country will send one more regiment to South Vietnam by the end of April and a full infantry division by mid-July.

The present ROK troop total of 23,000 would thus rise to about 40,000.

Seoul argued that its present contingent in Vietnam was a reasonable contribution. But if more troops were to be sent, South Korea must look to its national interests, that is, be compensated.

So far as can be learned now, South Korea has been promised:

The gradual, selected reequipping (chiefly in heavy weapons) of its 500,000-man army. Assurance that \$150 million in earmarked economic aid promptly will be forthcoming.

A stipend of about \$2 a day paid for each Korean soldier in Vietnam for better living conditions.

The continued flow of Korean civilian technicians to good-paying construction jobs in South Vietnam.

A greater share for Korea in the procurement of cement, of military uniforms, and other goods needed by South Vietnam.

An interesting story. I do not know what the facts are. But I do know, Mr. President, the American people are entitled to know what the facts are.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles from which I have quoted, the one from today's issue of the Washington Post entitled "HUMPHREY Agrees To See Fulbright Panel Privately," and the one from yesterday's Washington Daily News entitled "South Korea Drove a Bargain with H.H.H.," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 1, 1966]

HUMPHREY AGREES TO SEE FULBRIGHT PANEL PRIVATELY

Vice President HUMPHREY agreed yesterday to a compromise plan to meet with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in private, informal session.

For the past 2 weeks HUMPHREY has rejected Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT'S request that he meet with the committee in a more formal public session.

Under the compromise plan, HUMPHREY will meet with the committee this afternoon on the neutral ground of Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD'S Capitol office.

FULBRIGHT'S disagreement with another high administration official—President Johnson—continued to simmer yesterday.

The President refused to make public the testimony he gave to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 25, 1961, after he returned from an Asian tour which he made as Vice President. On Monday FULBRIGHT suggested that the President make the testimony public.

At a press conference yesterday, Presidential Press Secretary Bill Moyers said that Mr. Johnson had appeared before the 1961 committee meeting with the understanding that

it "would be informal and private." Moyers said that the President "doesn't regard it as appropriate to change the rules 5 years later" by making public his testimony.

In another development, FULBRIGHT disclosed that the committee would resume public hearings on U.S. Asian policy next Tuesday.

The new hearings will center on Communist China. The first witnesses will be two university experts on China—A. Doak Barnett of Columbia University on Tuesday and Harvard's John K. Fairbank on Thursday.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 24, 1966]

MORE AID IN VIETNAM FOR MORE AID: SOUTH KOREA DROVE A BARGAIN WITH H.H.H.

(By Walt Friedenber)

SEOUL, February 24.—Vice President HUMPHREY ended his 2-week, nine-nation tour here with a bargaining session on terms for sending more South Korean troops to help fight in Vietnam.

The terms were not made public. It is agreed, however, that this country will send one more regiment to South Vietnam by the end of April and a full infantry division by mid-July.

The present ROK troop total of 23,000 would thus rise to about 40,000.

Seoul argued that its present contingent in Vietnam was a reasonable contribution. But if more troops were to be sent, South Korea must look to its "national interests," that is, be compensated.

So far as can be learned now, South Korea has been promised:

The gradual, selected reequipping (chiefly in heavy weapons) of its 500,000-man army. Assurance that \$150 million in earmarked economic aid promptly will be forthcoming.

A stipend of about \$2 a day paid for each Korean soldier in Vietnam for "better living conditions."

The continued flow of Korean civilian technicians to good-paying construction jobs in South Vietnam.

A greater share for Korea in the procurement of cement, of military uniforms, and other goods needed by South Vietnam.

Mr. MORSE. I do know, Mr. President, that in a democracy, if it is to be preserved, the executive branch of Government must be stopped, whether it involves the President or the Vice President or both, from engaging in government by executive supremacy. If the Daily News story I have read is true, this is dangerous stuff.

If it is true, it is important that we proceed without delay to check the increasing exercise of arbitrary, capricious power on the part of the President and the Vice President of the United States in the field of foreign policy.

By our failure to demand a public accounting, we will entrench government not by law but by a man. I know of no man, including the President of the United States, who should be given such unchecked arbitrary power.

Thus, Mr. President, I do not intend to participate in any conference—which is going on as I speak now—in the name of the Committee on Foreign Relations. In my judgment, if members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, as individual Senators, wish to meet with the Vice President of the United States, then they should do it in their individual capacities as Senators. They should not go into any such off-the-record informal meeting in the name of the Foreign Relations Committee, because when a For-

ign Relations Committee meeting is held, it should be held as an official meeting, in accordance with the rules and policies of the committee.

Mr. President, it saddens me to make these comments about the Vice President, but I mean every word.

In my judgment, anyone who advocates, as the Vice President is advocating, the bombing of people to a so-called peace table, has lost his right to claim to be a liberal. Anyone who is advocating the kind of an escalating war, which the Vice President is advocating in his public statements, has lost the right to claim to be a liberal.

Mr. President, I have said before on the floor of the Senate, and repeat today, that the issue is now before the American people.

I say to the American people that they and they alone have the authority to check this escalating war in Vietnam, that they will have to do it at the ballot box, beginning in the primaries just ahead, and then voting in the November elections in 1966, continuing in the primaries in 1968 and voting in the general election in 1968. Unless the American people are willing to defeat those who are seeking to lead this country—by its present foreign policy—into a major war in Asia, which will be the inevitable end result, then the American people have only themselves to blame as increasing thousands and thousands of Americans, both military and civilian, will be slaughtered in that holocaust.

Mr. President, that is the issue.

I am going to urge—short of a formal declaration of war, which this President should have recommended before he sent a single boy into Asia to be slaughtered—that the American people defeat the policy which now characterizes the warmaking policy of the administration.

I am perfectly willing to face the ballot box. I am perfectly willing to be judged by my people. I have served for 20 years in the Senate, always on the basis of the principle that each term is my last, for that is the only basis upon which anyone, in my judgment, has any right to serve in the Senate. For if we are not willing to serve in this body on the assumption that we are going to be either reelected or defeated on the basis of the record we make, as we utilize our independence of judgment on the facts as we find them, then we have no right to serve here at all.

I am perfectly willing to be judged on the record that I make, and to be judged on my record for peace—a peace on terms which honors my country and carries out the long-held professions of my country that we believe in following the rule of law in the settlement of international disputes, and not in the rule of the jungle by the use of military force which we are following today in southeast Asia.

COMMUNICATIONS ON VIETNAM WAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that certain communications, editorials, and articles dealing with my views on foreign policy be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Feb. 8, 1966]

MORSE ON THE VIETNAM WAR

Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 28 that the administration had tried to "expose fully to the public" the elements of the Vietnam problem but that it was hard to get the people to listen.

Critics of the administration's policy do not agree that an effort has been made to expose the public to all elements of the problem. They think the administration has withheld information and deceived the public in statements and speeches. The critics might agree that it has been hard to get the people to listen.

But this situation has changed, we believe, as a result of the big buildup of U.S. forces in Vietnam, the bombing pause and its resumption and the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. People are in a mood to listen. They want to obtain a better understanding of the problem.

Des Moines had evidence of this new mood Sunday when about a thousand persons turned out to hear Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, talk at a meeting sponsored by Iowans for Peace in Vietnam. Judging by the applause and the questioning of Senator Morse, the audience was largely sympathetic to the views of the Oregon Senator, a harsh critic of administration policies.

Senator Morse made a strong, reasonable and unemotional presentation of his case. He made clear that he respects and admires President Johnson and that he believes the President wants peace. Morse has no sympathy for communism. He does not favor an immediate pullout of troops from Vietnam and he does not support those who violate laws in peace demonstrations.

Senator Morse challenged the legal basis for the actions the United States has taken in Vietnam, without a declaration of war. He sees a drift to government by Executive decisions. He believes secrecy policies and deceptive propaganda make it difficult for people to get the facts on Vietnam—and to generate a change in our foreign policy.

Morse listed what he believes are the failures of the United States to live up to provisions of the Geneva treaty of 1954 and the United Nations Charter. He told of the lack of support for U.S. views among other countries. He praised the belated decision to ask the United Nations to consider the problem. He expressed his fears about the dangers of escalation that could lead to war with Red China and the Soviet Union.

We hope the great debate goes on, not only through speeches throughout the country by men like Senator MORSE and those who disagree with him, but also in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and on the floor of the Senate.

The search for an alternative policy to one of indefinite expansion and intensification of the war must continue—and that search will be helped by bringing everything, except security matters, into the open. Democratic and constitutional processes must be preserved in handling even such a difficult problem as the war in Vietnam.

[From the Oregon Journal, Feb. 18, 1966]
WORLD WAR I VETERAN VOICES DOUBTS ON VIETNAM

To the EDITOR:

May I in the name of Christianity and democracy express my deep concern in regard to the road of destruction along which our President and the hawks of the Pentagon are leading us?

I volunteered 11 days after war was declared in 1917. I furnished three boys and a girl in World War II and one boy in the Korean war.

While they were gone I ran a 250-acre farm alone to make sure they had the food with which to fight. I gave a gallon of blood that they and their comrades might have blood to meet their needs. I sold Government bonds and never once did I miss my quota, even if I had to buy enough myself to fill it.

Now, some of those "super patriots" insist that I send my grandsons to fight and die in that hellhole of Vietnam in order to force a people to accept our brand of democracy merely because it has proved a success here where conditions are in no way the same except that each deals with human beings. What is wrong with America's faith in democracy when we will say that we must send these boys to fight and die 7,000 miles away because this big deal of communism is liable to take us over?

Nowhere in the world can you show me where communism has ever been able to give its people the things that we have accomplished for ourselves. Nowhere can you show me a country that has accepted communism but what was driven there by economic and social breakdown in its ability to serve its people. Communism cannot gain a foothold unless there is poverty, injustice, and economic chaos. This is the ground in which it survives. Can napalm bombs and destruction kill communism or solve these problems? It cannot.

I will admit that America with all of the destructive weapons can scorch the whole of North and South Vietnam, but you will never kill the cause for which they fight regardless of what we choose to call it, and you will leave behind a hatred all over Asia that will live on forever. Why doesn't our Government tell the people that 87,000 Vietnamese regulars deserted in 1964 and 90,000 in the first 10 months of 1965? These are men whom we have equipped and trained, and yet Mr. Johnson leads us to believe that they have come from the North. Most of the arms that we capture are not Chinese made, but Russian and United States made.

If we would have spent just a fraction of our cost of war today in medical, educational, social, and economic advancements, we would not be called on 20 years after our real commitment was made by Vinegar Joe Stillwell, who was head of the Chinese Nationalist Forces during World War II. We would not be called on to make this staggering decision facing us.

I helped to elect Mr. Johnson because of my faith in him to resolve this crucial problem. But now I am thinking that perhaps I have made a terrible mistake for he seems completely under the spell of the hawks of the Pentagon.

General Eisenhower warned us of this military-industrial complex lest they would take over; so did Gen. Matthew B. Ridgeway in his book "Soldier." "I challenge any thesis that destroying the military might of China would be in our long-range interest." We could create there a great vacuum which would compel us to drain our own resources of men and money to fill, and it would bring us face to face with Russia along a 7,000-mile frontier. This is not my appraisal, but the appraisal by a man whom I cannot bring myself to call a "pinkie" or dove.

If such an emergency exists in Asia, why are we to be called on to solve it alone? Is our stake so much greater than the members of SEATO and NATO? I know no better way of sucking us dry than the way we are going.

I say what I have said because I fear it needs to be said. I have spent my 71 years in full support of my country's ideals, but I'm sure this is not one of them. My eyesight is good and I can still handle a gun. Let me go if there is no other way, even if I do not believe or agree with it. But for God and country's sake exhaust every avenue before we commit these boys against

March 2, 1966

their will to fight and die in Vietnam that may be a lost cause. But if this be necessary then let every laborer, every farmer, every industrialist operate on a non-profit basis. In closing let me remind us all—"What profit a man if he gaineth the whole world and yet loseth his own soul."

SIDNEY M. LOVRIEN.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
February 6, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your strong, dissenting voice on our Vietnam policy is a major contribution to the restoration of sanity in our foreign policy. We are grateful for your courage and lucid portrayal of the ominous, mistaken course we are following.

We hope your committee will continue its valiant effort to get the facts before the American people, define our goals and turn our policy toward realistic peace efforts.

Sincerely yours,

JACQUELINE KIENZLE.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,
February 7, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You should know, directly, that your position and your intentions in the questions of the war in Vietnam have our full support and are very much appreciated.

We have joined the protests and we have written to President Johnson. We are unable to understand his objectives except in terms of economical and political expansion and domination, which probably, is what "imperialism" means.

Yours truly,

HUGO RIBEIRO.

OREGON TRUCKING ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Portland, Oreg., February 1, 1966.

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

DEAR WAYNE: I can't help but believe that you had a great influence on the President when he referred the Vietnam situation to the United Nations. I had the privilege of viewing last Sunday's TV program and felt at the time that you were right, that from this time on the American public would demand United Nations consideration.

I appreciate your forthright and positive position, though I am sure that at times it has been difficult, but then I also believe that you are happier when you have a tough job to do.

My best wishes to you and Mrs. Morse for this session of Congress.

Best personal regards.

ROBERT R. KNIPE,
Managing Director.

LAKE OSWEGO, OREG.,
February 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please continue your efforts in pressing for stronger investigation of the facts in our administration's policy and participation in the Vietnam war.

I feel very strongly that the majority of the American people do not favor further involvement in this war.

We must seek negotiation and help from the United Nations if we are to survive as a world leader.

Sincerely,

VICTORIA F. JENSEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Let me be one of the first to congratulate you on your sincere remarks at Des Moines last night.

I am writing many letters to various parties relative to the Vietnam war and many of us are so grateful to you for your effort in getting the President to not be so stubborn and listen to someone besides the two Secretaries.

I only hope you can get these two men into the Senate for questioning.

Many of us are attempting to try and help to stop this horrible carnage.

We are behind you in your efforts.

Sincerely,

ROY A. GAGE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 8, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When the record shows how shamefully most great nations and the United States have treated China, no wonder that country resents us.

McNamara's declaration that we can defeat both Russia and China only provokes war.

There is a paperback on "China" by Felix Green (95 cents). Perhaps Mr. Berg can procure a copy. I recommend you read pages 264 to 293 wherein many strong points are presented why our present policy regarding China is unjust.

A wise acquaintance said to me, "I think all the wise men are dead and I am feeling bad myself."

With great respect and best wishes.

Sincerely,

WALLACE A. PRATT.

ONTARIO, OREG.,
February 7, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Sorry you have to suffer all this, trying to help us the people, trying to save our loved ones. People everywhere are with you but are afraid of causing trouble for their loved ones. I can't understand why mothers and fathers of this country can't put a stop to sending our men to protect everyone else in the world. All we want is to have our men to protect our own country right here.

We all know you are right and always have been. We have sent many letters protesting this war but we are just the people not the Great Society. The servicemen are hooked. This is not a free country, we are full of fear of our own President. That is the way they want it. We would all feel different if it was a declared war. We all know how rotten all this is. This is the worst.

Many of the other people in the Congress are against the President but are also afraid of him. I am afraid to sign my name.

Keep well and keep trying to help us. It makes us feel good to know someone like you is still allowed in the Senate. We keep hoping they won't shut you up, but expect it any time. They shut up everyone else. We are sorry you are the only one having to fight all this. The people are with you so keep it up.

Everything you have said a year ago is turning out exactly like you said it would. The Big Three still hasn't been able to tell us a true answer. Our dear loved ones getting killed for someone else. Oh dear God. How can three men have such power?

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 4, 1966.

DEAR SIR: I agree with you on the concern of saving young American lives over in Vietnam. We should save the "flower of our youth" from getting killed over in Vietnam. Those orientals should fight for themselves. I speak as a Korean war veteran.

Sincerely,

Mr. THOMAS DOWD.

LAKE OSWEGO, OREG.,

January 31, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your stand on the Vietnam war. My support is with you and I feel that you are gaining more support all the time.

Let us hope that this move of the President's today to take the issue to the United Nations succeeds.

Keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

KATHERINE CORTRIGHT.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
January 27, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to say that I agree with you about Vietnam. I told you so last April, but I would like to remind you.

My Dad and I voted for you when you were a Republican even though we were Democrats.

Would you tell Senators HARTKE, MCCARTHY, MOSS, BURDICK, METCALF, MCGOVERN, MANSFIELD, GRUENING, and FULBRIGHT that they have support for their opposition. Thank you.

Yours truly,

BARBARA J. LUCAS.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
January 29, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to applaud your public stand against the Administration's Vietnam foreign policy. As a graduate student in political science at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, but an absentee voter in the State of Oregon, I am much concerned about the fearsome implications of the present war in terms of escalation, the potential involvement of the Chinese, and the impact the war atmosphere has upon the democratic process within our country. I wish to encourage your effort in seeking to alter our Nation's foreign policy generally, and specifically in terms of seeking our withdrawal from Vietnam. As far as the techniques of withdrawal are concerned your expertise in this matter goes beyond my knowledge. However, I can see that our involvement in Vietnam will solve no problems confronting that nation, nor add to our Nation's statute throughout the world, nor be of any material "self interest" to the United States. Morally and from a "realist" point of view, I see no rational reason why we must continue our policy in Vietnam.

As an aside, I have noticed a shift of attitude within the academic circles of students, teaching assistants, and professors within the last year which increasingly questions and has doubts about our present policy in Vietnam. At home in Roseburg during Christmas I also talked with friends, admittedly from a select socioeconomic level and high educational level, who were in support of your position and very concerned about the Vietnam policy of our Government and its implications upon our Nation's general foreign policy.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL A. DONDERO.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 26, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I and my family should like to commend you for voicing your opinions regarding the so-called peaceful expedition in Vietnam. Yours is as "a voice crying in the wilderness" and you deserve praise for taking the right, but unpopular stand, on this controversial situation.

March 2, 1966

4509

I have followed your stand on this matter for the past several years and have used material as expressed by you in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the whole sorry record of this situation.

Respectfully,

HOWARD WATERBURY, JR.

ASHLAND, OREG.,
January 25, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: Your efforts are sincere to familiarize the American people of the facts of Vietnam. It is hoped that you will continue to demand that the Vietnam situation come to a halt, and be referred to the United Nations for settlement in accord with the Geneva agreement.

Respectfully,

CLAUDE J. MILLER.

OREGON CITY, OREG.,
January 27, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Realizing that you, no doubt, have had much criticism regarding your stand on the Vietnam situation and that those of us who are in agreement with you are often lax at letting you know that we are 100 percent for you I feel that I have, thus far, been remiss by not writing you in commendation. I want you to know that many rather quiet people are behind you in the stand you have taken. Despite all the people with whom I talk daily I have yet to hear one person express support of what we are doing in Vietnam.

While many people, thinking it unpatriotic not to support policies of the President, have rather begrudgingly given assent to his escalation of the war because they feel he ought to know what he is doing, they do not support our role in Vietnam, and they are hoping and praying for peace. Republicans and Democrats alike, however, support you in your role of opposition and I'm glad to see that now some others are joining you vocally in the Senate and House.

Again, congratulations on your faithfulness to conscience and to the upholding of the constitutional freedoms of our democracy.

Respectfully yours,

REV. HORACE L. BACHELDER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 27, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: * * * We would like to know, why we are in Vietnam. To whom are we committed? There are so many questions that have no answers in this regard. We parents have sons that are going to be involved in this mess, should certainly have the right to know why our boys are being sent there.

Many people in Oregon appreciate your stand on the Vietnam situation, and hope you will continue your work to end this war.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOHN D. BOONE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 26, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington 25, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Tonight's Oregon Journal carries a short note that you oppose the sending of draftees to Vietnam against their will without congressional approval.

I earnestly concur and I applaud your stand. I detest the administration's bypassing of Congress with the Vietnam mess; such action is usurpation of power.

No. 37—21

I very sincerely pray your legislation is fruitful.

Yours,

MACLYN GEROLD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 26, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to express my support for the views you have so courageously expounded concerning Vietnam and the draft.

I suspect you will go down in history—if certain people in the Pentagon do not prevent us from having a history—as the most sane and thoughtful person in the U.S. Senate at present.

Sincerely,

ARLENE BLUM.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 15, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am proud to be a resident of a State which is represented by a man whose political vision is as fearless, sane, and farsighted as yours. May your sanity prevail.

Please: Vote "no" in more U.N. war funds.

Sincerely,

RUTH HAN.

WOODBURN, OREG.,
February 25, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our warm and sincere congratulations go forth to you today for the brilliant courage you have demonstrated, particularly during the recent TV Vietnam hearings. We are proud of you, Senator MORSE, and of Chairman FULBRIGHT, that you are taking this stand and fighting for what you believe in. In these days many are too chickenhearted even though they may talk big in some circles.

We have thought of you so often; if we had written every time we thought of you; and when we had opinions and suggestions on some of these present-day affairs that are so critical, your office staff would be swamped with letters.

There is great interest shown in our community, as all over the Nation, but it seems there are so many who are talking and surely do not have full information. Some do not understand your motives and have taken your remark about the rise of Hitlerism as a shocking condemnation of our administration and not as we feel, a warning as to what could happen here if we don't all take an interest and some action at the polls.

Because we have supported you openly in our small area we have received some criticism too, and one day a party called me on the telephone following the General Taylor inquiry, very much alarmed about our friend, Senator MORSE, and that communism was everywhere (possibly under every bush) and she was afraid.

In February, to learn more about the Vietnam affair, we attended several great decisions meetings. The group was very, very small, an ex-colonel as discussion leader, apparently with the view that fight was necessary and war should be escalated. We were not inclined to go along, and our representation from Oregon in the matter of the Taylor-Gavin-Rusk was relegated to the lowest depths following a complimentary remark we had made about our Senator on the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Chairman FULBRIGHT.

If you should have any occasion to consider the groups interested in great decisions it would seem proper that the discussion leader refrain from attempted influence of deci-

sions in these matters and that discussions be given to the public attending, rather than to listen to lengthy arguments in favor of the military as in this case here.

Thank you, and keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. HARRY G. THORN.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 26, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I admire your stand on Vietnam and wait with great interest each progressive step you make toward your goal.

Sincerely,

MARY EDITH GILKERTSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 24, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue to voice your opposition to President Johnson's war in Vietnam since I agree with most of your policies and ideas in this regard.

From my listening and reading, I feel we are aiding an evil government against the only people who seem to care for the Vietnam country and majority.

At any rate our being there is intervention and wrong. It has none of my moral support.

Sincerely,

Mrs. RICHARD E. TRACY.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 21, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Last night we held a surprisingly well-attended meeting on Vietnam in my legislative district. Of those present I was surprised by what I feel is a change of mood following the public hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings.

I feel it is most important that further hearings be held to solidify the changing mood.

I was surprised when the audience was involved in expressing their opinions. I asked for a show of hands and approximately 70 percent favored deescalation; 20 percent favored continuance of present policy; 10 percent increase war effort; 90 percent favored calling for internationally conducted elections and for abiding by such election even though this meant the election of a Communist South Vietnam Government.

I remain your loyal supporter.

Sincerely,

WALLY PRIESTLEY,
State Representative.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 24, 1966.

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: What price commitment if your country is ravaged, your people dead, or any who survive reduced to a cave-man era.

Financial cost in the black market, misused funds, and aid to the world, plus plans for a better life here at home are too expensive for your tax weary people to pay.

There can be honor in retreat—in the realization that we have made a mistake and admitting it. France still lives with dignity.

Allies? Who are they? Where are they except on paper? Their numbers do not support us by financial or military aid to any great degree. I beg you, Mr. President, to listen to your learned educators, your fellow

March 2, 1966

4510

Senators, who have made a life study of these problems, and to your religious leaders. Seek a peaceful settlement—not a peaceful talk of settlement—while on the other hand you prepare for a larger war. Another Korea may not be the best answer, but it is a better solution than land or nuclear warfare.

You, as President of the United States, have a debt to the world. It is far greater than any commitment in Asia—it is life and the right to live. Please, Mr. President, give us peace.

Sincerely yours,

MARY A. GALVIN.

PORTLAND, OREG.

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

DEAR SENATOR: This family again cannot find the proper words to commend you enough on your stand against the President's Vietnam policy. It is our constant prayer that you can continue to find the strength to do so.

The Senate hearings were watched with great interest and much was learned. It is our belief that without you to lead the way many other Members of the Senate would have remained silent and just blindly followed the President's wishes.

Sincerely yours,

MARY A. GALVIN.

TILLAMOOK, OREG.,

February 18, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I think you are on the right track with your "no draftees to Vietnam" bill—or any other undeclared war. If those countries cannot furnish their own manpower to win then they cannot preserve their freedom, and we certainly cannot police the whole world.

The American people are not willing to make this terrible human sacrifice to "save face" for some few policymakers. Ridiculous, if it weren't so tragic.

Yours truly,

VERNA ROSENBERG.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 22, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Again I want to take this opportunity to support you in your stand on the Vietnam question. It must be a source of some satisfaction to you to have such a broad swing over to what has been the rational point of view on this matter, and to be able to move out of an almost completely isolated position into one of rather broad support.

I have just finished reading David Halberstam's Pulitzer Prize winning book "The Making of a Quagmire," which I thought the most impressive documentation of the history of our involvement in that area, and the best presentation of the persistent misinformation and misadvice and misestimates of the situation, which came first from our military people, secondly to our Embassy people, and finally to Washington. I think the question might be raised as to legally treasonable activity on the part of some of our people in the past 6 or 8 years. These are strong words, but since that kind of activity has now gotten us into a situation in which we may ask a great many young Americans to give their lives for the wrong cause—at the wrong place and the wrong time—I think it is a question fair to raise and I think you are the man to raise it.

The description of events from the military headquarters and from the Embassy

in Saigon sounded so much to me like the thing I previously described to you from Taipei that I think it is worth again noting that our people are largely talking to themselves in our foreign offices.

For perspective I am sending you a copy of a small bit by Arnold Toynbee which I think might interest you, which first appeared in the London Observer, and then was reprinted by the Witness—an Episcopalian weekly—in 1965.

With kindest regards I am,
Very sincerely,

JOSEPH B. TRAINER, M.D.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 24, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your continuing efforts to stop the escalation of the war in Vietnam. Please keep up the good work.

This Oregonian is very proud to have you representing her in Congress.

Sincerely,

SOPHIA LOVING.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 24, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for speaking so clearly about Vietnam. I am willing to stop this destruction on any terms and get on with the reconstruction. Why, after all of our years of foreign aid, don't we have less costly, more effective aid? I can't afford to spend so much for so little.

Sincerely yours,

MARGRET B. BAILEY.

EUGENE, OREG.,

February 24, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your continued efforts to bring the Vietnam question to national focus. As a registered voter in Oregon I am proud to know that at least one of Oregon's representatives to Congress is willing to challenge the administration's present policy in Vietnam.

Your continued efforts to clarify the alternatives available in the present "executive war" are deeply appreciated, as are your efforts to stop U.S. unilateral offensives in Vietnam. I also am in favor of the recent bill initiated by you and Senator GRUENING of Alaska which asks that recent draftees not be sent to Vietnam unless they volunteer to do so. I think this is definitely a step in the right direction.

My personal feeling is that the war in Vietnam is a very unfortunate mistake on the part of U.S. foreign policy. I do not believe we can "win" militarily in Vietnam without the commitment of 2½ million troops which would be unthinkable. Our best recourse is to cease the bombing of North Vietnam (the bombing only results in solidifying the opposition and determination of the North Vietnamese people), recognize the NLF at the negotiation table, encourage and support the direct involvement of the United Nations and then abide by its decisions, and most of all be willing to accept a compromise settlement rather than push for a military victory which would mean the annihilation of the Vietnamese people and a very likely chance of involving the Red Chinese directly in a land war.

Best wishes for the success of your continued efforts with regard to the Vietnam question.

Sincerely,

MRS. JEAN H. EHRHORN.

EUGENE, OREG.

February 24, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is just a note to indicate again my 200 percent support of your stand in regard to the war in Vietnam. I shall be everlastingly grateful for your courage and perseverance.

The recent unanimous statement by the American Bar Association alleging the legality of our involvement in Vietnam is to me absolutely incomprehensible. As a result, I am enclosing a few quotations that I have run across in the judgment of the military tribunal of the Nuremberg war crimes trial, which you might find useful if you have not already noted them. Since the U.S. representatives were on the tribunal, we stand condemned in Vietnam by the same words we used in condemning the Nazis.

Sincerely,

CARL J. NELSON.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,

February 22, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have watched at least a part of the proceedings of the Senate inquiry concerning Vietnam. We appreciate something of the complexity of the situation, but which for most of us must be at some distance from the more intimate facts of the situation. In your position you must be in possession of facts not available to us here. We have appreciated your sincerity in trying to impress all and sundry with the hazards being faced and of the deep desire of our people for honorable peace, seeking a peaceful solution reflecting a people of honor.

I have been rather increasing disturbed at the assurances we have been receiving that our Government is ready to sit down unconditionally at any time or place to negotiate this matter, then to discover that we seem to have established certain adamant preconditions. Among these is the matter that we will not sit with any representative of the Vietcong, but only those from North Vietnam. Other preconditions also seem to lie in the background.

It is to be hoped that here, too, we may be honorable and do as we say we are ready to do—talk peace with anyone anywhere and at any time. The situation being such as it is, it would be difficult to summarily withdraw from this business, and such would possibly leave a disastrous aftermath. But ways must be found. If negotiations must be carried on deviously and at arms length to avoid the Chinese pressures upon Hanoi, requiring a slow-paced patience, then let us do so. This might require processes not open to public view, and the public could only ask for reassurances of some kind that every avenue is being pursued and no doors being shut.

Whatever you can do to further such a cause will be in the interest of all people. It will require the kind of courage you have shown in the past as you have sought to serve the cause of what is best for America. Our prayers and best wishes attend you in these difficult areas of service.

Sincerely,

W. H. MONROE.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,

February 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: There is always the time to write a letter to your elected representative and this is mine. I want to congratulate you on your courage in questioning

March 2, 1966

4511

our actions in this Vietnam affair. I'm proud you are Oregon's Senator, too. History is going to prove you correct but I'm not sure you are going to have much influence. It is discouraging to see how readily we are putting so much power in the hands of the executive branch. If this continues what is going to happen to the power of the Senate and House of Representatives? Even the best of Presidents can be misinformed or influenced by the wrong advisers. The article in this weeks National Observer, which reported the Senate hearing, is priceless. I didn't see the TV report. Anyway, I'm proud of you.

I don't think many of the Government officials realize how unhappy most of us are about this "engagement" in southeast Asia. I belong to a "great decision" group and all of them agreed it was foolish and senseless. Of course, we couldn't solve the problem of how to get out there. I hope you can. Someone needs to solve this huge problem.

Good luck.

Mrs. GLENN STEWART.

LANGLOIS, OREG.,
 February 10, 1966,

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Many of my friends, no doubt, will not take the time to write to you, but I can assure you that they will have the same views as I do on your stand on the war in Vietnam, I agree as you do, that investigation should not stop at the Senate level, and not behind closed doors, only unless for security reasons.

In all, Senator, I think that you are doing a good job where you are. I like you because you have guts to stand up and let the world know what you think.

Sincerely Yours,

AL and LOUISE BROWN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
 February 11, 1966.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: God bless you for your fearless approach to all problems concerning the welfare of the Nation and our freedom heritage. We watched with interest and appreciation the Senate hearings as televised across the country yesterday, with renewed confidence that we have many able minds and courageous hearts devoted to our country's best interests. May your voices continue to be heard on this problem of Vietnam as well as on every occasion where you are the champion of our individual rights and the national security.

Yours very truly,

Mr. and Mrs. KENNETH C. SMITH.

EDDYVILLE, OREG.,
 February 10, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write to praise the work of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in holding such effective hearings on U.S. foreign policy.

I hope that a full transcript of the hearings will be made easily available to the public since coverage by the communications media is inadequate with a few honorable exceptions. Voters should know the truth.

I write also to thank you for trying to block the appointment of Jack H. Vaughn as new head of the Peace Corps.

It is high time that we completely overhauled our thinking in foreign policy to make it conform with the realities of the atomic age. The time lag has been dangerously great.

Yours respectfully,

H. R. GLASCOCK, Sr.

GRANTS PASS, OREG.,
 February 8, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: While visiting in Grants Pass I listened to many of your broadcasts which I enjoyed very much. I agree heartily with all that you believe in. I certainly admire your courage and your stand in defense of the people's rights and the United States' position in Vietnam.

If there are ways we citizens might help in support of your program please let us know. We are behind you 100 percent.

Very sincerely yours,

HELEN E. ELLIOTT.
 RUTH E. MAYERS.
 GLADYS CLEGG.

FLORENCE, OREG.,
 February 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The televised hearings on Vietnam are very informative. I think it is getting through to a lot of people the futility of escalating the war.

Very truly yours,

MARIAN HUNT.

PORTLAND, OREG.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I got to watch a good deal of the Foreign Relations Committee hearings, plus the evening news regarding these hearings, plus special programs on these hearings. I have also read many newspaper articles in this regard. I still do not feel well informed on the subject, but I do have some thoughts.

None of the witnesses seemed in favor of escalating the war, all seemed excruciatingly sincere in their testimony and all seemed in favor of getting to the conference table with the enemy. Mostly in trying to get them to come to the conference table. One of the main problems seemed to be in predicting the future—perhaps you should call a fortune teller with a crystal ball in as a witness; pose hypothetical solutions and ask her to peer into the future to see what the result would be if such a course should be taken.

Based on the hearings, whether or not to contain the spread of communism by aggression seems to be the issue, with China's immediate intent the big question mark.

I do not believe we can or should be the policemen of the world. Aggression should be halted and our mutual protection treaties should be honored.

It does seem that the U.N. should be the instrument through which peace is manipulated. If that doesn't work no avenue toward peace should be unexplored. This also seems to be being done, or tried.

These hearings have been the best thing to happen in this country in a long time. The public should know what is going on as well as just how difficult it is to wrestle with this problem.

Sincerely,

Mrs. WALTER STAHLER.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
 February 24, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please continue to fight, in every way possible, the escalation of the Vietnam "situation." I am in Portland with my husband who attends Reed College, and am unfamiliar with politics and procedures in this area. I would appreciate any advice regarding my efforts to help in any way I can to bring about a peaceful settlement of this nightmare.

Most sincerely,

MARLENA LANGSTON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
 February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have owed you this letter since your brave, and almost solitary

stand against the Presidential takeover of congressional duties, in regard to Vietnam.

For a while, I thought that the constitutional point you were making was of lesser importance than the moral and humanitarian issues, but I have come to see that for this country, at any rate, the two are one. An undeclared war is a wrong that was guarded against by our basic law. An infringement there may lead to further infringements on issues more immediate to our personal rights. You were right, and I was wrong. Thank you.

Thank you for your courage, intrepidity, your continuing stand for the right as you see it.

Most sincerely,

FANNIE SCARL.

MEDFORD, OREG.,
 February 17, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I will not take your time by writing a long, involved letter concerning our policy in Vietnam.

I do, however, want to say that I applaud your stand on this important issue and am confident that you have contributed in large measure to a gradual change in public opinion concerning the administration's conduct of this war.

You are, as usual, performing a great public service and it is encouraging to see more and more of our responsible congressional leaders joining you in public criticism of this immoral war.

Thank you for saying what so badly needs to be said.

Yours very sincerely,

Mrs. MARJORY E. MADDEN.

CORNALLIS, OREG.,
 February 16, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing you to commend you on your academic and brilliant performance at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on February 10.

You have much support, more perhaps than you realize. I fear people are afraid of being anti-Vietnam because they will be labeled as Communists. We must stop this war in southeast Asia. We will become so weak, spreading ourselves so thin, our image throughout the world will be nil. Perhaps this is the very strategy of the Communists.

Please continue your fight for nonescalation of the war and for approaching this whole thing from a different viewpoint.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. W. A. SLABAUGH.

SPRINGFIELD, OREG.,
 February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: Please count me as one of the 17 to 1 against the war in Vietnam.

Fortunately, Americans are not quite as they were a few short years ago. Not all of them will give up reason and commonsense because it might be labeled communistic.

I am at a loss to understand the people who maintain that what we are doing throughout the world has anything to do with democracy, peace, or even anticommunism.

The countries we have helped most have developed the strongest communistic leanings and small wonder has a way of reverting to American interest.

One wonders how long Americans will continue to tax themselves to support their own destruction.

God bless you for having the courage of your convictions.

Sincerely,

H. M. CUMMINS.

March 2, 1966

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: These televised hearings have certainly been enlightening to those of us who are so deeply concerned. Believe me, I am praying that wisdom will be given to you who are forming our policy in this mess.

Few Americans would object to the giving of our resources, money, and knowledge as a contribution toward a solution. But I can't see drafting youngsters in their teens and shipping them off to Vietnam after just 6 months training.

It isn't always easy to do what you think is right, is it? Let me commend you for having moral courage, a most admirable attribute.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY M. WATERBURY.

BROOKS, OREG.,

February 23, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We agree with your position on Vietnam and admire your courage in stating your views.

We wish you continued success in the future.

Respectfully yours,

LILLI and FRANK HENRY.

P.S. Thank you for the excerpt of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your speech.

EUGENE, OREG.,

February 25, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please permit me to suggest that you advocate that the United States and other nations (optional) designate specific periods for peace prayer vigils. Prayer is the omnipotent force in the universe.

You have my 100 percent support of your steadfast position on the entire Vietnam issue.

May God bless you abundantly for your most excellent achievements for Oregon and the world.

A loyal and staunch Oregon friend,

Mrs. VIRGINIA F. SMITH.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

February 23, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am in agreement on your stand on the Vietnam issue, and have been following the televised hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee. I am so thankful for your outspoken concern, and that of Senator FULLBRIGHT, over our dangerous and hypocritical policies in Vietnam.

Yours truly,

MARGARET S. SPOERRI.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 22, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: After considerable reading and listening, and a fair understanding now of the history of the Indochina area leading up to the 1954 Geneva agreements, and after a reading of these latter agreements, and factual accounts of what has happened since that time (aided very little by the statements made by our administration), I must conclude that I concur with you in your courageous and determined opposition to our Government's present policy toward Vietnam.

May I say that I am very proud to have you as the senior Senator from Oregon. In retrospect, I believe that most of my disagreements with your stated views in the past—and this has not been too many times—have centered around my own incomplete grasp of pertinent facts. At any rate, I feel quite sure that time and history, perhaps most

particularly in reference to our conduct in southeast Asia, will honor your record in the U.S. Senate as that of a genuine patriot.

Would you please add my name to your mailing list and also that of my brother. His name and address are: Stanley O. Stewart, 2312 SE. 156th Avenue, Portland, Oreg., 97233.

Thank you, and my best wishes to you and your family.

Sincerely,

ELTON L. STEWART.

P.S.—If not too late, we would both appreciate copies of your January 1966 newsletter with your speech of January 19, 1966, as entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Thanks again.

E.L.S.

SALEM, OREG.,

February 25, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For several years we have followed your work concerning the problem of Vietnam, and have appreciated your consistent, understanding, and unhypocritical approach to it. We have been even more proud, as your constituents, and grateful for your recent efforts. It is good at this time to see men such as yourself and Senator FULLBRIGHT doing what needs to be done, and doing it so well.

If we could be of assistance to you in this work, we would appreciate your suggestions as to what we might do. We will, of course, consider these issues in voting this November.

Sincerely yours,

PHYLIS BERGER PH. D.

THE DALLES, OREG.,

February 24, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Though this is written on a church letterhead, it is strictly personal.

We received and read in its entirety your very interesting newsletter and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 19, 1966. Mrs. Morrow and I are more than ever impressed by your courageous and competent handling of the case in re Vietnam. We simply want you to be assured of the enthusiastic support of this family. You stand in this matter with some of the keenest and most honored of the country's advisors.

Even the Oregonian had to print Governor Hatfield's stand and the rather surprising result of "Great Decisions" discussions in which Oregon participants were divided 50-50 on Vietnam. We are not sanguine about the outcome at this time, but we are grateful for your efforts on behalf of sanity and what is right.

Very sincerely yours,

FRED R. MORROW.

NEWBERG, OREG.,

February 20, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Please use all your power as a Senator against this undeclared war in Vietnam. It is not legal to draft men under the age of 21 without parents' consent. These men must pay taxes when they are employed, but yet they have no say as to how this country should be governed as they do not have the right to vote.

The war in Vietnam should be put to a vote for or against.

Are the American people unable to stop sending troops to Vietnam?

Use your vote to stop this. More power to you; you are correct in your fight against wars undeclared.

ROBERT R. KAMPH.

Veteran, World War II,
91st Infantry Division.

EUGENE, OREG.,

February 20, 1966.

DEAR HON. SENATOR MORSE: I would like to thank you for your courageous stand on Vietnam, and your faith in democracy.

I believe that the U.S. policy in Vietnam is illegal and immoral, and that our foreign policy is too narrowminded to deal with the complex problems of the world today. Our Government is acting on a cold-war foreign policy of containment, and it sees internal revolutions and nationalist movements as Communist aggression. We cannot bully or blackmail countries into a democratic form of government. I urge our immediate withdrawal from Vietnam, and I suggest that the United States reconsider its foreign policy.

Please place me on your mailing list, for I would like to follow your actions in the Senate.

Respectfully yours,

MARTIN I. DURST.

MARY JOYCE DURST.

EUGENE, OREG.,

February 23, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been watching the hearings on the Vietnam question, and I wish to compliment you and Senator FULLBRIGHT on the courage you have shown on these issues. I know most of the people are behind you. I, in my business of serving the public, go into many homes and in asking about the Vietnam war find that the majority of people feel as you do on the issues. We are very fortunate in having men such as you in our Government. God bless you, and keep up the good work.

Yours truly,

SAMUEL MARRONE.

WINSTON, OREG.,

February 24, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the information you sent me in relation to South Vietnam, and let me say I am very proud of you for your stand opposite to that of the present administration, but Senator MORSE, I do not see how a formal declaration of war by the Congress changes the situation in relation to the danger of a war with China, and in the end a nuclear war from which no nation can emerge victor.

It seems to me our great military power was created not to attack but to repel an attack.

Are the American people to furnish the men and arms to police the world?

If we follow the advice of Mr. Rusk, Mr. McNamara, and President Johnson we are sure to end up in a war with China, and a declaration of war would be the go sign they now lack.

Thank you for your efforts in behalf of peace and justice but I am very much afraid the future looks very black.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH B. HUKK.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

February 24, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a resident of Oregon, and the mother of a son who could be called into the service at any time, it is a consolation to know we have a man representing us, with the courage of his own convictions.

I only hope and pray this terrible slaughter of our boys may soon end.

After listening to the hearings—I felt like you and your committee—there is so much more we could have done, and still could do, to improve this horrible situation without all of this heartbreak for everyone involved.

It is indeed a sad and empty feeling to realize we raise our beloved sons only to be snatched away in the prime of their young

March 2, 1966

4513

lives, to fight a war that seems so unnecessary.

I pray that God will give our leaders the proper guidance to end this brutal war.

Keep up the good work. That is what America is all about. The freedom to speak out and be heard and the wisdom to make the right decisions by free and open discussions.

Sincerely,

Mrs. W. G. ROVANG.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
February 27, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks greatly, sir, for your stand on the Vietnam war and current proposals.

Your stand on this issue is as great to witness as your display of skill in riding your horse seen some years ago at a horse show.

May God give you added strength to bring proposals of war to the stage of negotiation and debate, that peace may reign in our land.

Sincerely,

DONALD COLLIER.

SWEET HOME, OREG.,
February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are doing splendid job. We want to thank you very deeply.

Have wanted to write you many times because we feel you are taking the right course on the war situation.

I find it hard to express all the "gratitude" in writing you.

You and the men such as MANSFIELD and FULBRIGHT are giving us new hope, good luck.

Yours truly,

RAYMOND EWING.

February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Hurry for you. I'm with you all the way—and have been since I've been in Oregon.

I hope you keep up the good work, I'm so sick of secrecy—and some of the lies that come out of this administration. I'm tired of being treated as though I'm not good enough, or wise enough to have a voice in the policy of this great land.

I'm an Independent—but a registered Democrat since 1932—because I believed in the Democratic Party principles, more than I've been able to believe in the Republicans.

We receive your congressional report and do appreciate getting it, for it gives us a chance to at least know what is going on in Washington.

Thank you again for the TV Senate hearings. I listened to every one—and appreciate what all of you are trying to do.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LEO A. KILGES.

LEBANON, OREG.,
February 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You must get many letters scolding you for your stand on Vietnam. Critics always write the most letters. I hope those who agree with you also let you know that they do. I am one of them.

I listened attentively to all the Senate Foreign Relations Committee broadcasts with special attention to the opinions of Mr. Rusk and General Taylor. I wanted to find through them an area of agreement with my President. I could not.

Early in January 1964, Slim and I stopped awhile in Tuxtla Gutierrez on our way north from Panama. A compatriot staying at our hotel, a Californian, showed us a newspaper published in Mexico City and asked us to read a certain editorial and give him our opinion. With some difficulty and his help, I translated. This is the gist of it:

"Tourists from Estados Unidos mean much to our economy. Treat them well. Be courteous. Above all do not make argument politico. Because they are obsessed with the fear of Communists. It is a national sickness and they cannot help it. It has been their foreign policy for over 40 years and one day it will lead them into bad trouble. But they cannot help it. We will ignore it. We are thankful for their friendship and the prosperity their tourists bring to us. But we will not make argument politico."

My reaction was anger and humiliation. The Californian laughed and said, "Think about it."

Senator MORSE, I have thought about it. Thought about it a great deal since the Vietnam situation assumed such a frightening aspect. I am not now angry but I do feel humiliated. Have we indeed carried fear and hatred and national arrogance to the predicted "bad trouble"?

I am grateful for the mailings that come to us from your office. I am deeply thankful that you sit in the Senate and on its Foreign Relations Committee. Your fearless stand on our foreign policy gives me some measure of hope.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. KATHERINE HARRIS.

MILWAUKIE, OREG.

DEAR Mr. MORSE: Thank you for the way you are fighting for the common man. The people of Oregon are lucky to have someone like you to fight for us; the majority of people are with you.

Keep up the good work we are doing all we can to help.

Thank you again.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN PHILLIPS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 23, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just heard President Johnson's speech to the Freedom House Award, in which he implores us to support the war. With just as much zeal and emotion, I implore you as my Senator, not to desist in your efforts to find another way.

We have three young daughters, not sons, but my point of view in no way reflects anything but the utmost respect for our servicemen in Vietnam. Somewhere in all the avenues open to us and all the intelligence of our diplomats there must be somehow, some idea that can point toward a new solution to our world strife.

I will not go on at length as to why we support your position but wish to indicate our support.

Sincerely,

CORINNE and DUANE PAULSON.

OAK PARK, MICH.,
February 21, 1966.

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

MOST HONORABLE SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to tell you that me, my family and very many of my friends want to say thank God for you.

We are all American citizens and are very much concerned and upset with our President's policy, and the whole war in Vietnam.

We do not feel that we should be responsible for the unjust slaughter of our boys, and the Vietnamese people, but so far there seems very little that we can do to stop it. Please continue to do your part and the investigations into the whole affair. Let more people know what the true situation is, and we hope and pray that we can come to some settlement in a hurry.

Please tell me if there is anything that I can do to help stop this war, before it is too late.

Sincerely,

THELMA MILLER.

PORTLAND, OREG.

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

DEAR SIR: This letter is to inform you that our entire family is deeply concerned over the situation in Vietnam.

We strongly urge you to continue to pursue activities that would bring this matter to a peaceful solution. We are very much opposed to the present policies of President Johnson and his advisers.

We are thankful that there are still brave men at home who are not afraid to voice their opinions.

Respectfully,

Mrs. N. RASSEKH.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your efforts to save humanity from a nuclear war are greatly appreciated. History will have to record your good works.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. SUMMERS, M.D.

TACOMA, WASH.,
February 19, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Oregon State can be proud of their Senator. God bless you on your stand on Vietnam. We pray the American people will get behind you and support you all the way on this important matter. There has to be a better way than wars and its bloody killings.

Sincerely yours,

MYRTLE ROBISON.
BERT ROBISON.
SHELLEY ROBISON.

PACIFIC GROVE, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are certainly a man Americans can be proud to claim as their own. Throughout the hearings you have conducted yourself in a cool, intelligent manner as befitting your position.

Thank you so very much for striving to bring peace to the world and an end to the killings. I'm certain you will be long remembered and honored when the militarists are long forgotten.

"Blessed are the peacemakers." You are among them.

Sincerely yours,

STEVE A. POLKAELA.

LOS ALTOS, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is difficult to find a way to express our gratitude to you for your courageous and lonely fight on the Vietnam issue. If we get out of this thing alive you above anyone in public life deserve the credit. You and Senator FULBRIGHT were very effective at the hearings. Perhaps it will prove to be the beginning of the end.

Very sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. JOHN FRYMIRE.

SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.,
February 20, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Grateful thanks must be expressed by my wife and myself to you for your marvelous display of intelli-

March 2, 1966

gence and integrity—your unswerving devotion to truth, to peace, to humanity—in which lie all mankind's hopes for an end to the foul conflict in Vietnam and for an end to all wars.

Your voice is America singing.

Sincerely,

EDMUND STONE.

STUYVESANT, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your criticism of our war in Vietnam, and for your efforts at clarifying our policy there.

Although this engagement is confusing and confused, it does seem that where there is fighting there is a war. If it is war does it not have to be declared by Congress? It seems to be Presidential wars that are not controlled.

I hope that you will continue to criticize everything with which you disagree. If citizens cannot disagree with any policy involving our Armed Forces and have no say in where our forces shall be sent what voice do we have?

Very truly yours,

MURIEL T. ASBORNSEN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
July 19, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: More power to you. I'm behind you in your efforts to get Vietnam war negotiated—put in U.N. hands—and stop U.S. aggression.

Sincerely,

FLORENCE JUVINALL.

CARMEL, N.Y.

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

DEAR SIR: Our thanks and admiration to you Senator MORSE for your courage to stand up, almost alone, for what you consider right, moral, and the good of your country.

Very truly yours,

IDA RUTH BERRY,
NICHOLAS BERRY.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

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

SIR: Thank you for your wonderful and brave stand you are taking to try to bring about an end to the terrible undeclared war in Vietnam.

May I respectfully request that you support the realistic proposal of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY to admit the Vietcong to peace negotiations and to the formation of a new government for South Vietnam, as they represent more than 75 percent of the population of South Vietnam?

Please continue your brave fight to bring an early end to the terrible sufferings and enormous waste of our country's money in a war we should have not entered into.

Our country is being condemned all over the world for our intrusion into the civil war of an oriental country. Thank God we have a man like you who will fight for justice no matter how the warmongers try to smear you. God bless you.

Yours truly,

CLARA SHOECRAFT.

STUDIO CITY, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: I was so deeply impressed with your statements and position during the hearings which were on television that it has

taken me these number of days to collect my thoughts in order to write to you.

Your statesmanship in the midst of confusion and darkness is a beacon of light and we are proud of you and wish you Godspeed and good health in order to remain the voice of sanity and reason.

I know dozens and dozens of people who share my views about your great patriotism but as you well know human nature is such that people are quick to criticize and rarely exert effort when they agree * * * so please be assured that you have tremendous support all over the country.

It is appropriate that I should have written this letter on George Washington's birthday—a day of reflection.

Sincerely,

LULIAN SHADRON.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For years my parents have been telling me what a dreadful man you are, but after thinking it over, I think you're great. My husband and I appreciate your determined questioning of Rusk, Taylor, etc.; and hope you can prevent President Johnson's abuse of the Tonkin Gulf resolution. We are concerned by the administration's confusion and apparent willingness to escalate indefinitely at the behest of Hanoi.

We'll be back in Oregon in a couple of years and hope to be able to vote for you then.

Sincerely,

JUDITH W. ALLEN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I must apologize for not writing to you long before this to say how much I appreciate your persistent and welcome voice of sanity all these months. At last it seems that some other Members of Congress are joining with you, thank goodness. But your courage and patience in advocating a course of reason with respect to the Vietnam policy will long be remembered.

Sincerely yours,

ELIZABETH REED, M.D.

WEST COPAKE, N.Y.,
February 23, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senator From the State of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is with respect, admiration, and gratitude that we write to you to offer our unqualified support for your honest and courageous stand on the Vietnam policy of the United States.

We have followed your outstanding career for many years and are very pleased to have this opportunity to extend our respects and appreciation to you for being a voice of conscience to the American people and the world. You have moved us to join you in fighting for the redemption of our foreign policy. We have written to everyone we can think of to either thank them for supporting you or ask them to join you. We hope it will, in some small way, help.

As the parents of three small children, we look toward the future with many uncertainties, as have all parents for all time, but our outlook includes the fear that no matter what sacrifices we may make to insure our children's health, a good education and the rest, a nuclear war may make all our efforts meaningless.

We thank you for your efforts to make the world a safer place for all children to find fulfillment and the joys of life.

With respect and deep affection, we remain,
Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT D. TASSLER.

ISLAND CITY, OREG.,

February 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I wish to thank you for your stand on the Vietnam situation. It is nice to know that there are people like you that have the courage to speak up. We as ordinary citizens cannot speak up against the war without being classed as being unfair to our soldiers in Vietnam or being Communist appeasers.

I am a member of the Masonic Order as I know you are, and I have never known any Mason to be a Communist appeaser or sympathizer.

This war is a nasty mess and I am glad to know that through your efforts it is being brought before the United Nations for possible settlement. Also I like your stand on withdrawal of the broad authorization of the President to conduct the war in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

AXEL DAHLSTROM.

BAKER, OREG.,
February 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For many years I have been more or less opposed to this business of writing letters to elected representatives on the theory that you people probably have more important things to do than to read and answer them. Your appearance on a recent Sunday television program, however, prompts me to write this to let you know that my wife and I, while we have not been your most ardent supporters in the past, do feel that your opposition to our so-called foreign policy is justified, particularly as it pertains to Vietnam. Our position there is untenable to say the least, but it appears that we are caught between the devil and the deep blue sea.

It is our thinking that it is high time that this Nation takes a long, hard look at its foreign policy. It doesn't quite make sense to me that the United States should take it upon itself to make a utopia out of the entire world without some help from our so-called allies. It is inconceivable that we can justify helping with our hard-earned dollars those foreign countries, including Great Britain and France, if you please, and many others, only to have them use this aid to help the other side, perhaps not directly but most certainly indirectly.

Perhaps with advancing age we become more selfish, but with a son approaching military age (now 16), it is going to be particularly difficult for me to see the reason for sacrificing him in an Asian conflict, perhaps, to force democracy on a bunch of people, 99 percent of whom don't know or care of the difference between democracy and communism.

We feel that it is about time for Congress to start acting like a Congress and stop rubber stamping everything that the present occupant of the White House requests or demands. For all the good it did, the last Congress could have stayed home and the buildings could have been rented to the labor unions. At least this would have saved the salaries and netted a tidy sum for the Treasury.

We know that it is not easy for you to take your present stand, and we are not sure in our own minds that you are entirely right. To pull out of Vietnam now, I am afraid, would be disastrous, but maybe it is time for us to admit that we cannot save the entire world all by ourselves and return to some kind of sanity in this foreign policy field.

Keep up the good work. If we can be of any assistance, let us know.

Yours very truly,

W. L. JACKSON.

March 2, 1966

4515

NORTH POWDER, OREG.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I have watched with great interest the hearings on television concerning Vietnam. I can say the information the public has been given in this situation has been, until this time, completely inadequate. I feel that not only this issue, but others equally important, should be made public to the population.

I understand from what I read that you were responsible, along with a few other men on the committee, in making this possible to our TV industry. You are to be commended.

I would also like to say I agree in most part with you on Vietnam. However, I look on it in a slightly different manner. I feel, as many other people who have discussed this, feel that this war is kept going not in Hanoi, but in Washington. Don't misunderstand me. I am not pink or Red. I am decidedly opposed to communism. I feel it has little, if any, merit. But I do feel we have thwarted almost every effort to reach a peaceful settlement so far. I am of the opinion that our President, in order to save his neck at home on the economic field, is sending our young men to give their necks on the battlefield. From what little information I can glean from the press, I have reached the conclusion that our economy is strong, not because of our national product, but because of the millions and billions of dollars pouring into our defense spending and the circulation of money for the Great Society programs which have been started.

I think the bombing lull served two purposes. It gave Hanoi time to rebuild installations, thus giving her the capability to continue the war at a heavier tempo. It also served our purposes in the worldwide flight of doves on a so-called peace mission, which I feel was never meant to accomplish peace. It was a neat job any con artist would admire.

Then our President made his big play at the United Nations and while that body was still deliberating, took off for Hawaii and stated his intent of giving all it took to defeat the enemy. I cannot possibly imagine how the world could seriously think we have really exhausted every avenue of peace when we have yet to make a sincere step in this direction.

I am opposed to this war which some have said (including the Secretary of Defense) could last 10 years. I have four sons who could be spilling their blood over there, and what a tragic waste it would be.

I don't want communism anymore than the next but I feel we have set ourselves up as the protector of all mankind. It is impossible.

Maybe this isn't from scripture, but as a child I heard it many times: "The Lord helps those who help themselves." I do not feel, that aside from economic aid to these weak countries, we owe them the lifeblood of our young men. Teach them how to help themselves and give them aid. Let them choose their own paths. We cannot.

I want to say that anything I can do in my small way to see you back as our senior Senator from Oregon, I will do. Maybe this doesn't agree with your politics, but on the other hand, I'm going to do everything I can to convince everyone I know that Lyndon B. Johnson should not be our next President. I am sickened by many of the Members of our Congress who mouth everything he says as if it were the gospel and I do admire your courage in speaking out against some of his policies. More than your ideas, I admire your integrity and courage.

I am a housewife. I have seven children and perhaps I have little business even saying anything. But I feel so strongly that we are on the wrong road that I had to write

you and say I just wish there were a few more who see things as you do.

Most sincerely,

JANICE METZ.

CORVALIS, OREG.,
January 3, 1966.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: We send our best wishes for a healthy, happy, and prosperous New Year.

We receive your reports regularly and appreciate having them.

Again we wish to commend you for your stand on foreign aid to countries that do not deserve it, how can we be so stupid to send aid to people like Nasser and many others that we know are our enemies.

We are enclosing a clipping out from the Albany paper, we go along with this and hope that you will also.

We assure you of our continued support in your efforts.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES E. WILLIAMS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
January 31, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: When we moved to Portland 11 years ago from New Orleans, I brought along my French drip coffee pot and we ordered our coffee from Baton Rouge. As usual, I was up at 6:30 dripping coffee and saw the early TV report.

It must be highly gratifying to you to know that your aim in part (U.N. Security Council) has been accomplished. Congratulations. We are very proud and I believe you'll go down in history as the greatest statesman and Senator who ever served his country. The brilliance of your thinking has again been demonstrated. We'll all keep praying for peace, for you and for our President's strength. He certainly has my sincere sympathy. The times ahead will be trying. So lets keep trying!

Sincerely,

Mrs. PAUL F. MIELLY.

P.S.—I just looked up the words "statesman." "A man versed in the principles and art of government; especially, one who shows wisdom in treating or directing public matters; also a man occupied with the affairs of government and influential in shaping its policy." You surely have been a tremendous influence in shaping our policy so it fits and I can put the letter back in the envelope.

BAKER, OREG.

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

Sm: My faith in the democratic process has been invigorated anew by the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, so recently televised. As one of your Oregon constituents, I owe a special debt of gratitude to you, Senator MORSE, for your persistent and courageous efforts to put your convictions first, and to keep our Vietnam policy in perspective. At times you, Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator CHURCH seemed to have been waging a lone battle against heavy odds. It now seems you have been rewarded, at least in the efforts of all the committee members to make a thorough and searching inquiry into our policy in Vietnam. I hope nothing will stop or hinder the committee from further challenging the premises on which our present policy is based, and then recommending a more sane and realistic approach to our future there. General Gavin has contributed much in that

direction. "Profiles in Courage" would now have you, Senator MORSE, to add to its pages.

Very truly yours,

VIRGINIA COEN.

ONTARIO, OREG.

DEAR SIR: We are all very happy we still have someone left like you that doesn't want our loved ones getting killed for every other country.

Mothers and fathers of this country want to know how to stop sending our boys to death. We are full of fear wondering why this country thinks it's so powerful it can lick the world. Our loved ones are so afraid and sick of going to Vietnam just to die.

How can mothers and fathers put a stop to this? Our boys are getting killed. How can I be a member of the "Women Strike for Peace"? Ask the people what they think about this—not the President.

Mrs. HARRIS.

WILDERVILLE, OREG.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: We want to congratulate you for the stand you are taking. Every American should know and understand that Congress can only declare war. It seems as though the American people should be awakened. Seems though the American people are just in a trance; they have to be told, and you are the man that can do it. A few more letters like you had in the Courier and also in the Oregonian should wake most of them. Hope to hear more of you.

Your truly,

ANNA RUMBOLZOMY,
E. C. RUMBOLZ.

MEDFORD, OREG.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Am writing you today commending you on your stand on the Vietnam controversy. From visits around my territory which includes northern California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, I find most of my contacts are entirely in agreement with your reasoning and firm stand. You have taken a most courageous stand against forces who are in my opinion acting quite contrary to the wishes of the people, especially those in this area.

I, personally, am a firm believer in the Monroe Doctrine and would gladly do anything possible to look after our interests and protection in this hemisphere. Beyond that and those boundaries, we are delving too much into affairs and responsibilities of Europe and the Far East.

Our resources are limited and the mounting Government debt is awesome, contrary to the claims of our so-called leaders. I and others believe and agree with you that our (the public) interests should be protected and that the public should have the facts about our involvements around the world and our fabulous giveaways.

Our Vice President traveling through the Far East is demonstrating his generosity which has been true to his past record. With that you are no doubt quite familiar. If we have danger from the extreme right, then we have the same from the extreme left of which he has been a member for some time.

Many of your constituents are highly pleased with your bold and forthright position. We are proud of you and our Governor for the sensible stand you have taken.

Ours is a free country and we want to keep it that way. This cannot be done by constantly piddling away our resources in men and money. We are depending upon you to look after our welfare in your honorable capacity.

Sincerely yours,

LES W. BAILEY.

March 2, 1966

FOREST GROVE, OREG.,
January 30, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I congratulate you on your clear, concise, and very pertinent remarks made on the CBS "Congress and the War" program, Sunday.

Like Most Americans, I have been very disturbed by the get-out-of-Vietnam demonstrations around the country, but even more disturbed by the fact that the average citizen of this Republic literally cannot get any information upon which to make any kind of sensible judgment about the war. The equivocal statements of the President and his defenders do nothing but increase my anxiety and, if conversations with friends are any indication, the uneasiness of Americans is general.

As though gross national product has anything to do with ethics or international law. I was especially pleased that you pointed out the moral and practical issues involved. We have already been judged (and found wanting) by our fellow nations, and we must face our penalty from an international court. And we must realize that this war is not likely to stop with Vietnam.

I don't think I'm alone in feeling this way. My husband, a history professor at Pacific University, doesn't seem to have any inside information I don't have. The politicians and political scientists or whatever we talk to seem as much in the dark as we average citizens about President Johnson's intentions. If this is a democracy, I think we have a right to know—at least more than we know now.

Pain in the neck you may be to your colleagues in the Senate, but I'm awfully glad I voted for you.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. FRANK CHIPPS.

P.S.—Is it possible to get a copy of the Mansfield report?

SALEM, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR MR. MORSE: As an Oregonian and a constituent of yours I wish to take this opportunity to express my affirmation of your stand on the Vietnam issues, now being debated before the Armed Services Committee of the Congress.

Your intelligent and courageous effort to end this futile conflict should be applauded by all who are really interested in peace.

Please keep up your efforts. I am sure that eventually the American people will get behind you and others like you to bring pressure on those determining our course of action, to stop this undeclared war.

Sincerely,

W. J. GENTZHOW.

PORTLAND, OREG.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been so thankful for your attitude toward the war in Vietnam. Whenever I have heard you speak or have read your views in print they have always cheered my heart. I'm surely very glad that our Oregon Senator is against this war.

Very sincerely,

CLARA IRWIN.

ASTORIA, OREG.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been more than sympathetic to your stand on the Vietnam issue, and this final stand which you and Senator GRUENING assume on the relationship of the draft to the situation is inspirational. You have been willing to stand and be counted for a long time and you are beginning to rally solid support from others such as Senator GRUENING.

With the change in attitude as evidenced by the Catholic ecumenical announcement which intimated that it would be possible to live in the same world with Communists and that it is not necessary to eliminate them—I see some crack in the superpatriotic front which I view somewhat like that of an alcoholic personality—it survives on the euphoria supplied by opportunities of patriotic demonstration which make it feel greater and more secure than it really is.

I pledge myself to work in your behalf as hard as I am able.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. FRYBACH, Ph. D.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: I know how busy you must be these days but as a citizen and a Korean veteran I hope that you will have the time to read my short letter to you. I'm not a very good letterwriter but I felt that I wanted to write this one.

All these months I've been reading about your views and watching you on television concerning the war in Vietnam and I wanted you to know that I agree with you 100 percent. I want you to know I am very proud to have a person such as yourself to represent my thoughts in the Senate. Without people like you the average citizens such as myself would never be heard of.

In closing may I say that I hope you will continue to stick to whatever your beliefs may be for the good of our country, and may God give you the strength and energy to continue your views concerning Vietnam. Someday perhaps I will have the good fortune of being able to meet you personally and to shake the hand of a real man and an American. Whatever I may be able to do for you please do not hesitate to ask.

Respectfully yours,

BUNG L. CHINN.

FLORENCE, OREG.,
February 14, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The televised hearings on Vietnam are very enlightening. They bolster my opinion on the subject, which is:

The United States should admit Vietnam was and is a mistake, and we should get out now.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS M. HUNT, D.M.D.

PORTLAND, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR: Be assured that many more than those who write you support your courageous attempt to save this country from its disastrous and immoral course.

I am proud to be an Oregonian at this time.

Sincerely yours,

RUDI H. NUSSBAUM.

SALEM, OREG.

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

DEAR SIR: Our family urges immediate and open debate on the Vietnam war as you have suggested.

Yours truly,

T. P. MITCHELL.

SALEM, OREG.

DEAR HONORABLE SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for the letters I am receiving from you. I agree with everything you do in regards to the war in Vietnam. I hope our officials will come to know too that they are in a very critical war and should withdraw, the sooner the better. Thank you again for the letters you sent me. Please note my address has changed from 285 McNary Avenue NW., to 1375 Ruge Street NW., Salem, Oregon.

Yours respectfully,

GERHARD GINSBRECHT.

PHOENIX, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We support your views and we wish there were more like you and Senator FULBRIGHT.

It disturbed us to hear Secretary of State Rusk's answers to why we didn't fight communism in Cuba in 1960 just 90 miles from us. Yet we are asked to make the supreme sacrifice now in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. OTTO MCGINLEY.

PORTLAND, OREG.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: You are doing good work there in Washington and we hope that we can have peace with honor in the near future so the boys can come marching home once again.

Your great efforts are much appreciated in this great State of Oregon, I feel.

Yours truly,

Mrs. LINNIS WENTWORTH.

EUGENE, OREG.

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

SIR: The continuing hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee of which you, Senator, are a member and which is so ably chaired by Senator FULBRIGHT, are of deep and abiding interest to me.

In no other way can the people of the Nation learn the aims and objectives of the lawmakers of their country as well as possible by listening to discussions of this nature. I heartily endorse these hearings and consider them to be extremely important in helping the citizen to an informed and more enlightened state of mind.

We regularly receive the newsletter and the excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from your office, both of which we appreciate and read with interest. We commend your able presentation of the facts regarding our entry into the Vietnam situation and hope for a speedy settlement of this war which is so tremendously costly in money and in blood spilled.

Very truly yours,

DOROTHY E. FELTUS.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register Guard,
Feb. 13, 1966]

WHY NOT WITHDRAW FROM VIETNAM?

(By Robert M. Hutchins)

The picture we get from Washington portrays our Government earnestly, even frantically pursuing all avenues to peace and finding them blocked by sullen and derisive Orientals.

How can we make peace, we say, if we can find nobody to make it with? Since we can't make peace, we must make war.

The first question is, how much war do we have to make? A leading diplomatic expert, George Kennan, has joined a military authority, Gen. James Gavin, in suggesting that we stay where we are and "simmer down." Their theory is that if we hang on without doing anybody very much damage somebody will eventually come forward from the other side and offer to settle.

This proposal is better than burning up Vietnam, North and South, in the name of the freedom and independence of the south. But it leads to the second question: Why hang on?

"Surrender" is a dreadful word. Both Gavin and Gen. Maxwell Taylor are revolted by it. What is the matter with "withdrawal"?

If we have made a mistake, if we have no right to be where we are, if we are doing enormous harm to ourselves as well as others, why should we not admit the mistake and correct it? This is something we could do all by ourselves.

It is now officially admitted that we have made a mistake. No other interpretation can be placed on the peace campaign of the ad-

March 2, 1966

ministration. To put the matter on no higher ground, we have decided we can't win.

Nobody has ever succeeded in discovering any basis for our presence in Vietnam except our own decision to go there. No treaty or international convention of any sort authorizes the United States to blow up some of the South Vietnamese in order to maintain in power those who could not have achieved power without us. In attacking North Vietnam, we violated our solemn obligations under the Charter of the United Nations.

The Geneva accords of 1954 did not contemplate two independent countries, South and North Vietnam. On the contrary, they explicitly stated that the whole territory would be united after elections to be held in 1956. We prevented those elections. We created the fiction that South Vietnam is an independent state that has called on us to protect it against aggression.

So why not withdraw? The North Vietnamese know as well as we do that we can't win. They are equally aware that there is no moral or legal excuse for our presence. Why should they talk to us?

The reason we do not withdraw from a hopeless and guilt-ridden adventure is that we have been persuaded by almost half a century of propaganda that wherever communism raises its ugly head it is our duty to chop it off. We cannot allow Ho Chi Minh to triumph because he is a Communist. We cannot leave southeast Asia open to Communist China.

The example of Yugoslavia suggests that we should be building up Ho Chi Minh against China. "Pacem in Terris," the last encyclical of Pope John XXIII, warns us not to let our hatred of an ideology lead us into a mistaken estimate of the intentions of those who profess it. The hypothetical possibility of a distant danger does not justify a present crime.

FEBRUARY 15, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As one of your constituents temporarily residing in the South, I am pleased to be able to tell you that many of the students here have expressed to me their admiration for your stand on Vietnam. Many of us believe that conscription of students (or anyone else) to fight in an undeclared war which they regard as immoral and contrary to the national interest, is a usurpation of their basic political rights and their right to oppose the administration's insane policies. We hope that you will push your proposal to allow draftees to defer service in Vietnam and will continue to vigorously and vocally oppose this war.

Sincerely,

JIM DRISCOLL.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 20, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for sticking by your guns. The American people need you Senator, more than they will ever know. Thank you.

W. J. PALMER.

LYONS, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been most interested in the public hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the comments of the witnesses. In fact, I stayed home from work yesterday to hear them.

I am sure there has never been a more informative series of programs ever presented.

I must admit, Senator Morse, that I have never voted for you but it seems that the questions that came to my mind as the witnesses gave their opening statements are the

very questions that you asked when your turn of questioning began. So I guess your thinking must be more agreeable than I had realized.

I felt that the testimony of Mr. Bell was interesting in regard to the economical phases of the Vietnamese front. Although this information may be available to all of us—how many private citizens know where or how to ask for tariff and import costs in Vietnam or how government projects are handled?

Many, many other pieces of information in regard to our problems in the world have been brought to mind and gives me much food for thought.

I would like to see the line of questioning pursued in regard to Ky's statement in Honolulu in the livid statement about refusal to sit down at the conference table or anywhere else with the enemy leaders. What chance is there for settlement when the primary participants refuse to sit down to talk? I was shocked to hear this news broadcast and until it was mentioned in today's hearing have heard nothing more of it. It seems most important to me.

I am very sorry that more people cannot view these hearings in their entirety—working people, professional people, and students find it impossible to see it all and much is lost in the concise comments of the 11 p.m. newscaster.

Am looking forward to the testimony of General Taylor next week. Would like to see Mr. McNamara there too, so keep trying. I am sure that he could give the people a testimony that would not harm our Nation's position, although am not so sure about this.

I felt it was a privilege indeed, to hear Mr. Kennan's testimony. His ideas on the effects of our foreign policies on the common people of these lands was most interesting and realistic. It is hard for the American people to comprehend the thinking and problems of such people. We have to be jarred up once in a while.

Again let me say that I feel these televised hearings are most informative and I hope they continue, not only on the Vietnam crisis but on many other subjects on which we stand to gain or lose much.

Sincerely,

NADINE DUGGAN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
February 10, 1966.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: Keep up the good work on Vietnam and everything else. I only hope your unusually forthright language will not jeopardize your Senate seat in your next election.

Keep it up.

Sincerely,

PETER LOMHOFF.

EUGENE, OREG.,
February 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Need I reiterate that you "scored" again when Ambassador Kennan was questioned by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Thursday.

When you read the President's Honolulu statement, it put all the careful pussyfooting in proper perspective. I'm sure the thoughtful people in the country appreciate this. Thank you for having the courage.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY LEEPER.

P.S.—I'm sure these hearings will offer President Johnson some constructive alternatives to our present collision course.

IMBLER, OREG.,
February 23, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Knowing that you are fearless and uncompromising when a principle is at stake we are sending you this newspaper clipping for your attention. If its thesis is true what hope is there in the United States trying to influence world affairs anywhere, anyplace? Are the American people too far gone on the road to personal gain without regard to the rights of others? Can the administration claim that they are activated by altruistic and noble purposes in Vietnam when they can do nothing to stop such grafting? And as a leading member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee we are hopeful that you—if no one else—might be able to do something about it.

We take both the Oregon Journal and the Oregonian and try to read all sides and all the commentators have to say about Vietnam. Never before in history it seems to us has such an issue been so cloudy and mixed up and yet of so vital importance to us and the world at large. We do not see how people can attack you so bitterly over your courageous stand in what you think to be right unless they have studied only one side of the issue. There is no doubt that you are sincere. However the same seems to be true of Johnson, Rusk and McNamara. They are no less sincere than you although taking a very opposite stand to you. If the top statesmen and political leaders of the day differ so what right has the ordinary person not nearly so well versed on the subject to take such violent positions either pro or con. But whichever side is right this grafting should be handled and it appears to us that it is up to Johnson and the administration to see that something is done about it and we are hoping that you can be the "gadfly" (the term meant in no disparaging way, believe us) to sting them into action.

Hoping to hear from you as soon as it is possible for you to do so in your busy life for we really get anxious about such things as mentioned above, we are,

Sincerely,

A. K. LARSEN.

Mrs. A. K. LARSEN.

P.S.—Since writing this letter we have read your speech given before the Senate and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dated January 19, 1966, which we received this morning. It is very illuminating and instructive as to the historical background of the present dispute. Your arguments seem to be irrefutable.

COOS BAY, OREG.,
February 22, 1966.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: I think it most appropriate my first letter to a Congressman be on Washington's Birthday. The role you are playing in Congress is equally as important as that of our First President.

I had the extreme pleasure of attending your lecture on the campus of Southwestern Oregon Community College a couple weeks ago, and while it has been impossible for me to watch the Senate hearings on television during the daytime, I have certainly heard many favorable repercussions from them.

The position you have taken on our involvement in the Vietnamese war is most commendable, and the fact that you are standing almost entirely alone, in my esti-

March 2, 1966

mation, warrants all the moral support we in Oregon can give you. I am most proud to be a citizen of Oregon, and to be represented in Washington, D.C., by a man of your caliber.

Please accept my congratulations on your courage in the face of such powerful opposition.

Very truly yours,

EUGENE M. GRAY.

SCAPPOOSE, OREG.,
February 24, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I admire the courage with which you state your position on the Vietnam situation. Our Nation needs men who will stand for what is right, even though it means standing alone.

May God grant you many more years of honorable service to our country.

Sincerely,

EUGENE A. OSTER.

MCMINNVILLE, OREG.,
February 24, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I should like to support you in your untiring efforts to oppose the present policy of the administration in Vietnam.

It is sad indeed that so many persons in high positions are so insensitive to the worldwide distrust and hatred of the United States which is being generated by this country's unilateral policy in Vietnam.

Hopefully the voices of reason such as yours will soon be heeded.

Sincerely,

ELLYN J. PAULUS.

BANDON, OREG.,
February 21, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Your stand on our position in Vietnam is well taken in my book.

It is by the courage and wisdom of men of your thinking that our Nation will survive the peril we face.

Keep up your good work. You have. I'm sure more solid support than you know.

Sincerely,

R. W. STRONG.

CORNELIUS, OREG.,
February 24, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are in full accord with the stand you have taken in regard to the Vietnam situation.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. DIETRICH.
Mrs. JOHN H. DIETRICH,
Mrs. P. J. DIETRICH.

TROUTDALE, OREG.,
February 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U. S. Courthouse,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is written to inform you that we admire your courage in speaking out against the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. We heard your statements over a recent TV broadcast. We believe you and hope you are successful in any attempts you undertake to correct this confusing war.

Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR GUDGE.

EUGENE, OREG.
SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C.:

I want to say congratulations on the "seminars" on television. I heard both General Gavin and George Kennan the full 10 hours and I am glad to know that millions of people had a lesson in history and sanity.

Sincerely,

ANN KLEINSASSER.

FEBRUARY 21, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: This is to indicate my strong support of your fight for peace, and particularly your emphasis on the need for placing responsibility on the United Nations or some other international body.

I also would favor a bill to prevent sending draftees to Vietnam for actions which would run counter to their own consciences.

Thank you for your vigorous and steadfast interest in the cause of peace and of government by the people.

Respectfully,

VIRGINIA CORNING.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
February 24, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Words cannot express how grateful I am for your clear and sensible stand against the President's Vietnam policy. In my travels to eastern Oregon, I find more and more people talking about the war. They wouldn't talk about it a few months ago. Usually they say something fairly neutral until they find how the other person feels about it. Many people over there feel unsure about our involvement in that country. As you know, eastern Oregonians tend to be more conservative than in the cities of the western area. There is a group of professional workers in Medford who oppose the war. They are too cautious to come out openly in the papers because of the reactionary opinions of the "wheels" in that town. Antiadministration policy feeling here in Corvallis seems to be spreading. We had no trouble in getting 50 persons, mostly professors, to participate in a peace vigil at Christmastime. Still more have joined our ranks since then. There is going to be a large international protest of the war on March 25 and 26. Rumor has it that there will be more than 10 nations participating in some form of protest on those days.

Some of us have written Mr. Howard Morgan to ask him to run for the Senate. We don't want to have to choose between Robert Duncan and Mark Hatfield.

I know you will keep up the good work. I will support you at every opportunity.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. STEBBINS.

THE DALLES, OREG.,
February 25, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for your speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Our family agrees with you 100 percent about everything you say concerning our operations in Vietnam.

I am enclosing some pages from the Oregonian in which I thought you might be interested. It would seem that the mass communications media in this country, even on the news pages, are being used as giant propaganda weapons by this administration. Letters are beginning to appear in our

local paper pro and con the Vietnam war, but the writers' names are omitted by request to the editor. They are afraid. For families with draft-age sons, freedom of speech is no longer a reality.

The U.S. Senate seems to be our last hope between the American people and a real dictatorship. The House of Representatives has apparently given up doing its own thinking.

God bless you and keep up the good work.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. WILLIAM E. MAY.

FEBRUARY 25, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your January "Senator Morse Reports" and especially for the copy of your speech in the U.S. Senate on January 16 concerning Vietnam.

You brought out numerous points that needed airing and you helped set the record straight. In taking to task the White House, the State Department, and the Defense Department you used straight-from-the-shoulder language; not a lot of double talk.

I do not know the answers to the many complex situations of today but I do know it is frustrating to feel the integrity of our own Government is subject to question even while human life is at stake. I love my country, as I am certain you also do, and I can only hope that our other political leaders do too.

Many thanks for coming out as you did and for making your position so very clear.

Sincerely,

VICTOR G. GRUETZNER.

SALEM, OREG.,
February 27, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: How grateful we are for your courageous leadership on this whole issue of Vietnam. We follow closely day by day the contribution you make to clarify the issue. I sat for almost as many hours as you, viewing the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings. Many of our friends did likewise. More power to you.

We do hope you are successful in getting Congress to rescind the resolution the Congress passed in 1964, which the President has used as a mandate for his action. We trust the Congress will not appropriate the \$4.8 billion for further conduct of the war.

I'm enclosing an ad we ran in the Statesman and the Capitol-Journal dailies. It would be interesting to know what effect it had in your mail, if any, the week following.

We feel a tremendous urgency to do everything in our power to support you and others. Do you have any suggestions? I've spent the whole day, Sunday, just writing to you Senators. Also wrote CBS, both commending them for running the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings and condemning them for subsequent censorship and coloring of news following Friendly's resignation.

Here is a quotable quote:

"Rarely in the history of world affairs has any country indulged in such a colossal act of self-righteous arrogance as did our United States when we decided for the strife-torn people of South Vietnam that they are better off dead than Red."—Rabbi Israel Margolies, Beth Am, the People's temple, New York City, December 11, 1965.

Thanks too, for the reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other material which you sent to keep us informed. I

March 2, 1966

would like to have some of the valuable reprints from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing. Senator FULBRIGHT's summary statement following Dean Rusk's testimony was classic.

Sincerely,

MARVIN and VIOLET NETTLETON.

P.S.—It is not necessary to take up your secretary's time in answering our letters. Just know we are with you 99 percent of the time.

VIOLET NETTLETON.

STAYTON, OREG.,
 February 28, 1966.

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

HON. SENATOR MORSE: We are behind you 100 percent in the stand you are taking in Vietnam. Would that more Congressmen were like you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EDW. J. BELL.

EUGENE, OREG.,
 February 15, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Hats off to you and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

We, and many of our neighbors congratulate you for your fine effort in helping to get the facts before the American people.

Apparently, a large segment of the Johnson administration have failed to take a lesson from their defeat in the Korean war. It seems we have failed to champion peace—because it bothers people like Mr. McNamara and Mr. (Gen.) Maxwell Taylor, who apparently act purely for the interest of the war industries—perhaps you will accomplish what our lukewarm or sold-out politicians have failed to do.

For the present, therefore, we are watching the hearings with keen interest.

Sincerely,

The J. W. WALKERS.

(If it were possible to re-do our votes of last election—we'd surely make some changes. But then, there's another in 1968.)

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
 February 18, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: First I would like to tell you that my wife and I both Oregon residents, support fully your criticism of present foreign policy in Vietnam and Latin America.

Recently you sent us "The State of the War in Vietnam," a speech you made on January 19, 1966, in the Senate. If you could send us additional copies we would like to send them to various people with whom we are debating the topic. We could very easily make very good use of 5 to 10 copies.

It seems that your arguments have been basically legal ones. Other good points could be made on the moral level of course. But, perhaps unfortunately, the debate seems to hinge in most people's minds on the issue of the seemingly pragmatic question of how to stop communism, morality, and legal questions being peripheral.

The argument as I hear it says that if we don't do what we are doing we will encourage national wars of liberation. It seems to me that the following argument could be made to refute that position. Given that our objective is to inhibit such wars in the future, our efforts in Vietnam should be evaluated in terms of that objective. Such wars seem first to involve a political stage in which forces are gathered for the second stage, the actual military effort. Since the political stage seems to come first, and is in that sense the crucial stage, what effects do our policies have at this political level. It might be suggested that our present efforts would in fact fertilize anti-American, and

pro anti-American organizational, feelings and activities. I imagine this would be easier to show in the case of the Santa Domingo "effort to stop communism," but it would seem likely to be a valid point in Vietnam as well. Also, the illegality and immorality of our position could be seen in this context as working to our practical disadvantage to the extent that it helped generate the political atmosphere in countries that could later be the targets of national wars of liberation.

We wish we could do more in correcting our current policies. We appreciate your efforts.

Sincerely,

GARY R. HAMILTON.

COLLEGE PARK, MD.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I extend my deep appreciation for your courageous effort in enlightening the people of the United States to the horrible situation which presently confronts us all. Needless to say there will be those who will say that you are a member of some Communist conspiracy dedicated to the overthrow of our governmental structure. This sir, as you know, is the price one must pay in order to generate and convince people of a higher principle.

Sir, I am behind you 100 percent.

Respectfully,

RONALD J. PEDONE.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
 February 21, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I, residents of Oregon, strongly support your courageous stand on Vietnam. The United States is indeed in deep waters there, and strong voices are very much needed at this time to make sure that the people are presented with articulate and thoughtful alternatives to the administration's policies. We hope you will continue to oppose courses of action which seem to you unwise.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN T. McCLELLAN.

BETHESDA, Md.,
 February 26, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please know that during the entire course of the Vietnam affair you have been speaking for me. I know too little of practical politics to understand why an honest stand on an issue gets a man discounted (or blackwashed) as a crank, and why "statesmanship" must involve shiftiness. I prefer your method.

So if you read a nasty column by one of our latter-day Clausewitz' which accuses you of woolly thinking it might be of minute comfort to remember that one citizen thinks that you are one of the only two Senators who have been on this issue both right and courageous.

Sincerely,

C. W. McCUTCHEN.

DETROIT, MICH.,
 February 22, 1966.

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

DEAR Mr. MORSE: Just a few words of heartfelt thanks for your intelligent and courageous position on Vietnam, and particularly for your being able to bring these discussions to the public.

It is ironic that those in position of power and control do not accept the fact that unless there is public discussion (and freedom of all kinds of expression of opinions) they are jeopardizing the very rights and freedoms

on the domestic front that they claim to be trying to preserve internationally.

Again, thank you and with all good wishes.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. HERBERT T. RIEBLING.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
 February 20, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope that you will find continued energy to keep up your persistent criticism of the Vietnam policy of the administration.

It is without doubt in error; and only by continuing to keep its follies and promises before the public can changes be effected.

Sincerely,

NICOLAUS C. MILLS.

BLOOMFIELD, N.J.,
 February 21, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your honest, wise, and fearless stand that what we are doing in Vietnam is wrong, futile, and dangerous, gives me and many, many others like me a little heart and hope. I fought, bled, and nearly died in the First World War. Now I consider war a complete negation of rational behavior.

Keep on standing out against our tragic waste of money and lives in the undeclared war in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

RAY FREEMAN JENNEY.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
 February 21, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: No answer is requested but pass this letter on to your colleagues.

This is an expression of appreciation of the writer and his friends for your forthright and just stand on our dilemma in Asia. We believe that you and Senator FULBRIGHT can prevent the fruition of the impending holocaust in Asia with a direct television appeal to the American people. The very form and substance of this Government is at stake in this matter and if you fail * * * there appears little hope for the Nation itself.

If you fail, it is too probable that the Chinese Army will march when spring trips north again. You just don't start a ruckus in a man's backyard without a retort from him. Example: The Cuban crisis at our own back stoop * * * we acted and so will China.

Since the Premier of North Vietnam organized and helped to direct the rebellion of Indochina against France, it is a certainty that a great majority of its people remember and respect him. Therefore, to deny the Vietcong representation at the peace table is to invite a never-ending war of attrition * * * one in which the American people will ultimately rebel against forced tyranny at home.

As if our Nation isn't already in deep trouble, it is entering a storm cycle unprecedented in weather history which, in itself will compound the confusion of our leadership. This, together with a major conflict in Asia may well destroy your Nation and mine.

Respectfully,

CLAUDE STRICKLAND.

BROOKLINE, MASS.,
 February 20, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to express my appreciation for the persistent and

March 2, 1966

courageous manner in which you have exposed the folly of our position in Vietnam.

I hope that you have continued to maintain close contact with the people of Oregon during this trying period, for the American Nation would be much the poorer without your presence in the Senate.

With all good wishes.

Very truly yours,

ALLAN SIDD.

PARIS, FRANCE,
February 20, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are young New Yorkers who have been traveling in Europe since the beginning of the year, and it is with ever-increasing dismay that we read and hear of our country's mounting involvement in the Vietnamese war.

Both of us have been active in opposing the war during the last year, and have been uneasy ever since the United States entered into the conflict. Aside from our feeling that political reality makes the involvement of our Armed Forces an absurd and tragic mistake. We are both deeply against war, and the senseless brutality and slaughter, terror and destruction that characterize this war in particular.

Our motivation to write you stems from a troubled feeling we have about what seems to us to be going on in the United States. We looked forward to the open hearings in the Senate, and even though they were not planned as satisfactorily as could be wished, they appeared to us as the greatest existing hope that the Chief Executive's blind misuse of power could begin to be arrested, or at least curbed.

After hearing you speak in New York last summer we were glad to know that there are some clear-sighted, energetic champions of our cause representing us in the Senate. Both you and Senator GRUENING have shown great courage and intelligence in dealing with the stubborn egotism of the administration.

But we still remain troubled, not only by the threat of flag-waving "superpatriots"—modern day jingoists who seek to discredit us by defamation, but by the large numbers of Americans who seem to be permitting themselves to be led like sheep into the belief that, out of some supreme loyalty, they must support whatever unwise decision made by the administration.

We feel that all Americans are entitled, and should be able to know all the facts, and should judge for themselves. If this would truly happen, we believe that the "great consensus" supposedly supporting the Chief Executive would be exposed as a hollow slogan, and true public opinion would dictate a sane policy.

In our experiences abroad we have found that most Europeans with whom we have come in contact, consider the U.S. role in the war both dangerous and foolish. The French especially, after years of Indochinese bloodshed, are particularly adept at not being fooled by the rosy picture of the war emanating from the information services of the U.S. Government. The newspaper, *Le Monde*, has exposed so many of Rusk's and McNamara's deceptions that it now merely takes them for granted as deceptions and leaves it at that, at least so it seems.

We wish to encourage you in your campaign to enlighten the American people, and to prevent the terrible outcome to which the present policy of the Government must inevitably lead.

We are keenly interested in what we can do to aid the cause of peace.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,

ARTHUR BERGEN.
ROBERTA BERGEN.

LARCHMONT, N.Y.

February 20, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: God bless you, Senator. How wonderful to be a man of conscience long before anyone had the courage to be labeled a "dove."

Our family and many of my friends are your devoted admirers and applaud your stand to oppose this shameful war in Vietnam.

We feel the hope of the world lies with you and other men of courage like you.

Please know there are many, many like us throughout the country and the world.

Yours truly,

JUNE HARRIS.

GROSSE POINTE PARK, MICH.,
February 20, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you sincerely for bringing before the American people the issues and truths on the war in Vietnam. You are to be congratulated for your statesmanship; there is so little left in our country.

We urge continued "live" TV coverage of public testimony, particularly by McNamara and HUMPHREY. It would be excellent if more of the coverage could be seen during the evening, when the men as well as the women of our country could hear firsthand the opinions and views they need and want to hear. We who "pay the bill" in lives and tax money have the right to hear the issues discussed. It is our men and our money the President and his henchmen are committing to Vietnam. Never has a President had so much power and been so unconcerned about what the people want. President Johnson appears concerned only about his power and political dictatorship, which does exist.

You Senators are our hope—please continue the investigations and make this man (the President) and his advisers account for the commitments they have made in our name but with no authority from us. We have no voice in the choice of the fancy "advisers" when we vote for an official, yet these men are blueprinting our policies—let's put a stop to that.

We do not belong in the Vietnam civil war—let's get out—keep our men and money at home.

Mr. Rusk testified that we are "willing to go along and accept" the result of a free election in South Vietnam, even though they vote for a Communist government. Our men would then be giving their lives for one free election since if the people of South Vietnam choose a Communist government, there will never be another free election. That's too great a sacrifice to ask of an American boy, to say nothing of the American dollars.

With great respect, we remain,

Very truly yours,

RICHARD R. RIPKA,
NANCY H. RIPKA.

P.S.—We strongly urge the rescission of the 1964 resolution.

ENCINO, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your public utterances on the war in Vietnam and your probing questions in the recent Foreign Relations Committee hearings concerning U.S. policy in that unfortunate country deserve the gratitude and commendation of every American citizen.

You are performing a truly great public service in attempting to reveal to the people of this country the very dangerous course our Government is now pursuing and how, if this course is not changed in the direction

of a more rational policy, we may be headed for a nuclear holocaust.

Please keep on calling for a sane and moderating policy in this destructive and immoral war we are carrying on against the people of both North and South Vietnam. You and your colleagues of like mind on the Foreign Relations Committee will be able to reach the good sense and conscience of the American people over the heads of the President and his misguided advisers. Then perhaps you will have achieved the "consensus" for peace the President will find hard to ignore.

All of us who are interested in peace owe you and men like Senator FULBRIGHT a huge debt of gratitude. I wish to express my own feeling of admiration and appreciation to you for trying to return U.S. policy to the course of rationality, morality, and legality.

Sincerely,

HERBERT HERRITT.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is an assurance of my continuing support for your continued stance and courageous advocacy of rationality in Vietnam, in southeast Asia, and in foreign policy in general.

Sincerely,

CAROL F. DRISKO.

BRIGHTON, MASS.,
February 20, 1966.

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

My DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am fully in accord with your position regarding the Vietnam conflict. I urge you strongly to introduce the measure which Secretary Rusk has challenged you to do. The President has continued in his little war unchecked and in violation of the Constitution for too long. We are a democratic nation and contrary to a marked trend in the opposite direction will continue to be so.

I sincerely hope that it passes—and by a wide margin.

Very truly yours,

MICHEL POTHEAU.

ROYAL OAK, MICH.,
February 18, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been reading about and listening to your committee hearings, and the impression I draw from all of the proceedings is that to all except you and Senator FULBRIGHT those of us who disagree with the Johnson decisions are not much better than Benedict Arnold. This is not so. I've had relatives in the armed services since the Revolutionary War. They served their country during times of war, and I have been proud of them, but I am not proud of what we are doing in Vietnam.

This is not a war. President Johnson was given a blank check to do as he pleased in Vietnam. The Congress gave away the stops put into our Constitution. Is there nothing we can do to rescind this action? Let us get back to the three branches of government.

I have an 18-year-old son in college at the present time, and I cannot conceive of his being sent to Vietnam. This is not what I have raised my son for, and I am heartsick for all of our boys who are fighting over there simply because our President has envisioned himself as the father of the world.

We cannot and must not enter into every civil war in the world. I think we are ter-

March 2, 1966

ribly wrong, and have always thought it took more courage to say you're wrong than to stubbornly insist you are always right. I think we should bring our troops home from Vietnam. We are a big enough nation to admit we were wrong, but the head of this country doesn't seem to be. I hope he will someday realize what he has done to the young men and their families that he has involved in this action.

I applaud your courage in not being "yes men," and I hope you can overpower your opponents.

Sincerely,

THERESA A. COLVIN.

LOMBARD, ILL.,
February 21, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God for people like you who have put integrity and decency above politics. You have earned the respect and gratitude of the entire Nation, Democrats and Republicans alike.

As you know, many mothers wrote and telegraphed President Johnson and their various Senators when they saw the impending danger of commitment, but the President chose to disregard the pleas.

Many of us begged to have the problem placed in the U.N. When we were stunned by the President's war address we sent more letters and telegrams trying to stay his hand.

We have been ill, to say the least. Ours are the war babies and we can't forget past tears. We see no necessity for more war.

You are not unaware, of course, that in a sincere effort to make our views known, we have been lumped with Communist sympathizers. Our only interest is in loving our sons and in trying to save their lives. If love is a crime, we are indeed guilty.

It has always been my belief that a President's first duty is to preserve and protect families at home, not desecrate them. I am not alone in this assumption. You will find that any place women meet, President Johnson has become the household word for enemy.

We see him swinging at a mirage and crying wolf in an effort to cover up a bad decision and salvage his image both at home and abroad. He erred in putting the cart before the horse when he chose blood first and economics second. We clearly recognize economic aid as a duty, but in our minds it represented our first and only duty or commitment.

Like many others I voted for President Johnson in the belief that he would keep America out of war. I feel betrayed.

I send you my gratitude and pray that you will keep pressing home the point that war will never end if we refuse to consult with those we blithely term aggressors. It is their home and their country and their right to help solve its problems.

Sincerely,

MRS. ROBERT L. BARTA.

WAUKESHA, WIS.,
February 19, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We congratulate you for the investigation which the Senate is conducting into the Administration's war policies. At this point in history, the U.S. President holds such awesome powers that he can, almost singlehanded, commit the whole country to war against any party he names. It is therefore all the more important in this American democracy to reveal his operations and those of his numerous departments, in particular, the military, State, and the CIA.

What is good for the President is not necessarily good for the rest of us, and we favor the restoration of the balance of powers which was and still is prescribed by the magnificent American Constitution.

It is so easy for big war hawks to condemn and smear those who object to wars with charges of cowardice, subversion, stupidity, blindness, willful disobedience, etc., ad nauseam. But we contend that it takes as much courage and bravery to stand up and question the warpower structure, as to face the fire of a foreign opponent. As for stupidity and blindness, how many of the big war hawks of recent history drove their followers not to glorious victory, but to ignominious defeat and disaster? Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo, Napoleon, Kaiser Wilhelm—to name but a few. Even Stalin tried to liquidate a small nation in a brief campaign (Finland). The list is endless with names of those whose errors of prophecy were colossal.

It seems that since 1941 the United States has been constantly at war, and in our present state, being entangled everywhere in the world with governments—democratic, dictatorial, feudalistic, and whatnot, it looks as though there can be no end to our armed conflicts. This is sickening, and makes a mockery of national policy that pretends to be the "Great Society." Too much of our national substance, manpower, blood and productive genius is being squandered recklessly in the bottomless pits of war and its consequences. This monstrous folly can only bring us to disastrous ends. Even now, the swelling of hatred and contempt for the United States from many quarters overseas, where we expected to enjoy some respect and affection, is one of the most alarming developments of this decade. The American people are not a gang of international cannon-adeers in the world, but present military preparations and actions make us look that way.

We strongly oppose this U.S. war on Vietnam, and hope that you will continue to expose its follies and corruptions. In particular, we dread the possibility that U.S. military action in Vietnam will provoke the Chinese to war against us—with cooperation of the Russians, of course. We strongly back you in your efforts to bring this war to a halt, and hope that you will vote strongly against any congressional bills that demand expenditures or authorization for it.

Yours most sincerely,

RAY T. WENDLAND.
CHARLOTTE S. WENDLAND.

GALLIPOLIS, OHIO,
February 18, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to thank you for your stubborn and most rational efforts in behalf of a sane policy on southeast Asia. Be assured that there are many of us outside of Oregon who support you and agree with you. The cynicism of Dean Rusk's clever ploy today, challenging the Senate to vote yes or no on the appropriations bill, does not escape notice. Any knowledgeable person, of course, knows the bill will pass (they always do) but those of you who vote against it have already been branded. Naturally this will not in the least discourage you in your efforts.

One need not have the gift of prophecy to see the disaster ahead. Maybe it can be prevented—maybe not. But at least some of us can feel and say, no matter what comes, that we tried. For now we will keep on hoping and working in the cause of sanity and justice.

The courage and tenacity exhibited constantly by you will continue to be an inspiration and source of strength to us.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. HOLZER, Jr., M.D.

St. LOUIS, Mo.,
February 17, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I approve your stand on Vietnam and your courage in maintaining it in the face of much ugly opposition. I am sending letters expressing approval of your views to the White House, our United Nations representative, and other Members of Congress. I hope that future developments relating to Vietnam will soon begin to reflect the triumph of your commonsense attitudes.

Very truly yours,

LILLIAN L. HUBBELL.

NATIONAL CITY, CALIF.,
February 17, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to let you know that my wife and I are very glad that we have men like you serving in the Senate. Most of all, we are 100 percent behind you in ending the Vietnam war.

It is men like you with your courage that makes us feel patriotic. L.B.J. and his men have really twisted the truth about the war in Vietnam. It has gotten so bad that rather than burning my draft card, my wife and I registered as Republicans as a protest. Lucky for me I served in the Army before L.B.J. "took over" the Nation.

Best of luck to you and God bless America because we need help.

Yours truly,

OSCAR I. COUEDO.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
February 19, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would just like to write a few lines telling you that I have been following your position on Vietnam for the past few months and that I fully concur with your stand. It is unfortunate that the United States has been blindly led into the war and that at the present it is extremely difficult to find a solution which the administration will listen to. The President's "peace offensive" in December and January was offensive to everything that I have ever believed about diplomacy.

It is my hope that your position and the Senate Committee's hearings will force the administration to examine its position and the entire foreign policy. It is about time that we find something to replace containment.

I am writing the President to express my dissatisfaction with the present stand that he is taking.

Yours truly,

GARY S. HOROWITZ.

St. LOUIS, Mo.,
February 20, 1966.

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

HONORED SIR: I want to thank you and your colleagues for bringing to the American people a televised account of the Senate Foreign Relation Committee's inquiry into the administration's Vietnam policies.

I, like many of my business acquaintances and friends have tried in the past to find out why we are in Vietnam in the first place. All the people who speak for the administration repeatedly say that we have commitments, we must keep our word, etc. However under our late President, John F. Kennedy, we were told that we would never get into a shooting war in Vietnam, and our support would be merely advisory as far as military matters were concerned and, of course economic aid. Mr. Johnson was elected on this premise too, but he has completely

March 2, 1966

changed the course. Has Mr. Johnson made other commitments? I haven't been able to find out through the administration's Mr. Rusk or General Taylor. The only conclusion I have reached is that the administration has a long record of misjudgment and that we, the American people have been fooled by election promises.

Article I, section 8, paragraph 11 of the U.S. Constitution clearly states that Congress shall have the power to declare war. Why and by what right did Congress give up the powers? I think this was a grave mistake. If we had reason to be at war in Vietnam and we had a declaration of war by the Congress, I would be behind this action 100 percent. The way it stands, I'm against the administration's policy and I believe we should get out of there fast. Pick the most honorable way and get out and stay out. Because we don't like the Communist way of life, does this give us the right to force our ways on an alien people?

Well I've had my little say. I feel better and I share your views in every respect.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. BAGLEY.

GROSSE POINT, MICH.,
February 16, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is quite impossible to find words with which to thank you for the efforts you are making to bring peace to Vietnam and by thus doing avert a world holocaust.

I am one of the innumerable people in the country who believes that we have no right to interfere with the internal affairs of Vietnam.

We are regarded as cruel transgressors by most of the peoples of the world and certainly by our friends in the Far East.

In spite of the money we are spending to help people and win friends throughout the world, our image grows steadily uglier.

We are praying for your continued health and strength.

Gratefully yours,

IVA K. WILLMORE.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.,
February 15, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: Our sister State of Oregon may well be proud to have a man of your caliber and far-seeing vision as a Senator. I have, for a long time, admired and applauded your courage in taking the stand that you have taken in the matter of the war in Vietnam, and at this time I am writing to express my sentiments. I am wholly in agreement with your views in this matter, and I am sure that millions of other Americans are likewise in agreement with you. Unfortunately, we were never consulted, yet the lives of all of us, and the preservation of our country and this entire civilization may well be in danger unless this action is stopped before it goes too far.

I cannot see any justifiable reason why this country ever intruded into another country's internal affairs in the first place. We had not been attacked. This was a civil war in a country thousands of miles away. It was then stated that we would act only in an "advisory" capacity, with some economic aid, as needed. Then came the first bombing of Vietnam, which led to an ever-increasing aerial warfare—more troops sent—and every time this belligerent involvement is intensified still further the danger to all of us is intensified in the same ratio. I have written two letters of protest to the President in the past year. Both were acknowledged by someone in the State Depart-

ment, and brochures were enclosed which simply justified the action in Vietnam. So, obviously, writing letters of protest does not change one thing. The President offered "unconditional negotiations" in a speech last year, but even while making that speech the bombing of North Vietnam continued, and more troops were sent over—a direct contradiction to any offer of "unconditional negotiations." It is quite understandable why, in the face of such actions, North Vietnam rejected the offer as being "insincere." How could they think otherwise? If that offer had been backed up by a cessation of hostilities, showing that we really meant it—it might have been believed. One cannot offer peace, while continuing to build a war machine, and expect to be believed. The recent "peace offensive" was almost certain to fail for that same reason. "Actions speak louder than words." We cannot, in all fairness, expect North Vietnam to make all the concessions while we make none at all. There has to be a spirit of "give and take" in any negotiations if they are to succeed.

This country has brought criticism upon itself from all over the world because of these actions in Vietnam. If other countries were to send their armies over here to interfere in an internal civil war in our country, we would certainly resent their actions as being acts of aggression, and that is exactly what we are doing in Vietnam. The United Nations has pleaded for a cessation of hostilities, but, again, statements have been made that we are seeking peace, while we continue to enlarge our war effort. We are certainly not adding to our prestige in the world by these actions. Mere words, without appropriate action to back up those words, are not enough.

I am a Democrat. I voted for President Johnson because I firmly believed that he would keep us out of war. I am sure that millions of other Americans who voted for him, did so with the same belief. All of us have been shocked. We hoped that he would follow in the footsteps of F.D.R., and I am sure that if F.D.R. were with us today we would not be in this precarious situation. Under his masterful leadership the beginning of friendly relationship with Russia was made, and if this had been carried on, with tact and diplomacy, our two countries might be working together in a combined venture in the exploration of outer space—a venture bringing tremendous contributions to the world of science, and to mankind. Instead, that friendship has been allowed to suffer because our actions have aroused suspicion of what our real intentions may be.

This is too dangerous a time to take risks that could involve the total destruction of the world. Surely Vietnam is not worth that. If this war is enlarged and expanded enough to eventually bring Communist China into it, then our entire civilization is doomed to annihilation in an all-out nuclear war. Is Vietnam worth that?

Unfortunately, the matter has already been allowed to go so far that a withdrawal now would be taken as a "loss of face," but certainly a "loss of face" is far preferable to the risk of all-out war that would cost millions of innocent lives, and destroy all of us. Other countries did not rush into Vietnam with armies and aircraft, so why did this country alone choose to do so? It was not our business, at any time—and it is not our business now.

I congratulate you on your courageous stand, Senator Morse, and it is my fervent hope and prayer that the present debates in the Senate will result in finding a way to halt this dreadful thing before it goes any further. Surely peace can only be achieved by honestly working toward peace, not by armies or bombs while talking about wanting peace. May God direct you to find the an-

swer—before it is too late. This country needs men like you, and never more keenly than at a time such as this.

Very truly yours,

ROSALIE C. TEMPEST.

IUKA, MISS.,
February 20, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God you are still in Washington to speak out against the war in Vietnam. I sincerely hope that you and the other men who are against it can do something in time to save us from world war III.

For years I have admired the way you spoke out for what you believed, and I have been grateful for your presence in our law-making department. If only there were more like you there, maybe we could live in a more relaxed manner and without that constant fear of an atomic war.

Usually I am among those well-meaning people who sit back and hope that somebody else will speak out for the right things—but this time I just had to let you know how much both my husband and I appreciate you.

Sincerely yours,

MARY B. DAVIS.

PITTSFIELD, MASS.,
February 20, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The American people owe you immeasurable gratitude for the stand and courage you have taken against the Johnson policy, in this unpopular war in Vietnam, I wish there were more men of your caliber in Washington.

Best wishes to you and Senator FULBRIGHT.

Very truly yours,

PETER FRANCESSE.

LONDON, ENGLAND,
February 18, 1966.

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

MY DEAR SIR: I am an American living abroad who ceased to suffer from the oppressive anti-Communist atmosphere that is poisoning America in 1954, but I have never ceased protesting, for the sake of the whole world, against American foreign policy.

On Sunday, my family and I, supporters of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, are joining others in a silent vigil outside 10 Downing Street in an attempt to impress upon Mr. Wilson our shame and disgust over his Vietnam policy.

We watched on TV the other night Kennan's statements to the Foreign Relations Committee and after you had asked Kennan if any country voted democratically for a Communist government, would we have the right to interfere, my two sons got up and cheered you and the older said to me: "Mom, don't ever allow yourself to be bitter about America, not while it has men like Senator Morse." We were also pleased with FULBRIGHT and considered Senator LAUSCHE a McCarthyite figure who seemed to be intimidating Kennan to some degree.

I have seen a propaganda booklet issued by the Hanoi government with the men and women who compose the National Liberation Force and in my opinion, they are truly representative of the people of all of Vietnam, and they deserve the status of recognition as any of the resistance groups held during the war against the Nazis.

The crux of the whole tragedy is the failure of the United States to accept the legality of the Peiping government and to permit China's entry into the U.N. It may be too late where Peiping is concerned, but we here never give up hope for the U.N. Let there be two Chinas, but let us have peace.

March 2, 1966

Please accept the sincerest thanks from our family for your persistent efforts to give us a better world and to restore America's name to the reputation it had before F.D.R.'s death. With warm and affectionate good wishes,
 Yours,

ROSALYN BALCOMBE.

WHEELING, ILL.,
 February 19, 1966.

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

DEAR MR. MORSE: As an Ex-Frenchman, now an American citizen, who lived through part of the Indochina war fiasco, I wish to congratulate you on your wise and courageous stand on the South Vietnam issue. Keep up the good work, Mr. MORSE, you are on the right track.

Yours very truly,
 F. F. VANDERMEERSCH.

ANAHEIM, CALIF.,
 February 18, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It occurs to me that you might at present be getting a little mail of the uncomplimentary sort. Having been an admirer of yours for many, many years, and not having apprised you of that fact, I feel that this would probably be a good time to do so.

I greatly respect your honesty, your intelligence and your courage. I feel that you stand firmly for the people and on the side of history. I know that when the scores are totaled, you will be one of the great leaders of all time. I hope that Oregon respects you—you are an honor to that State.

Your stand on Vietnam allows this Nation to retain at least a little of its honor. Stand firm and guard your health, God bless you. We need you badly.

Very warmly yours,
 BOB COHEN.

AUSABLE FORKS, N.Y.,
 February 21, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit me to assure you, on the basis of what I know of the American people and the widespread interest that the televising of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings has aroused that the applause over a certain remark of yours—though promptly and quite properly suppressed—was echoed by perhaps countless millions of Americans, as it was by those of my own household.

If a few hundred million dollars of the billions we are spending killing people could be devoted by the Government to the televising of all important congressional proceedings, it would be a great step toward making ours a Government in fact of, by, and for the people.

I am, sir,
 Respectfully yours,
 ROCKWELL KENT.

LUTSEH, MINN.,
 February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you, and those others in our Congress for speaking up with all your strength and courage against the policy our President and those whose advice he is following in regard to the immoral and utterly unjustified war being waged in southeast Asia.

To me, a disabled veteran of the Rainbow Division of World War I, it borders on an almost unbelievable policy for our country and makes me fearful that the Armed Forces-industrial complex has taken over the foreign policy of our Nation.

May I urge you, and those who stand with you to stand fast and be not discouraged when criticized and called disloyal or near traitors.

I remember how that over 1,900 years ago, someone who we profess to follow and use as our ideal, had to remind those working with Him, that they would have said to them and about them all manner of evil. May your strength not weaken nor your courage fail.

Sincerely,
 JAY WHITSON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
 February 16, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is my first letter to a Senator, and it is to express my great admiration for you, and my sympathy with your views on our Government's war in Vietnam. Please add me to your statistics. I am 24 years old, a professional cellist.

I hope many more people will speak out, and if they don't very quickly, that you will not give up.

Yours sincerely,
 HELEN HARBISON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
 February 18, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I take this opportunity of writing you and extending my appreciation for your gallant stand on the Vietnam war. I trust that you will continue your fight, and I want you to know that there are millions of Americans hoping you will continue to do so.

This may not be a war to some people, but it is a big war for the boys who have to fight it. I see no victory in sight when the same policy is being used as in Korea. We do not fight wars to bring people to the conference table. That's nonsense. We fight wars to win. We cannot win in southeast Asia for many reasons. How can you feed 700 million people if you subdue them militarily? What kind of a stable government could you establish? What would you do if something happened to Ky? How can you make the oriental ever like the white man and vice versa? Nationalism is too strong.

War only decides who lives and who dies. You do not fight a war on the enemies' terms. You go all out to win with the best weapons and equipment possible which our Government to date has not given our men.

My 19-year-old boy says that if he is drafted he will only be gun fodder, and he does not want any part of Vietnam. He would defend this country to the hilt if it was in jeopardy, but he does not believe in what is taking place now in Asia. What would you advise him, Mr. MORSE, to do? I would appreciate hearing from you on this. It's too bad young men have to pay for the mistakes of old men.

Again thanking you for your good efforts and trusting I shall hear from you.

Sincerely,
 K. F. SCHADE.

FREEPORT, TEX.,
 February 18, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Count me as an American who repudiates the administration's policy on Vietnam.

Yours truly,
 ROBERT BING.

DELAWARE, OHIO.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I am writing to express my support of your position regarding the administration's policy in Vietnam. Although the attitude you have maintained be criticized

and attacked by more vocal elements of the citizenry, rest assured that there are many conscientious citizens who support your effort to investigate the problem in a democratic and open manner.

Sincerely,
 CHARLENE DWYER.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
 February 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your comments and those of Senator FULBRIGHT at the hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee have impressed me a great deal. I think you have all of America thinking.

Sincerely,
 AMELIA NUGENT.

TEANECK, N.J.,
 February 17, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that I support your efforts to secure peace in Vietnam. Everything that you have said about the war there makes sense to me.

Sincerely yours,
 AMY HAUSNER.

WILMINGTON, DEL.,
 February 19, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We applaud your courage and bravery in speaking out on the war in Vietnam. We urge you to continue to press for a peaceful settlement as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,
 EDWARD R. KEARNS.
 RUTH S. KEARNS.

AMES, IOWA,
 February 18, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to tell you how much I, and my family, appreciate your efforts to end the war in Vietnam. You are a true patriot, and I think I reflect the feelings of most informed Americans when I say that we are proud of you and grateful to you. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,
 DAVID E. METZLER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
 February 15, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please know that my wife and I applaud your courageous stand on the Vietnam policy. Please keep up the good work, sir.

We hope the immorality of U.S. actions in this area are not signs of the general decay of morals and ethics in our society. It is not always easy for a man to take an unpopular stand on issues as you do many times. However, we believe in the honesty and integrity of your convictions and stand behind you.

Sincerely,
 LEWIS LITZKY.

DESCANSO, CALIF.,
 February 19, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: As a pioneer Westerner (I am one of seven generations who has lived in San Diego County, and at present am the oldest of four generations still living here; with this introduction to the writer I must heartily commend you for your most proper

March 2, 1966

stand regards to this Vietnam war silly business.

Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, a World War veteran as I happen to be, expressed the true situation in Vietnam.

We are surely in the wrong war at the wrong place and the wrong time. I happened to see your committee recently at Berkeley via Westinghouse TV and then again yesterday at my home here via XER TV, Tijuana, Mexico. It was necessary for me to travel as far as Eureka, Calif., and back (1,800 miles). I encountered quite a few folks in the 12 days I was away and did not encounter a single person who was in favor of us being in Vietnam.

You, therefore, believe me, are not taking the minority view and unless our Constitution is to be thrown overboard we should have Congress declare war just as that fine document provides.

With such deep roots in my beloved country it includes Baker City, Oreg., in 1885 where my Uncle Elmer Holt was admitted to the bar at the ripe age of 18.

Keep up your strength and don't let them get away with it.

Sincerely and with kind regards,
ROY ARTHUR SILVA.

PROCTOR, MINN.,
February 17, 1966.

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

DEAR HON. SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express once again my gratitude for your appearances and your stand on Vietnam. Your unruffled countenance during the hearings are very confident to watch, besides the clarity of your position you have outlined.

I applaud you.
Sincerely,

PHYLLIS LAHLI,
LAKEWOOD, OHIO,
February 17, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have been wonderful on the TV hearings this past few days. Our entire family thinks so.

This quotation from Isaiah which President Johnson quotes so often has me concerned.

Isaiah 1: 18-19: "Come now, and let us reason together. * * * If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land. But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword."

I wish we had many more men like you in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,
BERNICE OLIPHANT.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: How we rejoice that we have such a great man living in our country today. Your courageous stand in this time of national crisis gives us hope indeed for the future of our country and the world.

With deepest appreciation, I am,

Sincerely,
Mrs. NORMA GROSSENBACHER.

AUBURNDALE, MASS.,
February 17, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree completely with your statements on the Vietnam war. You and some of your fellow senators who share your view, seem to be the only sane force in Washington these days.

The committee hearings are a wonderful public service. I believe the American public is not full aware of where this dangerous policy of President Johnson can lead and what disastrous events might take place unless caution is exercised.

Thank you for being such a concerned and dedicated public servant.

Mrs. T. R. MERRITT.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to convey my support of the investigations which you are conducting. And also to let you know that I am in agreement with your plan to resolve this conflict in the United Nations.

Very truly yours,

JOAN BRUCK.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
February 18, 1966.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: You are a great man. I can't find the proper words to express myself, how I feel and how I honor you for your wonderful work and words for us people—our men, husbands, and sons.

I will always honor you.

Mrs. MILITE KOKAL.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
February 19, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note to urge you to redouble your courageous efforts to terminate the conflict in South Vietnam and bring our fine young American men back home.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. LEMIRE,
PLYMOUTH, MICH.,
February 15, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my appreciation for your courageous and tireless work for a more reasonable policy by our Government in the Vietnam problem.

If you have any recommendations as to what an individual can do to help promote a less aggressive attitude by our Government, please let me know. I am willing to devote time and energy in the interest of stopping the senseless killing, but I don't know what to do.

Thank you for devoting your time and energy in behalf of peace.

Very truly yours,

BRUCE B. SPRATLING.

INGLEWOOD, CALIF.,
February 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are writing to encourage you in your attempt to enlighten the public on the true state of affairs in Vietnam and to bring an end to the hostilities there. The majority opinion in the United States today seems to be that our presence in Vietnam is justified because there has been Communist aggression from the north. We feel, however, that the United States especially in support of the Diem regime, has also committed aggression. We realize that our Government finds itself in a touchy situation, that it has a "tiger by the tail," so to speak, but we are convinced that no further good can come from prolonging the present tragic state of affairs. We urge our Representatives in Washington to demand that negotiations with the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese be commenced immediately, before the United States is irreversibly committed to further atrocities.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD HAROLD JOHNSON,
ANNA VAN ROAPHARST JOHNSON.

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

DEAR SEN: Please be advised that I support you wholeheartedly in your stand against our present Vietnam policies. They are immoral, impractical, and shortsighted. A country such as ours is capable of solving these problems in a more intelligent manner.

Sincerely yours,

DALE E. BIRKENHOLZ.

PACIFIC PALISADES, CALIF.,
February 10, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We feel that the so-called confusion of the American public may be due to lack of a responsible spokesman of views which many have privately come to. May we offer the committee and yourself congratulations for your courageous efforts to bring notice to the American people of the dangers of our present position in Vietnam.

We urge immediate steps to liquidate our commitments in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

FRANCES T. WILLIAMS,
BYRON D. WILLIAMS,
JUDITH J. WILLIAMS.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,
February 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We commend you for your forthright criticism of the foreign policy of the Johnson administration including Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

We urge you and the Foreign Relations Committee to continue investigations and public hearings into every area of foreign affairs of the executive branch including that latest sideshow, the Honolulu conference.

We hope for a new foreign policy in which military force is not an instrument.

Give 'em hell.

Best regards,

JOHN and ALMA DURR.

SANTA ROSA, CALIF.,
February 13, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Count me as being in full agreement with your views on Vietnam made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Views, substantiated by experts as former Ambassador George F. Kennan and General Gavin.

Thank you for being one of few Senators unafraid to speak out on behalf of logic in a misguided America.

This country was founded out of revolution. History refers to it as the spot heard around the world. For 190 years we have been the envy and aspiration of every backward nation. Instead of holding out our hand in help to others trying to achieve our way of life, we find ourselves denying them our very heritage, the right of free people to form governments of their own choosing. This country is following an asinine foreign policy in Vietnam and especially in the Dominican Republic and the tragedy of it is that young American boys are dying in its futile support.

Sincerely yours,

DINO J. GROSSI.

NORWALK, CONN.,
February 17, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In closely following the deliberations of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am extremely pleased with the stand you continue to take.

Please do not let up. For, if we continue our present course in Vietnam—both in the

March 2, 1966

4525

south, to try and bolster what appears to me to be an unpopular Government, and in the north, bombing daily a nation with whom we are not at war—it will mean eventual full-scale war with the Chinese, and a possible nuclear war with the Russians.

I have four boys, the oldest of whom is 12; I don't want to send them to Asia to get their legs blown off. Nor do I want my family to be destroyed—either instantaneously in a nuclear blast, or after a week of radiation sickness.

Sincerely,

STEWART H. ROSS.

ELMHURST, N.Y.
February 17, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: Let me be another to congratulate and commend you on your courageous and patriotic position re Vietnam. As an Air Force veteran of both World War II and Korea, I am eager to lend concurrence and encouragement to you since I have no ax to grind, having served my country.

I certainly would not suggest to you any arguments or courses to follow since I feel you are much more than competent to pursue these than I could ever be. However, I must heartily commend you on the statements made by you to General Gavin on the above date.

You, as a U.S. Senator, permit me to maintain confidence in the U.S. Congress. Please continue to represent the people of this country and do not fall prey to pressures and plays for power.

I have remitted a copy of this letter to President Johnson.

Sincerely,

VINCENT J. DEL GRECO.

JACKSON HEIGHTS, N.Y.,
February 19, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you, indeed, for putting General Taylor in his place. It is a pleasure to hear, in these times, one clear American voice.

Thank you, Senator.

Very sincerely,

DOROTHY HANLEY.

THIEF RIVER FALLS, MINN.,
February 19, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I have been listening to the hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during the last day or two as they came in over TV, and I want to commend you for your efforts, and to thank you for the stand you are taking.

Congress only has the real power to declare war, but in spite of this we are now engaged in a full-scale war in Vietnam. I read the newspapers quite carefully, and I want to say that in my opinion the resolution of August 1964 was never intended to authorize a war. The people, in general, did not understand it, and it was slipped through Congress, without any full understanding of how it could be used. The President and his advisers are using this resolution for a purpose for which it was never intended.

I hope you can get a few Members of Congress to back you up so that we can find out just where the Senators stand. You may not win, but it is interesting to know just where our Senators stand. As Dean Rusk said, "Let the people know where the Senate stands." Let's have a vote on your resolution to rescind.

The President may be Commander in Chief of the Army, but Congress holds the purse

No. 37—23

strings. But if you do not appropriate the money, he will have to limit the war.

It seems to me that we have no business in Vietnam, 10,000 miles away from home. Instead of sending our boys to the fighting front to fight and die, let us get them back home. That is the only way to back them up and protect them. There is no reason why we should play the role of world policeman.

Supposing we do blast and bomb Vietnam to pieces, then what have we accomplished. How long are we going to stay there—5 years, 10 years, 25 years, etc.? China is still there right alongside. Are we going to stay there indefinitely and spend the American taxpayers' money? This is our third world war away from home.

I listened to General Taylor and Dean Rusk. Their testimony was highly evasive. They did not want to tell anything to hurt the administration in any way.

It is my opinion that President Johnson and his advisers are leading our country and our people on the road to ruin and destruction. We have adopted Goldwater's policies, and the Republicans are laughing up their sleeves. You will hear a lot about this in the 1966 campaign, and much more in 1968.

You may use this letter in any way you think helpful.

Yours very truly,

H. O. BERVE.

HELLAM, PA.,
February 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I am not a man of words so I will not be able to express myself and my feelings as I would like to. I am just one of the millions of American workingmen and taxpayers.

This week I lost time from work to listen to the debate from Washington and I wish I would have lost more so I could have heard it all.

This week I think you have proven yourself one of the greatest men of our time. I wish I could have been there to applaud your every word.

It will take many more Senators like you to keep our country from falling into the hands of the military, which road it is on for the past several years.

The American people are as easily lead as the Germans, which I find hard to believe. Your road to peace is not an easy one. You will have to fight with no letup but I believe you will win. Clear-thinking people are behind you tooth and nail.

I only wish that Premier Ky would have been at the hearings so you could have shown the American people the stupid ass that our Government is forcing on the people of South Vietnam.

My wife and I have always regarded you with great respect and our finest wish and prayer for you is a long, healthy, and happy life.

Sincerely,

ALVIN N. IRWIN and VERA.

DOBBS FERRY, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bravo and God bless you for the good fight you are waging to air this bad stew in Vietnam. We who supported the Johnson administration for its peace platform are appalled by the escalation of this terrible civil war into an international tragedy.

Please know that you have the profound gratitude and support from citizens in every part of the United States.

Sincerely,

FLORENCE ZINER.

SUDBURY, MASS.,

February 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is most heartening to hear reported on television what your views are concerning the war in Vietnam. I have been so completely disillusioned—by the man for whom I voted in the last election, our President.

Let's hope that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee may continue to question our policies in Vietnam before the general public.

The thing that fascinates me is the fact that the news media's choice in reporting, points up your questioning of those who appear before the committee.

I have been your greatest admirer for many years and only wish that there were many more like you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. F. P. MORRISON.

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX.,
February 16, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to inform you that I am in accord with the position you have taken as concerns Vietnam. I believe it is imperative that a cease-fire commence immediately so that we might negotiate with Hanoi, and more importantly, with the N.L.F. I also believe we must uphold the Geneva accords if we are to achieve peace in Vietnam. In the name of humanity and "practical politics," I urge you to continue the fight for peace.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS D. R. MACNAIR.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 18, 1966.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm a Negro, 65 years old. I'm a veteran of military service with the 10th U.S. Cavalry on the Mexican border in 1920 and 1921. I also served with a quartermaster battalion of the 2d Army during World War II. I'm proud to say I was honorably discharged after these periods of military service.

After constantly watching television programs, listening to the radio, and reading newspaper reports, I'm offering you my heartiest congratulations and pledging to support you during your most worthy effort to prevent our beloved country from becoming involved in an unnecessary world war.

This country never has been more in need of men and women with your courage, foresight, and ability. You are one of the few Members of Congress who seem to really know how to recognize and talk to war-mongering statesmen and militarists. More power to you while so doing. Loyal and peace-loving Americans are desperately depending on you, Senator Morse, to carry on your campaign for good will among nations and a permanently peaceful world. May you continue to serve your constituents well, and may almighty God forever guide and bless you.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE D. JOHNSON.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,
February 16, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express my whole-hearted approval of your committee's hearings on the U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

March 2, 1966

I beg you to do everything possible to stop this senseless war in which our standard-bearer has publicly expressed his admiration for Adolf Hitler.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. MARSHALL.

SPARTA, N.J.,
February 19, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your fine job of opening the public's eye. You are so right. At all the gatherings that I attend, the conversation is "Why are we in Vietnam, or why is the Government playing politics instead of winning the war? Please continue your good work. You have my full support.

As a father of two sons of draft age and a veteran of World War II, 28th Infantry Division, the only thing that keeps our sanity, my wife and I, is that some one like you thinks of America first.

Yours truly,

RALPH ROBERTS.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
February 21, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: I support your opposition to the illegal, undeclared war against the Vietnamese people.

Acting as we have outside the procedures of the United Nations has weakened both that organization and our own position.

I look forward to your speech in the Senate and hope it will bring some action from the American people, a voice of protest expression that our Government will accept meaningfully.

Sincerely,

LEONARD ENGL.

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.,
February 18, 1966.

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

SIR: I have closely followed the hearings which have been taking place regarding our Vietnam policy. I firmly believe that these hearings are extremely essential in bringing before the American people the realities of this senseless, brutal and illegal conflict.

I heartily support your courageous and resolute stand. May others be similarly enlightened before a nuclear holocaust destroys mankind.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM P. ERICKSON.

NEWARK, DEL.,
February 18, 1966.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to express my support for your position on the Foreign Relations Committee and thank you for your most intelligent questioning of the witnesses.

Yours truly,

DONNA M. ORGONEST.

PALM DESERT, CALIF.,
February 21, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my heartfelt thanks for what you are doing. Those of us who must look particularly to the Senate for the courage, dedication, and wisdom to keep our country's liberties, freedom of speech and traditional honor unimpaired are fortunate to have men like you to guard them.

Courageous, forthright men are all too rare. May you have a long and distinguished career

in that small band. History proves that it is always those few who must protect the many.

Most sincerely,

CYRIA HENDERSON.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.,
February 18, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I take this opportunity to thank you for the service you are rendering your country participating in the debate on the Vietnam war as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I, like most Americans I know stand behind our Armed Forces in Vietnam who I feel should have full moral, economic, and arms support. I do not, however, support the present and past foreign policy which has so tragically involved our country in this war.

With best wishes,

Gratefully yours,

DAVID ROBERTS III.

MENOMONEE FALLS, WIS.,
February 19, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We strongly support your stand on the Vietnam war. We hope you will continue to struggle to make your viewpoint heard even though we realize that you have been put in the position of receiving very unpleasant opposition.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT P. OVERS.
MARCELLA M. OVERS.CHICAGO, ILL.,
February 23, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank the Almighty for Senators such as you and J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT; real Americans who are not afraid to stand up and be counted. What can we do to help? Keep up the good work.

HOWARD E. SEVERE.

CHEVY CHASE, MD.,
February 27, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want to tell you how grateful we are to you for all the work you are doing to oppose the war in Vietnam, and in fighting the large war budget demanded for this destructive purpose, with all the sadness and grief it can cause.

Are we not, actually, intruders in Vietnam? Are we properly protecting our own citizens when we allow them to be drafted into the jungles of Vietnam? We hope your influence will be widespread.

With gratitude to you,

NAYAN and STANWOOD COBB.

EGLIN AFB, FLA.,
February 28, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: I wanted to take this opportunity to applaud you for your stand on U.S. involvement in an unconstitutional and futile war. Your courage as a public servant in expressing dissent has been very heartening to me and I urge you to continue in the future as you have in the past.

In addition, your stand against "government by secrecy" is a view which should be pursued vigorously. Too long have decisions affecting all Americans been made by some public officials without their taking into consideration what many of us really do think and without the American people knowing what was happening until after some action had already been taken; i.e., Vietnam.

I will eagerly be reading your comments and following debates in which you are involved. With a person such as you, I feel sanity can yet prevail.

Thank you for reading my comments.

Respectfully yours,

HARRIS G. KRAHAM,
Lieutenant, USAF.MUNCIE, IND.,
February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am entirely in sympathy with the stand you took at the hearings.

To surrender foreign policy decisions to Johnson, Rusk, and McNamara would be a big mistake.

Sincerely yours,

ROYAL J. MORSEY.

CHULA VISTA, CALIF.,
February 22, 1966.

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

SIR: You are to be commended in advocating to rescind the joint resolution of August 1964 and your stand on debate of our Vietnam policy. We rely on you as our representative of the people to bring out the true facts, at least as much as possible, and in this way perhaps control the power of the few.

Many of us understand how the consensus of a nation is obtained through a control of information and disguising of facts so that the majority of the people are in no position to judge or recommend action (granted that this is supposedly done for our best interests), so we do and must count on the representatives of the people to act for us and to obtain these facts and truths as was intended. (Or is Congress swayed in the same way by distorted facts, censored information, lack of interest, and fear?)

Perhaps the better policy would be to take into consideration that negotiations should take place with all political elements represented. In disagreement with Mr. Rusk, why not the Buddhists and the Catholics, as well as the Vietcong? Vietnam should be treated as a whole, not as a North and a South. Where did we lose sight of this?

I am sure you have the support of many, and our hope must be that this hearing will lead to a change in our policy in Vietnam, making it more realistic, more universal, more humane.

Very truly yours,

MARTA H. PORTER.

WINNFIELD, I.A.,
February 24, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: My personal thanks for your stand on the war in Vietnam.

This part of the "grass roots of America" seems to be generally in favor of an escalated war up to and including the bombing of Peiping with nuclear weapons, if necessary.

I am not a native of Louisiana. However, I am now a registered voter here. I shall do my best to keep informed, so as to vote as intelligently as possible, and wherever I can, I shall speak out against this war in Vietnam.

In the meantime my thanks to you for doing your thankless task and my commendations to you for your courageous stand in this matter.

Yours truly,

MRS. WILLO L. CURRIER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
February 23, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please keep up your good and vital fight against the administration's war policy in Vietnam.

March 2, 1966

Your excellent stand is winning more and more support and will force a change for peace.

Your gallant devotion to truth and justice is a rare example nowadays, and much admired.

Sincerely yours,
NINA and MORRIS INDMAN.

DENVER, COLO.,
February 22, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE: My wife and I are definitely opposed to the administration's policy in Vietnam. We are in full accord with your stand.

It is about time we quit murdering our boys in Vietnam, and if it is a war why doesn't the United States declare war on Vietnam?

Hoping you will give your full support and consideration in stopping to send our boys to Vietnam.

With warm and kindest regards, I remain.

Sincerely yours,
ROGER HAHN.

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,
February 22, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: I want to express my sincere appreciation for the conscientious and articulate stand you have taken in challenging the administration's handling of the Vietnam situation. Although I can claim no expert knowledge in southeast Asia, I know from research and active participation in Latin America that the current stand of the United States is objectionable and untenable. Furthermore, I resent the wholesale use of deception on the American people, and the unwarranted assertion that we must police the world, even without a congressional mandate.

It seems of the utmost importance that (1) the public be made aware of the duplicity of the administration in this instance; (2) the Congress engage in a rational debate to clarify legal and moral issues at stake; (3) every possible avenue to negotiation be explored by the United States, without the imposition of unrealistic prerequisites or the exclusion of any interested parties; (4) the United Nations, a Geneva convention, or any other international group which is willing to collaborate in promoting meaningful mediation be given every encouragement to do so, with the expectation that the United States would take advantage of any opportunity so offered.

Please accept my thanks for the key role which you have played in dramatizing the fact that we are now engaged in an illegal war, that we can never hope for victory in the traditional sense, that the democratic process is being seriously eroded at home, and that our posture before the world is inconsistent and dangerous in many respects.

Sincerely yours,
DWIGHT B. HEATH.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 20, 1966.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE.

SIR: I support your attitude toward Vietnam.

Sincerely,
CLAUDE E. EMERY, M.D.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
February 20, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just listened to your committee TV broadcasts, and thank God or the Divine Force for allowing such a man as you, who is not afraid to stick by his convictions—his love for the lives of his fellow man. Senator FULBRIGHT too is to

be congratulated and CHURCH of Idaho. It takes the wideopen spaces to widen men's minds.

I happen to be an older woman and the longer I live, I'm shocked and grieved at the present happenings in this world of ours. I certainly wish you continued success.

Sincerely,
A. ELLA RILEY.

FEBRUARY 21, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for the courage and integrity you have displayed in bringing before the American people an open discussion on the problem of Vietnam.

I believe as you do, that when they know the facts they will refuse to support present policy there.

I beg you continue these hearings, bringing in other witnesses, from the academic sphere among others, who can add the weight of their opinion to those already expressed.

Sincerely,
SEYMOUR C. POST, M.D.

WHITTIER, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I deeply admire your courage and your devotion to truth. History books of the future will have to report that at least one voice in the Senate of the United States of America kept insisting that the policy of shooting first and asking questions later was not appropriate in international affairs.

I felt, as you did, that Secretary of Defense McNamara ought to appear before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee prepared to answer questions. Government by secrecy is not representative government. Government of the people, by the people, for the people, can survive many a storm so long as dissent can be distinguished from disloyalty. If a majority of us favor a dangerous policy, the minority must, at least, have the privilege of saying what they think.

All who believe in truly representative government owe you a debt of gratitude.

Sincerely,
ROBERT L. MONTGOMERY.

FLUSHING N.Y.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to express our thanks to you for your unflinching devotion to the cause of peace.

Please keep up your good work.

Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. M. ALTSCHULER.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
February 19, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my admiration for you regarding your views on the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. During the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings you have expressed your feelings and criticisms on the administration's policy on Vietnam. I share your views on our involvement with this war, and I applaud your firm and forthright statements made during the hearings. I also applaud Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator GORE.

It disturbs me to hear the testimony of many of the Nation's top military experts and other Government officials stating that they feel we should escalate the war and press on to victory. I do not feel that there is any victory to be obtained. The victory and further escalation of the war appear to me to be a waste of our country's money, resources, and individual lives. It also appears

to me that the United States has no right to intrude in another country's civil war.

I only wish that more people in this country shared your views, and that the United States would disengage itself from this terrible war while it is still within our power to do so.

Sincerely,
JOAN PAVLU.

DULUTH, MINN.,
February 22, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for the sensible stand you have taken in respect to the involvement of our country in this Vietnam war.

I am sure that most of our citizens, who are loyal to our country, feel that our Government has no business in sending our boys over there to be butchered. It is absurd to think that we as one nation, are going to be able to put an end to aggression all over the world. No country in history ever did it. As far as communism, we have plenty in this hemisphere to combat and how about Cuba off our shores? Let's look after United States first.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM E. WAKEFIELD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: All Americans will be the winners if your positions and those of Senator FULBRIGHT, as voiced late this afternoon, become the one that are implemented shortly.

Keep public hearings going as long as possible for the sake of world peace.

Most sincerely,
MAXINE R. ARONS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In writing to you I am speaking for myself, my family, and for almost all of my friends. We heartily endorse your efforts to make the Vietnam war an issue for public debate. Public policy and war are too important to be left in the hands of the military. Our people have been misinformed on the Vietnam situation and the administration has been misadvised by professional soldiers and lobbyists. I am writing to let you know that your support is far greater than the press and the polls would have the Nation believe.

Very truly yours,
JACOB A. ARLOW, M.D.

DUBUQUE, IOWA,
February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are doing a tremendous job of restoring dignity and responsibility to the Senatorial office and calling the Executive to account for the disaster we are heading for in Asia.

Needless to say, I agree that we must extricate ourselves from Vietnam as soon as possible and try to establish communications with China.

Yours truly,
EDMUND DEMERS.

YONKERS, N.Y.,
February 16, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to take this time to again tell you that there are hundreds of people that I have talked to in complete accord with yours and many of the other Senators views on the Vietnam fiasco caused against the will of the people of this country. I have seen and heard all of your hearings on television and have yet to see how it is possible for this country of ours to be spending billions of dollars on this very

March 2, 1966

untasteful foreign policy supported by our President, the killing of the young men of this country in a battle with absolutely no purpose is inhuman, unjust, and should not be permitted since it is definitely illegal from its origin.

Since we have bases located so strategically around China and Russia why is it so necessary to kill ourselves for a people who are near uncivilized than I can think of? In closing I would like to say that the people I have talked to are in full support of your stand against this fiasco we are being forced into by the Government officials who will be paid in full at the next election. Thank God there are Senators like yourself elected to office of this country who would really have have us in dire straits.

Sincerely,

GEORGE CHIAVEITA,
Ex-GI.

KANSAS CITY, Mo.,
February 14, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Even though you and some of your dissenting associates have been described as being "blind to experience and deaf to hope" (whatever that means) be mindful of the fact that there are millions of Americans who are privately, and some of them publicly, cheering for all of you.

Jack Kennedy said, "The United Nations is our last best hope in a world where the instruments of war far exceed the instruments of peace" but, in view of the fact that we have violated and repudiated all of the peacekeeping provisions of the charter, many of us have come to the conclusion that our "last best hope" is that small group of dissenters (statesmen) in the Senate who are willing to stand alone for decency and sanity.

We are more than grateful and hope and pray that none of you will be cowed by the inane political blusterings being broadcast by a President who has lost all perspective (if he ever had any) and who is now living in an era, created within his own distorted imagination, entirely outside of history.

Yours truly,

ARCH R. MAULSBY.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
February 15, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I admire your courage and integrity in continually opposing Johnson's war in Vietnam. I strongly support you in urging the halting the bombing of North Vietnam, the recognition of the NLF, the reconvening of the Geneva conference, and most recently your commitment to lead a filibuster to stall the approval of appropriations for the war. I also urge you to work for the defeat of the appropriations, which would just be another blank check for Johnson to continue this bloody and senseless war.

I'm with you all the way.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY A. PETERSON.

LUCKAHOE, N.Y.,
February 15, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Hitherto I confided in President Johnson's abilities in the Vietnam situation, but since the Hawaii meetings I have lost hope in his competence. It is my sad conclusion that his authority in Vietnam should henceforth be rescinded.

Lives are sacrificed, a nation is destroyed, and now truth is so distorted that words have lost all meaning. In my conviction faulty commitments have been devised to force us into provoked hostilities with China.

The 1950 crossing of the 38th Korean parallel and forced votes have voided the United Nations of credibly respectable authority in Asia. It is impossible to expect

a sovereign country to come to negotiations—unconditional at that—upon the sole unilateral authority of the United States. Still, until the Hawaii meetings one could hope that President Johnson's true desires for peace and a better world might break that paradox.

That hope is dashed. Resumed bombing, needless embarrassment of the United Nations, and now the handshakes with the desperado Saigon generals and the Vice President's postposterous trip make it improbable that President Johnson can still extricate himself from the tangle. Those are gestures aimed at internal idiosyncrasies in our country. Internationally they are worse than irrelevant. India is starving. We are on the threshold of inexhaustible human tragedy.

We need at least the wordless truce attainable by cessation of bombing and retreat into defensible enclaves to protect politically endangered Vietnamese minorities. Ultimately the perverted Korea affair must be wound up to restore international organization to its authorized impartial functions.

Evidence is abundant, the situation most severe, and we pray for our dear President. But it is urgent that his incompetent Vietnam power be now rescinded.

Yours very respectfully,

JOHN V. GRAUMAN.

WHITTIER, CALIF.,
February 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senior Senator From Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have postponed much too long to thank you for your stand on Vietnam and for your constant, and often solitary, fight for the preservation of our constitutional rights. I do so humbly thank you now.

I have written to our President today (as well as to Senator FULBRIGHT and to the two Senators from California) urging that they follow your leadership in bringing the Vietnam situation to full debate on the floor of the Senate.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS N. EVERETT.

Bronx, N.Y.,
February 15, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to take this opportunity to thank and praise you on your forthright stand on Vietnam. Your and Senator GRUENING's long and lonely stand from among the whole governmental establishment has been an act of heroism, particularly in the light of administration pressure and its manufactured "public opinion." Of the wide section of people I come in contact with, many of whom are complete strangers, I find concern and fright over our involvement there.

If President Johnson really believes in the Geneva accords, peace can very easily be achieved, although a final settlement over the long run would take time. To accept the accords would mean to withdraw all troops immediately and concurrently dismantle our bases there. At the same time we should partake in negotiations with the National Liberation Front, the people we are fighting. This may be considered by some as loss of face, but it is better to lose face for a short time than to lose our national honor for all time, much of which is already gone.

I heard you on CBS TV and radio in the last 2 weeks. Your were excellent. I would be greatly appreciative if you could send me a copy of the document "Why Vietnam" mentioned by Senator GRUENING, and the following: the State Department policy information paper written in 1949, presented

to the Senate Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations in June 1951; the Rand Corp., study commissioned by the U.S. Air Force examining the reasons why China entered the Korean war; the Mansfield report; the latest economic report of the President.

Thank you very much, for everything. Keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

ALAN RESPLER.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
February 13, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am very unhappy over my country's foreign policy in Vietnam and Santo Domingo. I am glad your eloquence is speaking for me so bravely.

Thank you most sincerely.

HILDA MARIE SCHROEDER.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
February 13, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your position on our Vietnam policy is to be commended. Congratulations to you and to the other members of the Foreign Relations Committee for presenting the issues to the public. The testimony of General Gavin and particularly that of Ambassador Kennan elicited by you and the other members of the committee only confirm the view that our military involvement in Vietnam is a monstrous error, and that to increase that involvement will be to compound the error.

Although you will, I am sure, persevere in your course regardless of what your detractors will say, it may nevertheless be heartening to receive expressions of support.

Sincerely yours,

E. A. SCHROEDER.

JEWELL, OREG.,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you for your stand on Vietnam. You and Senator FULBRIGHT are true Americans.

I have followed this war in Vietnam for a long time. Things that you predicted, as well as Walter Lippmann, have come true. We need to be alert so that communism doesn't take hold here.

Have talked with several of my friends, who have the same feeling. I again commend you for your stand.

Very truly,

Mrs. H. E. CARLSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I are extremely proud of your courageous stand with respect to the Vietnamese crisis. If ever the American people needed a tribune to protect them from those who enrich themselves at the expense of the weak, it is today. Our fervent hope is that you and your congressional companions do not weaken under the pressure.

Sincerely,

PETER J. DONAHUE,
CATHERINE A. DONAHUE.

CARMEL, CALIF.,
February 14, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As native Oregonians and graduates of the University in Eugene, we want to tell you of our pride in you the past week. You were wonderful as you said just what so many of us wanted you to say.

You may see by the clippings from today's Chronicle that folks out here are behind you of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Sincerely yours,

PAULINE FORD.

March 2, 1966

MILTON-FREEWATER, OREG.,
February 26, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE: It is quite evident that you have pertinent evidence that we should never have taken the stand we did in Vietnam. It is another painful illustration in human history of giving any group enough rope and they will hang themselves.

We have been too preoccupied with foreign communism and looking over the fence at other people's faults and problems that we took too little cognizance of our own.

The handwriting was on the wall when our own Government aid to our own backward groups failed to achieve their purposes. To compound the trouble with foreign borders was deplorable and now we reach a wretched end. We still hate to reach the obvious conclusion that money cannot and will not buy morality.

ARDEN GAWITH.

JERSEY CITY, N.J.,
February 21, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to assure you of my support—and that of many thinking people I know—in your opposition to the Government's handling of the South Vietnam debacle.

We feel that no American President has a right to carry on an undeclared full-fledged war against any people or any nation in the world, sacrificing needlessly American lives and reducing this country's economy and resources.

Any money allotted to the pursuit of this war should instead be used to improve education, eliminate poverty and slums, improve health standards and reduce unemployment in this country. Nations, such as India, where famine is threatening, should be supported and food supplies should be shipped to them by this country. This is a better way to combat communism because people will favor a nation that feeds them but will hate the one that tries to impose an ideology upon them by killing them.

Sincerely yours,

FRED WETMORE.

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
February 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: You and your chairman, Mr. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, have expressed my every thought concerning the Vietnam war. I was beginning to think all of Congress along with our President had let the people of this country down, but after hearing all your speeches my faith in the men of our Government was renewed.

I firmly believe you should do everything in your power to enforce your ideas concerning this situation. If we have broken the Constitution and this war is illegal, then you should go over the President's head and stop it.

I voted for President Johnson but if he doesn't take constructive steps to bring this Vietnam situation before the United Nations and sincerely strive for a free election in this area, I for one will not vote for him again.

Every night on the newscasts I hear how many men we have killed in Vietnam. I'm not proud of this figure, because I love life—whether it's our side or the enemy. This bragging reminds me of little children playing with toy soldiers.

If our President would only stand up and say he cares more about America than any other country in the world and that because of this great love for us he was going to take immediate action to meet with our allies for a solution, I'm sure he would be running our country for some time. I just don't know how Mr. McNamara could advise anyone when he didn't even vote in this last

election. Anyone who could conveniently forget such an important responsibility couldn't in my view, remember to do anything constructive.

All of you received a standing ovation in my home. My entire family agrees with you and we would all like to know what we can do to force the President to get out of Vietnam as graciously as the Russians left Cuba. Sincerely,

Mrs. J. WRIGHT.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 18, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your position as an independent American has always been a source of immense gratification to me, and I wish there were more, like you, in the Senate.

Your opposition to the present Vietnam procedure impels me to give you my views in the matter.

Our country suffers under two beliefs that ruin our chances of taking part in the establishment of a peaceful world. The first of these is the delusion that the Communists are a single-minded, well-organized, worldwide, and united group of supermen.

This delusion is strengthened by our practice of classifying anyone as a Communist, who disagrees with us, and of tossing aside any disagreeable movement, as "Communist inspired."

Yet the communism of each Communist country is different from that of all the others, and they are all, and always will be dictatorships.

This is easy to realize when we try to imagine what the picture of Karl Marx is, in the mind of an Albanian shepherd or a Cuban plantation hand. Marx, of course, was utterly impractical, though somewhat justified by the conditions in his time.

There was virtually no capitalism in czarist Russia or imperial China, and most of what is called communism is caused by, and is a revolt against our second delusion.

This second American delusion is really the greatest one, having the approval of most of us, being time-honored, and being so familiar as to be taken for granted as perfectly proper and respectable. But it is to it that we can turn account for most of the misery of this world.

This delusion is: That a small group of individuals can "own" the land of a country and can collect the land rental from its inhabitants. There is no shred of evidence or trace of supporting argument that will justify this firmly established practice.

Yet we are in Vietnam, causing hideous torture and deaths, and swilling out money so direly needed here, helping to destroy the world value of the American dollar, to support a small, landowning class (among whom is a large wealthy alien church) the military, and a "government" of which we are totally ignorant.

These little oriental people have lived along the Chinese border for centuries. They do not think as we do. They do not act like us. And we will never remould them.

The United States of America could, with honor and dignity, request the United Nations, the Geneva Conference, or any disinterested body, to conduct an election there, in which the NFL or Vietcong would participate.

There is no question but that North and South Vietnam would reunite and elect Ho Chi Minh as their type of dictator, and go on with their type of communism until they tired of it. And you can be sure that Karl Marx would not be able to recognize one side of it.

Our alternative is to send a lot of young Wayne Morses and Joe Thompsons down there, from now on, to police the country, keep the landowners in their privileged

ascendency, and act as the "secular arm" of one church in its squabbles with another. A third delusion is: That trouble can be ended or corrected by force of arms. Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH S. THOMPSON.

MIAMI, FLA., February 21, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I applaud your courage to speak out against our involvement in Vietnam.

It is men like you who make our Constitution a living truth.

Continue your questioning and probing. We need men like you to "check and balance" executive powers.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. HERBERT M. ROSE.

EAST NORTHPORT, N.Y.,
February 20, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: We would like, once more, to commend your position as expressed in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, on the war in Vietnam.

It is gratifying that the opposition-at-large to this war, which has been slandered in various ways, has been heard in the Senate hearings through your articulate and documented statements and questions.

Respectfully yours,

NORMAN THURAU.
LILIANE THURAU.

REXFORD, N.Y.,
February 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would just like to take the time to thank you for bringing the facts to light with regard to our unfortunate situation in Vietnam. You can be assured of my backing as well as thousands of other Americans who feel the same as you do. I believe we should get out and take care of our own business first or surrender or make some sort of a peace instead of wasting valuable human lives and money. The added fact of a war with Red China should add to this but some say this is an impossibility. I just can't understand why your views aren't 100 percent imposed on them, meaning of course, the President and Congress.

All I can say is that I am behind you 100 percent and please continue your excellent work.

Yours truly,

GERALD M. OSWITT.

WHAT THE WAR IN VIETNAM IS DOING TO EDUCATION IN ALASKA (AS EVERYWHERE ELSE IN THE UNITED STATES)

Mr. GIUENING. Mr. President, in the last decade, public school enrollment in Alaska has increased by 108 percent, which ranks Alaska second in the Nation. This means that public school enrollment in Alaska is 68 percent greater than the national median, which is a healthy 40 percent.

In the last 15 years, the Anchorage Borough School District, which is the largest school district in Alaska, has grown by 700 percent. By 1970, it will almost double itself again.

On a per capita basis, Alaska is spending more for education than any other State—spending almost double the amount spent by Hawaii, the next ranked State. On a per capita basis, we are making a greater revenue effort on the State level than any other State—a third more than New Mexico which ranks

second in the Nation, and one-third of our State budget for the next fiscal year is going for education. We are proud of our public schools, and have good reason to be, for they are among the best in the Nation. But they will not long remain so, if the proposed administrative budget cuts in aid to schools in federally impacted areas is carried out.

This is truer in Alaska than in any other State. Why? Because 49 percent—nearly half—of the students attending public schools in Alaska are federally connected. No other State even approaches this figure—Hawaii is next, with slightly less than 30 percent, and all other States fall below 25 percent.

Admittedly, there are disparities in the payments some school districts now receive under the impacted aid program, and I agree that the Federal payments to the school districts should more clearly reflect the actual burdens imposed by the federally connected child. But, in this regard, payments cannot be adjusted by across-the-board cuts, as proposed by the administration, for it is the most heavily impacted areas that are growing the fastest.

Alaska is making a diligent tax effort to provide good schools. For instance, the two largest school districts, Anchorage and Fairbanks, have a per pupil bonded indebtedness of \$1,251 and \$1,657, respectively. The Office of Education compared these figures to those of four west coast cities, chosen purely at random. Seattle per-pupil bonded indebtedness is only \$604; Tacoma, \$552; Spokane, \$705; San Diego, \$630—thus, in each case, Alaska's burden is double or more. As I have mentioned before, one-third of the State budget goes for education—we are building schools at an unprecedented rate, and will continue to do so with all the resources within our means, but the proposed cutbacks in impacted aid funds will severely damage our efforts. Alaska will lose about \$4 million in payments to school districts and another half a million in construction funds. In terms of teachers, at an average salary of \$8,000—it would mean that we would have to make do with 500 fewer teachers—this we cannot afford—this money must be restored to the 1967 budget.

Yesterday, Congress approved a \$4.8 billion money bill to prosecute a wholly unnecessary war in southeast Asia—is it not obvious that our Federal school aid payments are going to be spent for guns? This is but another of the bitter fruits borne by the malignant weed of war.

Alaska has long been considered to be a potential giant among the States in the richness of its undeveloped natural resources—and the richest of all of these resources is our youth—the youth that will become tomorrow's leaders. We have both a duty and a responsibility to equip them with the best that is obtainable to insure competence in that future leadership—competence that will enable them to avoid the tragic follies in which we have become involved.

Is it not enough that we ask our youth to bear the burden of fighting a wholly unjustifiable war in Vietnam?

Must we also insist that their most uniquely valuable asset—a good education—be shortchanged?

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from Alaska. As he will see as I proceed with my speech on the budget and educational needs, the administration has made cuts not only in impacted area money, but in a good many vital areas in the field of education. In my judgment, this action is tarnishing the whole image of the Great Society and turning it into an empty, meaningless, preaching.

As far as the Senator from Oregon is concerned, this administration is going to have to advance proof that it has not advanced in the President's budget message to justify the program of cutbacks in this field. These cutbacks are, in effect, stabs in the back of the educational forces of this country. I say to the educators, you had better be on your guard, because if the administration succeeds in getting its budget cuts sustained in the Congress, the great progress we have been accomplishing with the great leap forward under President Kennedy will be lost.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the Senator not feel that it is one of the most tragic ironies in our history that, after the magnificent legislative record of this administration and this Congress in the 1st session of the 89th Congress, we are now going to have all that undone?

Mr. MORSE. The fact is that the whole program is rapidly become a tragic irony.

THE BUDGET AND EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have hesitated for some time in commenting upon the budget for fiscal year 1967 with respect to the provisions made therein to fund the wealth of legislation which has been added in recent years to our statute books. Adequate funding of our existing laws aiding education is a problem which deeply concerns me as the chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. My subcommittee as it considered each of the proposals had the responsibility of recommending to the Senate and to the Congress what, in our judgment, was the best support we could give at that time to every facet of the American educational system from kindergarten through graduate school.

The dominant philosophy which has underlain our efforts in this area has been to provide, either directly or indirectly, for the needs, not of an administrative hierarchy, but rather for the educational needs of our young citizens. It was our hope that we could, through each of our measures, help to erect an interlocking and interdependent system of financial aids through which the Federal Government could supplement, but not supplant, the funding of activities of our public and private educational systems in the realm of higher education and our public systems at the elementary and secondary levels.

Thus, for example, we built upon the

foundation of previous legislation such as the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Public Laws 815 and 874 of 1950, the Smith-Hughes Act and other vocational education aid measures going back to 1917, as well as the great foundation act for higher education in America which was signed by President Lincoln, in 1862, the Morrill Act. What we strove to do in each instance was to build upon the foundation of experience under older statutes, new programs which were the outgrowth of the old, and which, in our judgment, complemented but did not supplant the older laws. That this was our intention, I think, was made abundantly and explicitly clear in one instance, which took place on September 2, 1965, when in the course of making legislative history on the title IV insured loan program of the Higher Education Act of 1965, I was asked by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], whether by the new authority it was our intention that the guaranteed loans by banks under title IV would in any degree slow down or lessen our commitment to the National Defense Education Act title II direct loan program. As set forth on page 21859 of the RECORD of that debate, my reply was as follows:

My answer to the question is (that) the insured loan program set forth in the bill does not in any way signal either an elimination of the National Defense Education Act loan program under title II or amend it by weakening it in any respect.

I then went on to point out how the direct loan program with its cancellation features for teacher recruitment incentive purposes distinguished it clearly from other programs, and I concluded by saying in the course of making this legislative history:

The Senator has nothing to worry about so far as continuation of the National Defense Education Act loan program is concerned.

The statement I made at that time was my best understanding of the intent of the committee and my thought as to the intent of the administration.

I wish to say that that was the intent of the administration at that time. We worked closely with the administration and with its educational officials in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on that measure.

As will be seen shortly in my speech, I am utterly surprised, filled with amazement, and aghast that this administration, in my opinion, is walking out on the commitment that I had the perfect right to make as the spokesman for this administration, as its manager on the floor of the Senate, when the insured loan program under title IV of the Higher Educational Act of 1965 was passed in this body.

I am therefore somewhat shocked to learn from page 428 of the appendix to the budget for fiscal 1967 that the private credit market is expected to supply loan capital through guarantee programs, authorized in the Higher Education Act of 1965, subsidized by the Federal Government, to replace the \$190 million authorized in the title II student loan provision in the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

March 2, 1966

may involve a strengthening and diffusion of higher education capacity for research activity over the long run?

Second. Is the current general support of American universities enabling additional universities to advance their capacity for research activity?

Third. What are the social and economic effects of this concentration of research and development programs?

These are questions of the greatest importance to the Nation—to generations ahead. They are by no means limited to those people who now reside in these 12 States. They are by no means limited to an area of 12 States which today produces 35 percent of the Nation's manufactured goods with 28.6 percent of its population.

They are by no means limited to an area of 12 States which today produces 34.4 percent of the Nation's doctoral degrees from 28.6 percent of the Nation's population.

These questions must be answered to give shape, and form, and balance to this Nation's future for all the years ahead.

I am sending to the desk a resolution asking that an agency of Government given the responsibility for appraising our scientific resources make a study and report to the Congress a feasible plan for equitable direction of Federal research and development funds. This agency, the National Science Foundation, was charged from inception to "appraise the impact of research upon industrial development and upon the general welfare." It was further charged to "strengthen basic research and education in the sciences and to avoid undue concentration of such research and education."

The 15th annual report of the National Science Foundation gives further and full recognition to this original mandate in accepting the burden of science resources planning and in the commendable statement prefacing that report by its director, Leland J. Haworth.

I know so well, as a Member of this body during all the postwar years of the explosion of science, as a member of this body's Committee on Space, and as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, that the solution does not rest in simple arithmetic nor in per capita distribution of research dollars. Yet I know that, unless we find a formula for a feasible and responsible distribution of a significant portion of those 15 to 20 billions spent annually in research, we are victims of a trend which soon will escape reversal.

We will accept a population erosion which will concentrate our talents, our industries, and our people in narrow and hopelessly confined areas of this broad and beautiful land.

I ask that the resolution which I now send to the desk remain there for 10 calendar days for cosponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will remain at the desk as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 231) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

S. RES. 231

Resolved, That the National Science Foundation is requested to formulate and transmit to the Congress at the earliest practicable date its recommendations for such changes in—

(1) the laws under which research and development funds are granted, loaned, or otherwise made available by departments or agencies of the Government to institutions of higher learning for scientific or educational purposes; or

(2) the administration of such laws; as may be necessary and desirable to provide for a more equitable distribution of such funds to all qualified institutions of higher learning to avoid the concentration of such activities in any geographical area and to ensure a continuing reservoir of scientific and teaching skills and capacities throughout the several States.

VIETNAM AND RHODESIA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Vietnam and Rhodesia are half a world apart. But there is a reason why we should think of them together, in one particular connection.

This is what I want to discuss for a short time today.

In South Vietnam we are fighting a war to preserve the independence of that little country.

Britain is waging an economic war against Rhodesia to force that little country, which only recently declared its independence, to come back under British domination.

We are helping Britain in her Rhodesian struggle; but Britain is not helping us in South Vietnam. This epitomizes our relationships, today, with many of our allies. But since time is limited, I shall confine my discussion today to the United States and Vietnam, and Britain and Rhodesia.

It has been said, and rightly said, that this country has a commitment in South Vietnam. But so does Britain have a commitment.

The United Kingdom is one of the eight signatories to the SEATO pact, and has exactly the same obligations under that pact that the United States has. England's interest in preserving South Vietnam from engulfment by the Communists should be as great as our own.

We should be able to count upon substantial help from England, in our efforts to preserve the independence of South Vietnam, but we have not been getting it and there is no prospect that we will get it.

Yet Britain is getting our help in her efforts to destroy the independence of Rhodesia.

Just for background, let me portray the Rhodesian situation briefly.

Rhodesia declared its independence from Great Britain on November 11, 1965. Prime Minister Harold Wilson immediately characterized the action as "illegal" and "treasonable."

The declaration followed by slightly more than a month the rejection by Prime Minister Wilson of a demand by Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian D. Smith—in London discussions October 4 to 8, 1965—for immediate independence for the self-governing British possession.

Rhodesia's area is 153,330 square miles. Her population is slightly over 4 million, of which about 250,000 are white; about 1 white to each 15 blacks. The whites presently control the Rhodesian Government. Prime Minister Wilson declared independence would not be granted unless Rhodesia expanded African representation—now limited to 15 in the 65-member legislature—to pave the way for what he called true majority rule.

Economic sanctions by Britain promptly followed the Rhodesian declaration of independence. Rhodesian Prime Minister Smith was suspended November 12 by Sir Humphrey Gibbs, the Queen's representative. Then on November 17, Smith announced he had suspended Gibbs.

Britain also announced it would suspend all aid to Rhodesia, ban exports to Rhodesia, expel Rhodesia from the Sterling area, ban purchases of tobacco and sugar, and deny Rhodesia access to the London money market.

On November 12, 1965, the Security Council of the United Nations by a vote of 10 to 0, with France abstaining, called on all nations to refrain from rendering aid or recognition to what was termed "this illegal racist minority regime in Southern Rhodesia."

The United States thereupon declared an arms embargo on Rhodesia, announced it would discourage investment or travel in the country, and canceled Rhodesia's sugar quota.

On December 18, 1965, the U.S. Government advised all its citizens to comply with the British embargo on oil shipments to Rhodesia.

On December 28 the U.S. Department of Commerce prohibited the export of gasoline, kerosene, and other petroleum products to Rhodesia, without a validated export license, and announced that its general policy would be to deny such licenses.

The U.S. Government put pressure on American manufacturers who purchase raw materials from Rhodesia, and as a result various imports from Rhodesia have been discontinued. Imports of asbestos and lithium were discontinued on January 10. The State Department has been attempting to persuade American users of chrome to stop buying Rhodesian chrome or chrome ore, and it was recently reported that such purchases had been suspended. This seems a particularly shortsighted move, because in recent years nearly one-third of all chrome used in the United States has come from Rhodesia. Chromium is a material in short supply here, as well as being a strategic material; and the State Department's position in seeking a voluntary cutoff of Rhodesian chrome imports into this country seems hard to justify in the light of our own national interest.

The United States has not been a completely innocent bystander during the development, in recent years, of increased racial tensions in Rhodesia. Lest it be forgotten, let me recall an incident of about 4 years ago.

John K. Emmerson, U.S. consul general at Salisbury, Rhodesia, was recalled in March 1962, after 17 months in

March 2, 1966

I serve on the committee as a regular Republican member. Just this morning, we met and agreed on a well qualified step with the Government scientific background, to proceed in an orderly fashion to put the whole problem before Congress, first of all, by identifying all research grants which have been made.

As members of the Finance Committee and of the Committee on Appropriations, we have difficulty, sometimes, in this whole field, because of the problem of overlapping and duplicating research projects, in not being able to find where they are.

Thus, we are going to create an inventory and find out just how far the Government has gone into the research contract and grant business, find out where the contracts have been made, where contracts have been granted, or where the work is being done and then move into the direction of trying to get a more equitable distribution of projects into the educational areas where we have talent.

I therefore congratulate the Senator from Nebraska on the fact that while this has been discussed a great many times, and while it has grown into a seriousness which has caused us to create the special subcommittee to study the problem in depth, the Senator from Nebraska has come up with the one practical suggestion which can serve as a guideline by providing that the National Science Foundation assume the responsibility of working up some formula to propose to Congress. I believe that this is a step in the right direction and with the background of information which will come out of the study being made by this newly created subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, the testimony in the hearings, and the field investigations, I am sure that Representatives and Senators will be able better to evaluate this formula which will, I hope, eventuate from the very constructive suggestion which the Senator from Nebraska has made.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that he has selected an agency with some experience in this matter. As the Senator from Nebraska will remember, the Senator from South Dakota and I were the authors of a bill to create the National Science Foundation, followed with a request on handling appropriations after it was created. The Senator from South Dakota and I found, in the early days of the National Science Foundation, that they did not have quite as much money as they have now, but we found that about 70 percent of all their grants was going to one area of the country—I need not mention the area.

Mr. MUNDT. Near the growing of beautiful ivy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, the ivy area. We did not do this deliberately.

Mr. CURTIS. No.

Mr. MUNDT. Right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We felt that we should keep it from spreading. They did. They went about it. Mr. Waterman finally went about creating a broader spread. He has not created it, or done as well as we would probably have liked, but they have done pretty well.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator suggested that what they have done was to create a "low-priced spread," and we are over in the "high-priced spread."

Mr. MAGNUSON. They created the "low-priced spread," that is true, but there is a spin-off to this thing that we are always talking about; namely, the shortage of personnel in the field who, when they are trained, whether it be by Government grants, privately, or both, go off in another direction, and we consequently suffer from a severe lack of teachers who stay.

We have found from experience, and so has the National Science Foundation, that where we give some of these grants to the smaller colleges—we have them in our State, but in the Middle West there are great numbers of them—there is something about the smaller college atmosphere when they receive this grant—rather than the hustle-bustle of a large technical school in which students are given interviews for jobs by big corporations, and so forth—that the smaller college student is more inclined to wish to go into the teaching field. But it proves something, too, in these grants. So that I suggest that the National Science Foundation has learned, through hard experience, to try at least to do what the Senator is suggesting. The Senator has picked an agency which has had a great deal of background in this field.

Mr. CURTIS. I am well aware of that, and I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for having pioneered in this field in the creation of the National Science Foundation. I am sure that it enjoys a fine reputation throughout the academic world. They are qualified, if any agency is, to reduce to a formula some way to distribute these funds so that it will not just be happenstance, or rest entirely upon the competence of particular individuals who happen to be making the decision at the time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to commend the able and distinguished Senator from Nebraska for offering this resolution. If he has no objection, I should be pleased to join as a cosponsor.

Mr. CURTIS. I would be most happy to have the Senator from South Carolina added as a cosponsor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to join as a cosponsor to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a great many people have felt for a long

time that something along this line needed to be done. It is my hope that the resolution will be passed and that action will be taken on it soon.

There is no question, as was mentioned by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] a few moments ago, that a large percentage of contracts for research have gone to a very small geographical area of the United States.

It seems to me that funds for these research projects come from all the people in all the States of the Nation. Therefore, as much as possible, there should be a more equitable distribution of these projects. I am convinced that we have able scientists, that we have many able educators, and many able people in the various States of the Nation. Practically every State in this Nation has one or more outstanding educational institutions. It seems to me they might be considered for some kind of project under this program, rather than concentrating the projects in one area of the Nation.

Again I wish to commend the able Senator from Nebraska for his work on this problem. It is my hope that it will bear fruit.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina very much for his comments.

Mr. President, in a recent presentation illustrating the desirability of locating an important Federal structure in the Middle West of association noted:

Fourteen percent of Health, Education, and Welfare research and development expenditures at universities in 1964 were committed to universities located in New York, nearly 12 percent to universities located in California, and nearly 8 percent to universities located in Massachusetts.

Thirty-nine percent of Atomic Energy Commission research and development expenditures at universities in 1964 were committed to universities in California and nearly 20.5 percent to universities in New Mexico.

Sixty-nine percent of National Aeronautics and Space Administration research and development expenditures at universities in 1964 were committed to universities in California. This is the impact of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

Fifteen percent of all National Science Foundation grants to universities in 1964 went to universities in California, nearly 12 percent to universities in New York and nearly 10 percent to universities in Massachusetts.

The total expenditures for research and development at universities by these five major groupings of Federal agencies—Defense, HEW, AEC, NASA, and NSF—amounted to \$1.6 of the \$1.7 billion of Federal expenditures for research and development activities at universities in 1964.

At the conclusion of this notation these three questions are asked:

First. Is the current geographical distribution of Federal research and development grants and contracts at American universities meeting the major program objectives of Federal agencies, especially as these program objectives

that post, as a result of charges by Roy Welensky, then Rhodesian Prime Minister, that after appointment of G. Menen Williams as the U.S. State Department's African expert, U.S. representatives in Rhodesia had abandoned their "traditional line of noninvolvement in Rhodesian internal affairs" and had "pursued a line of not oversubtle alignment with African Nationalists."

Specific charges included these:

First. That the U.S. Information Agency had issued films and literature which "appeared to incite Africans to greater efforts to combat or boycott the federal and Southern Rhodesian systems of government."

Second. That certain films offered by USIA contained "scenes and episodes from past wars of liberation" coupled with "reminders that Africans, too, are struggling for their independence."

Third. That in Nyasaland, "American consular cars frequently have gotten mixed up in car processions of the Malawi Congress Party, making it appear as if U.S. officials and Malawi partisans are riding toward independence together."

Fourth. That in Southern Rhodesia, American consular men "have also been in close touch with Mr. Joshua Nkomo's Zambia movement." This liaison with Nkomo, it was charged, had been carried on "by both Americans and locally recruited African consular staff of U.S. diplomatic missions."

Sir Roy Welensky in June of 1962 ascribed what he called the present truculence of African leaders partly at least to American and United Nations encouragement.

Dissatisfaction was also expressed by the Rhodesians over the size of the U.S. diplomatic mission, which had a staff of nearly 200 persons, most of them locally employed Africans, and which was larger than any other diplomatic mission in the Federation, and even larger than the British High Commission in Rhodesia. These figures covered the two U.S. consulates in Lusaka and Zomba, as well as the Consulate General in Salisbury.

Throughout Africa, new countries have proliferated as the rising tide of black nationalism has spread across that continent. Every time a group of partially educated, half-savage tribes has constituted an alleged government and declared its country free and independent, we have been pressured by an unreasoning fear of world opinion into immediate recognition of that government. These new, unstable, little so-called countries are immediately admitted to the United Nations where each is given a voting strength the same as our own in that international body. We are told that under no circumstances must force be used to retain or recapture any of these newly declared independencies as territories or dominions of one of the civilized nations of the world.

But when Rhodesia declared its independence, there was a vast cry that force must be used to restore British control; and representatives of the United Kingdom at the United Nations were snubbed

and insulted because Britain had not used immediate force to destroy Rhodesian independence.

Does that sound like a double standard? In reality it is not. It is a single standard. The basic principle is increased power for the blacks; but no increased power for the whites.

The first white settlements in central Africa were made only 75 years ago. If we want to understand how the white Rhodesians feel, it may help to imagine how the early settlers in any State of our Union would have felt at being told, 75 years after settlement of the State began, that they should turn over their government to the Indian because they were the true majority.

As I have pointed out, the United States is aiding the British embargo on shipments to Rhodesia, and our State Department has even gone so far as to put pressure upon American users of chrome to halt purchases from Rhodesia, in spite of the fact that chrome is a critical metal in short supply in this country. But in agreeing to do all this, the United States has not obtained any agreement from Britain to assist us in an embargo or blockade against North Vietnam.

In fact, it does not even appear that our State Department sought such an agreement from Britain when we agreed to help Britain against Rhodesia.

This country has the necessary naval and air strength to enforce a sea blockade against North Vietnam. Those who argue against such a blockade make it a main point of their argument that Britain would not recognize the blockade, and, therefore, that we would be in trouble with our greatest ally if we should attempt to set up such a blockade. Sometimes, more euphemistically, those who argue along this line say that our allies would not recognize the blockade.

It is not at all certain that this is true. Perhaps the announcement of a blockade would give Britain a basis for cutting off trade which she now feels she must maintain in order to avoid offense to the Red Chinese, by whose sufferance alone Hong Kong is permitted to remain British territory.

Only 2 days ago the Commerce Department clamped controls on all exports from this country to Rhodesia. Perhaps there would be resistance by certain interests in the United Kingdom to similar action by that nation with respect to North Vietnam.

But since the United States is cutting off our shipments to and purchases from Rhodesia, in order to help Britain bring that turbulent dominion back under its control, why should we not ask Britain to help us cut off shipments of goods and supplies into North Vietnam, in aid of a defense against Communist aggression which is important to the whole free world?

One thing seems perfectly clear: we should not be asked to hold off on blockading North Vietnam because of any consideration for the British or their feelings about the matter.

If a blockade will help us in our struggle against Communist forces in South

Vietnam, if it will help us to shorten the months and the years during which American fighting men must be kept in South Vietnam, if it will reduce in any degree the grisly total which eventually will represent our total casualties in South Vietnam, then a blockade must be undertaken, and the sooner the better.

The weight of the evidence so far adduced supports the conclusion that a blockade will help accomplish these objectives.

The conclusion seems inescapable that, unless there are important facts concealed from us, this country is not doing all it can to win in South Vietnam, and will not be doing so until a blockade of North Vietnam has been set up and made effective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able editorial entitled "On the U.S. Policy Toward Rhodesia," which appeared in the Vicksburg Evening Post, of Vicksburg, Miss., on Monday, February 28, 1966.

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

ON THE U.S. POLICY TOWARD RHODESIA

The Commerce Department announced Saturday it is putting controls on all U.S. exports to Southern Rhodesia, and said this action would have the effect of cutting off virtually all exports of importance to the economy of that African country. Previously the United States had put an embargo on arms, military equipment and all petroleum into Rhodesia. Exports to Rhodesia in 1964 were reported at about \$21 million, with the principal export items being construction machinery, transport equipment, textiles, paper and wheat. Now, practically everything we exported into Rhodesia comes under the controls.

It just doesn't follow correct reasoning to adopt such a course against Rhodesia. First of all, it injects our country into the internal affairs of another nation; second, the quarrel between Britain and Rhodesia is none of our business, and we should not take sides in what should be a family affair; third, we, too, broke away from Britain, and proclaimed our independence, and we might, at least, have some sympathy with Rhodesia; fourth, this is the modern day, when all ties with colonialism must be broken, and so Rhodesia should be as entirely free and independent, and should have the same right to freedom and independence as the other African nations which have blossomed out in recent years; but finally, and most important, there is absolutely no basis for us to accede to Britain's wishes for economic sanctions against Rhodesia, when that same Britain insists on doing business with Cuba and North Vietnam and Red China, all of which are our mortal enemies. If, indeed, Britain had any claim whatever on our friendship, then she should be an ally in fact, by refraining from helping out those who are arrayed against our Nation.

If the Members of the Senate of the United States want something to really argue about, they should turn their attention away from Vietnam, and turn their oratorical guns against our administration policy in Rhodesia. There is fertile ground for sound and serious protest, whereas no such ground now exists in Vietnam. We are being played for the proverbial sucker in Rhodesia, while we do nothing to make our supposed allies desist from trade with our enemies. There is justification for an all-out protest against our Rhodesian policy.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a Department of Transportation. Introduction of the bill is at the request of the President and the executive department of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill would establish a 12th Cabinet Department. This is not a new proposal. The Commerce Committee of the Senate considered a similar proposal for a Department of Transportation in hearings held as far back as 1948. The matter of a Department of Transportation had been before many Congresses prior to that time. I have personal knowledge of the hearings in 1948.

Since 1948, the proposal to establish a Transportation Cabinet Department has been brought up on many occasions, and many study groups have been appointed by the executive department, and by Congress itself, which have recommended such an establishment.

The Commerce Committee's Special Study Group on Transportation Policies in 1961 suggested that a Transportation Department be established.

As I recall, the opening part of the so-called Hoover Commission proposals on reorganization of the Government suggested a Department of Transportation.

Over 5 years ago President Eisenhower recommended to the Congress that such a Department be created. Of course, the need for such a Department has been growing since that time.

President Johnson in his state of the Union message pointed out that such a Department of Transportation is needed to bring together our transportation activities. He stated that the present structure—35 Government agencies, spending \$5 billion yearly—makes it impossible to serve either the growing demands of the Nation, the needs of the industry, or the right of the taxpayer to full efficiency and frugality.

The Congress in the exercise of its power to regulate commerce is vitally interested in insuring that the needs of commerce—communities, shippers, users, and carriers—for a safe, efficient, equitable, and balanced transportation network are served.

The geography of this country makes transportation more important to the economic scheme of this country than to any other country in the world, because of the land mass of the United States and the nature of our economy.

Expedient and effective decision on this bill would be facilitated if the administration would transmit to Congress the factual studies and underlying data on which this recommendation is based.

That, I understand, will be done quickly.

It has been a perennial problem in the field of transportation legislation to subject value judgments and opinions to factual analysis because the facts have

not been readily available. Prompt receipt of this information will enable Congress not only to make a prompter decision, but also a better one.

Today the President has sent to Congress a message on transportation. Accompanying this organizational reform of one of the most vital aspects of governmental activities is the President's Transportation Message.

We have, of course, the best transportation system in the world. It has its flaws. But it is the only completely private enterprise transportation system in the world. Most countries have either government-owned transportation, or the government completely controls transportation and finances it wholly or in major part.

Although we have many flaws, we have a good system. Sometimes it is a marvel to me that it survives as a private enterprise. But it has flourished as a result of private initiative and endeavor. It has also grown with the encouragement and support of various governmental programs. I do not think that we should forget these aspects.

These programs of the government are widely dispersed and uncoordinated. Lately we have begun to aid our transportation system by research.

The bill which I have just introduced on automotive safety carries out that trend in order that we might have greater safety on our highways.

The President has alluded to 35 different departments and agencies involved in transportation, and stated that these programs involve vast sums of Federal money.

Transportation is so much an integral part of our economy, and so important to our economy, that few people realize that transportation activities comprise about one-fourth of the gross national product of this country. It is big business.

We hope that by this bill, the Federal role in transportation will be given a truly national and meaningful effect. If we are ever to achieve a coordinated national transportation system we must reorient and redirect these many programs. The exploding population and economic growth of the Nation demand that we bring some order to the structure of the Federal Government as it is presently organized to deal with transportation.

If we fail to do so now it is obvious the task will become immeasurably more difficult in the future, for transportation needs and problems were multiply.

The importance of transportation as an element of the complex interrelationships of our economic system is increasing daily. Yet there is no one in the present Government organization, other than the President himself, who has authority to coordinate many aspects of Federal transportation policies and programs. The independent regulatory agencies, such as the CAB, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and others, are not able under present law to take such action efficiently and effectively. For our part, we can legislate, but we do not administer.

It is a fact of governmental life that

transportation functions have not kept abreast of current or future requirements. Any projection into the future will confirm that conclusion.

If congressional transportation mandates are to meet the needs of the public, we must exercise foresight. This Nation must be assured of strong leadership in promoting advances in transportation technology for fast, efficient, economical service.

The bill attempts, and its objective is, to resolve these matters.

Departmental status would be conferred on those activities which represent the preponderance of government money and personnel concerned with transportation.

The key modes are the Bureau of Public Roads, which today is next to the Department of Defense as the second largest business in the world.

The Federal Aviation Agency which deals with the sensitive problem of airplane safety is another. It now costs us almost three-quarters of a billion dollars to operate this agency in order to keep the safety features of our airplanes intact and up to date. The FAA would be included in the proposed Department of Transportation.

The Maritime Administration—that is, the Maritime Administrator in the Department of Commerce which now has a single head as distinguished from the Maritime Commission, which has other functions—will also be transferred. There are provisions for integrating our merchant marine into this new department. It will bring the merchant marine into proper relationship with other forms of transportation, rather than operating by itself.

My friend from Oregon and I are interested in the proposed transfer of the Coast Guard into the new department.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, would the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. The Coast Guard renders invaluable service in Alaska, as it does in other parts of the Union. But there is no State in which the service of the Coast Guard is more valued and highly regarded than it is in Alaska. Our people are so glad to see them going out saving lives. It is one of the most cherished things that we have.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As an aid to water operations.

Mr. GRUENING. And I hope that nothing is done to impair its usefulness.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Also transferred is the Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation and its existing responsibilities.

This is a complex and major piece of legislation. It is probably the most important in many years in this field. Because of all of the activities that it covers no one will suggest, not even the chairman, that the bill should not be modified. There will be some portions that need to be corrected and some that may be opposed by Members of Congress. The administration has no particular pride of authorship. They are sending it up to make a start toward a Department of Transportation.

participation in the Asian Development Bank. It is an act of opportunity, which will enable the United States, together with 30 other nations, to join as charter members in a new venture of cooperation to promote economic growth in the poor countries of Asia. It is an act of promise, offering economic and political cooperation between countries which share a determination to raise the living standards of the impoverished peoples of Asia.

While offering opportunity and promise, the agreement to establish the Asian Development Bank, to which H.R. 12563 relates, will provide the foundation for a sound financial institution. It is clearly the product of careful and able work of representatives of different countries joined by a high common purpose, and the United States can be justly proud of its participation.

The Asian Development Bank is modeled in many important respects on the highly successful World Bank. Its constitution reflects also the devoted attention and wise counsel provided by Eugene Black, an eminent international economic statesman whose stewardship of the World Bank for a decade and a half contributed so much to its success.

Those who formulated this agreement can take pride in a well-wrought charter for an effective financial institution which will serve great purposes. They can also find pride in the remarkable response by subscribing countries to the authorized capital of \$1 billion. The countries of Asia have pledged very nearly \$650 million and 12 countries outside the Asian region are contributing \$350 million including the \$200 million pledged by the United States.

Under the leadership of the President, and following his great speech in Baltimore, the United States has played a distinguished role in helping to build this new institution. It is our task here today to follow through.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, at this moment the nations of Asia stand at a turning point in the course of their affairs. They are about to embark on a new enterprise that may, over time, mean the difference between starvation and plenty; between misery and well-being for many millions in that vast region.

This new enterprise is the Asian Development Bank, to which the United States and other advanced countries have been asked to give support. H.R. 12563 responds to this appeal by authorizing U.S. membership in the Asian Development Bank with a subscription of \$200 million. I rise to give my full support to this legislation.

We will not be alone in our response. Of total authorized Bank capital of \$1 billion, \$650 million will come from 19 Asian nations themselves, including \$200 million from Japan, and more than \$100 million from Australia and New Zealand. The remaining \$350 million is being subscribed by 12 countries outside Asia, \$150 million of which will come from countries other than the United States. Germany, for example, is subscribing \$34 million, the United Kingdom \$30 million, Canada \$25 million, and Italy \$20 million. Overall, our contribution repre-

sents only 25 percent of the Bank's hard-currency subscriptions. Our role is essential to the Bank's success, but we are not being called on to bear the major burden.

The facts of war and economic backwardness in Asia today speak plainly of the need for a regional institution to further economic development. I am deeply impressed with the extent to which these facts have been taken to heart in this country and by the degree and depth of support for H.R. 12563. This bill was reported unanimously by committees in both houses, and passed the other body by a margin of 3 to 1. Public expressions of support have reflected a broad range of opinion, and include the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Federation of Labor, the National Foreign Trade Council, the American Bankers Association, the Investment Bankers Association, the Cooperative League and the League of Women Voters.

I particularly wish to point out that the articles of agreement of the Asian Bank by no means confine its operations to support of projects in the public sector. This new Bank will have full powers to make loans, or guarantee loans by others, to productive private enterprises in member countries, and, after it has been determined that the Bank is in a position to do so, to make equity investments in private enterprises. The Bank will also be able to assist in underwriting security issues of private firms in member countries, thereby contributing to the development of local capital markets and the mobilization of domestic capital. And, since it will in future years float bond issues and make portfolio sales in private capital markets, the Bank will further facilitate the international flow of private funds.

Very careful consideration has been given to the possible effect of the subscription obligations authorized in H.R. 12563 upon our balance of payments. The Secretary of the Treasury has stated that the balance-of-payments effect of our subscription will be minimal, amounting to not more than \$10 million in the first year. Over a longer period, procurement in the United States financed by Bank loans can be expected very largely to offset our subscription payments. Nor need we be fearful of large drains on our capital market by the Bank. The Bank's articles specify that no securities may be issued except with the consent of the country where the issue is to take place, and that the Bank must follow the principle of diversifying its borrowing sources. The assurances of the administration and the safeguards built into the articles provide an ample basis on which to give this legislation a clean bill of health on balance-of-payments grounds.

Mr. President, much has been said in this Chamber about the role of the United States in Asia, and the importance of our making it known that we seek neither territorial gain nor military domination of the nations of that area. If we are serious about associating ourselves with the works of peace in Asia;

if we are truly committed to efforts to grapple with the economic and human problems that beset that area; if we wish to help Asians to find their way through their current trials; then H.R. 12563 provides us with the vehicle to achieve these ends.

I intend to heed the President's call in his great speech at Baltimore. I will vote for this bill and for the cause of peace it represents. I urge each of you to join me.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I would like the RECORD to show my opposition to Senate approval of this proposal. The Asian Development Bank is but one additional method by which the United States funnels foreign aid to virtually all the countries of the world. As is the case with banks of this type, the United States cannot exercise control over which countries are eligible to receive loans and other forms of financial and technical assistance. Eligible countries, such as Mongolia, have forms of government and political philosophies completely alien to those of our own people, and I consider it inconsistent with the best interest of our country to support, financially or otherwise, governments of this type.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 12563) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

REPORT BY SENATOR TYDINGS ON VISIT TO VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in his news bulletin to his constituents of February 1966, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] reports on his visit to Vietnam during the last congressional adjournment. The Senator supplies a most informative personal account of his experiences and observations. One does not have to agree with every detail in order to recognize this report to be a very useful contribution to public understanding of the Vietnamese problem.

I would address the Senate's attention particularly to the final section of the report, which is entitled "The Uncertain Future." It is a well-reasoned and temperate appraisal of the situation and the Senator's position with respect thereto. In setting it forth, Senator Tydings makes a significant contribution to public and Senate understanding of the Vietnamese problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bulletin "On the Record," for February 1966, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being objection, the text of the bulletin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

March 2, 1966

ON THE RECORD

(By U.S. Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS)

(NOTE.—During the past congressional recess, I spent a week in South Vietnam as a member of a four-man delegation. Traveling almost constantly from 6 in the morning until late at night, we met with our frontline troops in every major area—the 3d Marine Division in Da Nang, the 1st Cavalry in An Khê, a special forces A team in Cai Lát. We crisscrossed the country several times, visiting refugee camps, Vietnamese villages, and a variety of installations. In addition to meetings in Saigon with General Westmoreland, Ambassador Lodge, and AID Administrator Mann, we talked with Premier Ky and other South Vietnamese officials, students, and villagers.

(Our soldiers are fighting in a land whose terrain, people, and traditions were almost unknown to us 10 years ago. Even today Vietnam is strange and little understood. The diplomatic terrain is equally uncertain. We must guess the intentions of Peiping; we are unsure of the policy of those in control in Hanoi; we do not know what influence Moscow exerts, nor how independent the Vietcong is from Hanoi. The political and military situations change so rapidly that we must continually reexamine our assumptions and refine our views.—JOE TYDINGS.)

THE TROUBLED PAST

South Vietnam is about the size of California with a population of approximately 14 million. For centuries these sturdy, handsome people have fought off Chinese efforts to conquer them. They still regard the Chinese as traditional enemies. In the 19th century, the French colonized Indochina and began nearly 100 years of unenlightened rule. In 1942, Japan invaded and occupied the country.

After World War II, the French wished to return to Vietnam, but Ho Chi Minh, a popular resistance fighter against the Japanese, was in control. Orderly transition from colonial rule to self-government was unsuccessful, and war broke out between the French and Ho's Vietminh forces. The war dragged on for 8 years, until the French were decisively defeated at Dienbienphu.

At the conference table in Geneva in 1954, an accord was reached whereby firing ceased and a line was drawn between the Communist north and the non-Communist south. Free elections under international supervision were to be held throughout Vietnam in 1956 to select a government for a unified Vietnam. The United States did not sign the Geneva accords, but endorsed it in principle. After the country was partitioned, almost 1 million citizens fled from the north to the south. Only 100,000 chose to move north.

A relatively free election was held in the South in 1955. Ngo Dinh Diem overwhelmingly defeated Bao Dai, the former French puppet Emperor. Diem refused to permit the unification elections unless Ho Chi Minh agreed to effective international supervision in North Vietnam. The elections were not held. Diem soon terminated the practice of electing local officials and appointed his own men. He persecuted the Buddhists, the Cao Dai, and other religious sects. He permitted corruption to flourish, jailed his political opponents, and failed to make even token economic and social reforms.

Considerable opposition to Diem had developed by the late 1950's. Guerrilla fighters set up shadow governments in the provinces and began to kill village officials. These guerrillas were aided by North Vietnam. At the Third Lao Dong Party Conference in Hanoi in December 1960, the National Liberation Front was proclaimed, and Communist assistance became official.

Since Diem's demise in 1963, there have been five governments. The present Premier, Nguyen Cao Ky, inherited a difficult situation, but during his few months in office, he

has displayed greater understanding of the political, economic and social problems of his country than his predecessors. He has permitted free elections in the Provinces and has devoted increasing attention to desperately needed programs of education and rural development. While our officials believe Ky to be personally honest, corruption and graft exist at lower echelons of government.

We began to aid South Vietnam in 1954. Predicated on the assumption that "needed reforms" would be undertaken, this aid was to be entirely economic. When the situation deteriorated, however, President Eisenhower sent military assistance. President Kennedy continued this assistance and gradually increased the number of advisers.

In February 1965, the Vietcong threatened to cut South Vietnam in half, roughly along Highway 19 from Pleiku to the coast. Our military force in Vietnam then numbered about 20,000—mostly advisers and technical personnel. President Johnson was confronted by the alternatives of complete collapse or dramatic increase in our military commitment. He chose the latter.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

To secure the entire nation will be a long and difficult task and will require a massive military commitment. Two-thirds of the highways are controlled by the Vietcong. Passage of troops and supplies is difficult by day and impossible at night. Saigon and many of our military bases are vulnerable to sabotage and harassment.

The Vietcong infrastructure is effective in approximately two-thirds of the villages. Although the Vietcong do not always occupy the villages, a few sympathizers maintain close communication with jungle fighting units and are able to bring down an attack on a village that refuses to pay taxes to the Vietcong or which cooperates with the Saigon government. Thousands of village schoolteachers and officials have been kidnaped and assassinated. In this fashion, the Vietcong exercises control over two-thirds of the land area of South Vietnam, though less than one-third of the people.

In addition to guerrillas, at least seven hard-core regiments have come down from North Vietnam. Almost all heavy fighting in recent months has been against these North Vietnamese regulars. The struggle is no longer a revolt or an insurgency; troops are trained, equipped, and shipped from the north.

War has left thousands of Vietnamese homeless. I visited six refugee camps and met with the minister of social welfare and our AID officials to discuss the staggering problems of feeding, clothing, educating, employing, and ultimately relocating these refugees. Though some progress has been made in this area, more often than not it has been a case of too little, too late. We must help these people not only for humanitarian reasons, but also because their political support is essential. I am encouraged by the President's recent clear commitment to the welfare of the Vietnamese refugees. The need is great and the problem grave.

The morale of our troops is extremely high. I spoke with many Maryland boys in every unit I visited. Despite some inevitable bottlenecks, our men are better trained and equipped than any soldiers in history. They have displayed incredible bravery and resourcefulness under extreme conditions.

Special Forces units have set up camps throughout the toughest Vietcong territory in South Vietnam. These isolated camps, built much like stockades of our frontier days, are manned by 2 U.S. officers and 10 enlisted men. Together with local villagers, they have repeatedly defended these small forts against powerful Vietcong sieges.

While the war goes on, our troops and AID officials are rebuilding this war-ravaged country. Our civic action program has been one of the most important—though least

reported—activities in South Vietnam. It was a great inspiration to see our troops helping the villagers to build schools and sanitation facilities, dispensing medicine to sick children, and instructing families in the use of soap. Medical companies attached to our line units are providing badly needed medical assistance to thousands of Vietnamese villagers and farmers. These activities are almost unprecedented in the history of modern warfare.

THE UNCERTAIN FUTURE

Politics is the art of choosing among available alternatives. We are confronted by three basic possibilities: escalation, withdrawal, or continuing to defend the territory we now occupy. War is hell, but the alternative of unilateral withdrawal is less acceptable. My visit convinced me that our fundamental commitment to help defend South Vietnam is a necessary one. I found that our help is generally wanted. A precipitous withdrawal now would mean the end of an independent South Vietnamese Government and the ultimate murder of tens of thousands who have fought Communist aggression. Withdrawal would bring incalculable pressure upon Thailand and the other small countries of southeast Asia. Eventually, India could lose her independence and thus her strength as a great democratic counterweight to China.

Our objectives are limited. We do not want territory or a military garrison in southeast Asia. We are not there to wage an aggressive war. We do not want to destroy North Vietnam, merely persuade it to stop making war against its neighbor. Our aim is simply to give the people of South Vietnam an opportunity freely to choose their own form of government.

I had hoped that we could achieve our objectives by negotiation. The response to President Johnson's peace offensive has been disappointing, but we must intensify the search for an acceptable solution. I support turning this matter over to the United Nations and would welcome a renewal of the Geneva Conference. I think we should be willing to negotiate with the National Liberation Front as well as the government of North Vietnam, and to accept free elections in South Vietnam as an ultimate political solution.

While the search for peace continues, we must devise an appropriate military and political strategy. I was doubtful that our bombings of North Vietnam were sufficiently useful from a military standpoint to justify the political risk of their resumption. I had hoped that the President would have been able to continue the bombing pause. But now that he has made his decision, we must support him insofar as conscience permits. He has far greater access to the relevant information. I hope and pray that this decision is correct.

We can best achieve our goals by continuing to help the South Vietnamese build their nation with some degree of peace and security. We must place greater emphasis upon economic development and social reform. Seventy percent of the people of South Vietnam live in territory defended by United States and South Vietnamese troops. If we can protect the people in these areas from harassment and terror, and, at the same time, help them to rebuild their economy, institute governmental reforms, and embark on a program of social justice, we will have achieved many of our objectives. Even this will not be easy. Barring the unexpected, American soldiers will be in South Vietnam for many years to come. Our AID mission faces untold problems in trying to build a modern nation in a backward, war-torn country.

But whatever the difficulties, I am gratified that we finally appear to be recognizing the importance of civic reform. In the long run,

the most important phase of this struggle will be fought in the schools, the hospitals, the rice fields of South Vietnam, rather than on the battlefields.

TAX ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when H.R. 12752, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, is reported by the Committee on Finance, it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to speak on a subject of considerable interest to a number of Senators. I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor, and that I may be recognized to continue my remarks following the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISTRIBUTION AMONG THE STATES OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a resolution, the object of which is a better geographical distribution of the research and development funds that are granted, loaned, or otherwise made available by the agencies of the Federal Government to our institutions of higher learning.

This is a sizable program. So far these funds have been overly concentrated in two or three areas. Many fine colleges and universities have been left out. Many States have been left out.

For many years, various groups and individuals have urged a decentralization of these Government expenditures. No one has come up with a sound formula to accomplish that objective. The resolution which I am introducing proposes that such a formula be developed and fixes the responsibility for writing such a formula.

The pace of change is the constant factor in our changing lives, and the days ahead will each be filled with new wonderment. The technological explosion of World War II started this pace which accelerates each year. The mind of the man of science seems to know no bounds as we add today's achievements to tomorrow's routine. With all these blessings of great material progress, we in the Congress must assume the stewardship of its burdens.

Today we must work to keep this pace of progress. Today we must work diligently to give a better direction to this pace of progress lest our population explosion be coupled with a population erosion. We can erode away the academic excellence of many areas of this great Nation. We can erode away a balance in our national productivity which is now dwindling. We can concentrate in a few centers those talents which are basic to education, to continuing development, and to future productivity.

For 20 years the Congress has given sincere expression, but unfortunately a general expression, to the need for a balanced development of our basic sciences. For years we have wrestled with this burden, and we have found it a tough one to pin down. I hope today to set in motion a pursuit of the specifics which can begin to bring equity into an imbalance which worsens each year.

The imbalance which must be righted is not only the increasing maldistribution of \$15 to \$20 billions of Federal research and development funds but the reversal of trends which this maldistribution has set in motion. Mind you, were we to delay this reversal for another decade, the Members of this body might be faced, in a score of years, with the fact that wide areas of this great Nation may then fail to possess the skills and the talents to perform useful research in the basic sciences. Our great institutions of higher learning, in vast areas, may be reduced in scope to schools of narrower pursuits. Our laboratories and kindred facilities will move away, and will not then our industries follow that pattern?

The power of the Federal Government to generate scientific and technological achievement must be harnessed in the absolute of feasibility to render a balanced achievement.

An expression of my concern is well exemplified by the recent formation of the Midwest Resources Association, a 12-State effort seeking fair and equitable distribution of our resources and our skills. Twenty-four Members of this body form a bipartisan committee to aid its work. My distinguished senior colleague from Nebraska serves on its executive committee.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I commend my colleague for his sponsorship of this resolution.

His reference to the Midwest Resources Association is most appropriate.

This young organization represents the heartland of America—Nebraska, the Dakotas, Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa, Ohio, Kansas, Missouri, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

A completely bipartisan group, its whole dedication is to the economic welfare of our region. It is directed by a steering committee made up of the 12 Governors, 6 Senators, and 6 Members of the House of Representatives. Together with the senior Senator from Ohio, it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the association's executive committee and to participate in the organization's development.

This association was conceived out of a realization that only by uniting the Midwest would we be able to compete with the more populous and better financed States. Recently, the association employed a full-time executive secretary and opened an office in Washington.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have long been concerned about our ability to manage the research and development activities of the Federal Government. These programs have grown in the past two decades out of all proportion to any other segment of the national budget.

Just before World War II, the Government spent a mere \$75 million on science and technology annually. Today the figure is between \$15 and \$20 billion.

No one argues with the need for intensive programs of science, research, and technology. We still have vast frontiers to conquer. No one wants to put a price tag on the cure for cancer, the common cold, or heart disease. No one fails to recognize the literal life-and-death seriousness of maintaining our military strength.

That is not the point. The point is whether the Congress is intelligently providing ample funds for all these efforts and whether the Nation's scientific and technological resources are being properly utilized.

Many of these programs—and the justification for their funding—have not been based on any particular logic or rationale. They have, like Topsy, "just grown."

We had a striking example of this last year in the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee. Our distinguished chairman, Senator HOLLAND, insisted on a thoroughgoing analysis of research carried on by the Department of Agriculture.

While some progress was made and we have a better view of the Department's research effort than before, much remains to be done. What is indicated is a thorough overhaul which will provide the tools, the background, and the know-how to treat the entire research field and not just a narrow segment.

I commend the Senator for his concern with this problem and for his effort to bring something concrete out of the often expressed desire to make progress in this field.

May I say, Mr. President, that I think it would be difficult to find anyone more

March 2, 1966

qualified and experienced to pursue this resolution than the Senator from Nebraska, because of his long tenure in Congress, his membership on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and on the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and his activity, through the years, on the Government Operations Committee. It is with pleasure that I join him in this resolution as one of its cosponsors, and it is my hope that many other Senators will see fit to do the same.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator. I am fully aware that a proper distribution of these funds is a difficult task.

I have a very high regard for the National Science Foundation. It is Government oriented. I believe it is qualified to make a study, take a little time, and bring in a formula that will do justice to the programs undertaken and will, at the same time, help decentralize those activities from a geographical standpoint.

The industries of tomorrow will be located where the scientific complexes are now being located, and Congress has an obligation to do equity and justice in determining where this money is being spent, loaned, or given.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is not the situation sometimes aggravated by this type of occurrence: The necessity for some crash program will make its appearance. In the area of that project, there are certain well-known, outstanding institutions for example, educational institutions, which exist and have been active in the field. Without an organization like the National Science Foundation to make a complete appraisal of the available talent and facilities the nation over, there is always a tendency to say, "Well, college X or university X having done this in the past, let us give them this project, too."

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Not being aware of many facilities which would be equally good and perhaps even better, because of not having an overall schedule and for other reasons: and yet the National Science Foundation would have knowledge that would enable a decision to be made, which would take into consideration not only decentralization, but also other factors which would attach to other potential places for location.

Mr. CURTIS. I thoroughly agree with the Senator.

In addition, I should like to point out that when they pass over a well-qualified institution of higher learning, oftentimes that institution is unable to hold its scientific talent; it loses some of its talent to the areas that do get the grants, and the cycle picks up more and more, with the result of having Government funds injure one area to the advantage of another.

Mr. HRUSKA. The trend feeds on itself and keeps going.

Mr. CURTIS. Exactly. I thank the distinguished Senator.

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

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, not only for yielding, but also for bringing up this very important resolution he has before us now.

I remember some years ago talking to the National Cryogenics Association in Boulder, Colo., about some of the problems involved in Government support of research.

I believe at that time approximately 80 to 85 percent of the total funds being spent on scientific research were being generated out of the Federal Government, and I pointed out to them that in the process of continuing on this type of emphasis, unless something were done, it was bound to feed into certain well-defined areas, which would then deplete the scientific knowledge and brains of other areas they flowed into the areas where the money was going.

I gather from what the Senator is saying that he thinks this is one of the problems we are now facing; in other words, that a university has received a grant because they are supposed to be particularly capable in a certain field, and then, when a new program comes along and more money is to be spent, because this university has had a large program, that the second one is liable to flow into it automatically; because they have demonstrated capacity in the first one, they are assumed to have capacity in the second.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the Senator has stated the problem correctly.

I am not critical of the Government administrators who make the grants. I believe they need the guidance of a formula that might be developed by the National Science Foundation, in order that they might have an appraisal of the competence of a university, the competence of its instructor personnel and the heads of the departments. I think such a formula would be of great help to the Government administrators who are charged with distributing these billions of dollars.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wonder if the Senator could answer this for me, because I unfortunately have not had the opportunity to read his bill: In the resolution, are we referring to all types of research, or are we referring only to scientific research dealing with scientific subjects?

Mr. CURTIS. The resolution refers to the laws under which research and development funds are granted, loaned or otherwise made available by industry or agencies of the Government to institutions of higher learning for scientific or educational purposes.

Mr. DOMINICK. That could, then, take in research, for example, under the Disarmament Agency. As the Senator knows, the Disarmament Agency has in the past given out a research program to some professor somewhere, on the thesis that he is to come back with a new method of overcoming problems of a disarmament nature. It could I pre-

sume, take in educational research as well; is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. It seems to me this becomes even more important as the scope of research is developed, because obviously brains in all these different fields, by the sheer nature of it, cannot be concentrated in any two or three or half dozen universities; they must be spread throughout the country; otherwise, we would not have the good universities that we do.

I know that we have a very large series of programs in Colorado, but I have often wondered why some of the others do not go there as well, in view of the capacity that we have. It is possible that the formula that the Senator is suggesting the National Science Foundation develop would at least show the need for redistributing certain types of research which are now going into the southern area or the western area or the northern area; they might be focused in there deliberately under this type of formula, is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. At least, we would have the guidance of a qualified scientific group which could appraise all the talent in the country. Without a doubt, many of these grants and loans are well placed. On the other hand, there is no doubt that many of them could have been successfully handled elsewhere. There should be some guidance on it, some equity and justice injected into the disbursement of these funds.

Mr. DOMINICK. I believe that the Senator has brought up a subject which is, really, of great significance. I would be happy if the Senator would allow me to join him as a cosponsor of his resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. I would be very glad to have the Senator as a cosponsor, and I thank him.

Mr. DOMINICK. Even though eventually none of us may agree with the formula proposed, and I would wish to reserve my final decision.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with the Senator. The National Science Foundation might disappoint all of us, but, as of now, I believe it is the proper agency to which to turn to start this project.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to join the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], and the Senator from Nebraska, in expressing approval of the approach which he has made to this very sizable problem. I am happy to serve as a cosponsor of the bill. It comes at a most timely occasion, because the Government Operations Committee, of which the Senator from Nebraska is a member, has recently created a new subcommittee to conduct what I would not like to call an investigation, but it is a study in depth of the whole research program of Government headed by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS].

only has the rights of an investigator and prosecutor but also participates in some commission decisions.

As Mr. Loevinger put it, the FCC in effect "has authorized one of the adversary parties to this proceeding to rule upon objections filed by the other party, to suggest procedure to be followed, and to specify the issues and the order of consideration of evidence, all without notice or opportunity for comment from the other party."

Mr. Loevinger has described all this with such adjectives as unfair, inefficient, unreasonable and impractical. And while he has drawn the fire of one colleague who doesn't think a rate hearing should be run precisely like a court trial, it seems to us the Commissioner has a point.

There can be no quarrel with the FCC's investigation of the telephone company's rates. The agency is well within its rights in ordering such a study. And although A.T. & T. stockholders have been displaying nervousness since the probe began, no damage to the company's reputation is likely to eventuate.

However, it is a matter of legitimate concern that the company should receive fair-play during the hearings to come. The way ground rules are set up now, the match looks pretty one sided.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 1, 1966]
FCC MEMBER DEFENDS TV'S PROGRAMING:
BUT HE AGREES QUALITY IS NOT CONSISTENT

Lee Loevinger, Federal Communications Commissioner, said here yesterday he sees more danger in a commissioner trying to impose ideas of programing quality upon television stations than in letting TV viewers and program purveyors work out for themselves what will be on the air.

Loevinger, an assistant attorney general before he became one of the seven members of the FCC, gave his views in WGN-TV studios while being interviewed on "The Government Role In Broadcasting." The interview, one of WGN-TV's Your Right To Say It series, will be televised at 1:30 p.m., Sunday on channel 9.

TELLS OF QUANTITY

"Sure, I'm concerned that a lot of programs I think are good are not being shown, and a lot I don't think are so good are on the air," Loevinger said. "But I see far more danger in my trying to impose my ideas of quality than in letting people and purveyors of television choose on their own."

Loevinger expressed a belief that one reason for poor quality in some television is that the average station now offers 6,000 hours of programing a year, "and you just can't produce 6,000 hours of masterpieces—if you could, no one could stand to look at them."

WILL RELY ON NEWS

Asked what he thought American TV may be like in 10 years, Loevinger said: "I'll be surprised if it is radically different from today, really."

"Inevitably, TV will come to rely more and more on news and public affairs programs, for one reason because of the growing public conscience of broadcasters, and for another because we are running out of movies."

VIETNAM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, 2 days ago I inserted in the RECORD four articles on Vietnam written by William P. Frank, of the Wilmington, Del., News-Journal papers.

He has completed his series of perceptive articles with two additional installments, and again I would hope to make his comments available to a larger audience. Therefore I ask unanimous

consent that they be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Feb. 28, 1966]

THREE GOVERNMENTS RULE SOUTH VIETNAM

(NOTE.—This is the fifth of a series in which William P. Frank, who returned earlier this month from Vietnam, reports his impressions of that nation and its people.)

(By William P. Frank)

South Vietnam has an area slightly larger than the State of Washington yet it has, in effect, three governments.

Its population of about 15 million is outwardly governed by the Republic of Vietnam.

But both its economy and its daily life are influenced by the United States. And the National Liberation Front or Vietcong, which claims still to have influence over great sections of the country, is a factor constantly to be reckoned with.

U.S. officials in Washington insist this is a Vietnamese war with American forces helping the South Vietnamese Government. It doesn't take long for an observer to reach the conclusion that, in actuality, the South Vietnamese strip along the South China Sea is being influenced, changed, and affected by the American forces, backed by millions of American dollars and American resources.

The accepted capital of the Republic of Vietnam, with its military congress and military rulers, is Saigon.

The American capital is Washington with the U.S. Embassy and the command post of Gen. William C. Westmoreland in Vietnam as subsidiary capitals.

There is no question that headquarters of the Vietcong forces is Hanoi.

To complicate matters in this complex situation, there are a number of minority groups in South Vietnam which have been problems in the past and may still present problems in the future. Notable among these are the high-spirited individualistic Montagnards of the hill country north of Saigon.

They represent an important group with their own customs, tribal ways, and racial identity. They speak their own language, have their own traditions, and live in an area vulnerable to guerrilla infiltration.

Dealing with the Montagnards has posed a thorny problem. Various methods have been tried. Perhaps the most unusual is the technique of Dr. James Turpin, who operates his own hospital near the city of Dalat. He frequently negotiates with the Montagnards and has found the best approach to them is through cigars.

So, Turpin gathers cigars from friends and hands them out to Montagnard chieftains to gain their attention and friendship.

The extent of the American influence in the South Vietnamese Government is wide and extremely varied. In addition to the armed forces, there are a number of important civilian projects under the umbrella of what was once known as U.S. Operations Mission, now the U.S. Agency for International Development.

This includes a number of social welfare projects and a large corps of advisers. It was interesting to note that while the Americans are supposed to be the "advisers," they quite often "run the show" with the Vietnamese officials playing either a secondary, or supporting role.

During an interview with a high-ranking officer in the Vietnam National Police, I asked to interview William Benson, of Montana, the top U.S. adviser for the national police.

We drove to the AID building.

It was a little difficult getting past the guards and when we arrived in the lobby, we

were not permitted to walk to Benson's office. He had to come out to greet us.

After a long discussion with Benson, I got the definite idea that he and his staff actually were directing the organization of the National Police of Vietnam.

The effect of the millions of dollars being spent by the United States in Vietnam is apparent to the visitor from the moment he arrives in the Tan Son Nhut Airport. The civilian section of the airport is attractive and small but beyond the gates sprawls one of the largest military air bases in the world, inhabited chiefly by Americans, guarded by Americans, and used mostly by Americans.

Millions of American dollars have been and are being spent not only in military installations but in constructing harbors and harbor buildings—all directed by Americans with Vietnamese employees. Vietnamese now consider it a status symbol to be employed by the American Government or by American contractors.

The United States began its advisory system with the South Vietnamese Government on a small scale in 1955, with the U.S. Military Assistance Advisory Group. It is now one of three dozen alphabetized agencies in the country. Notable is MACV—Military Assistance Command Vietnam.

The entire economy of Vietnam today depends on American support—from the construction of harbors and facilities to the importation of rice into a country that once ranked the grain among its chief products.

American money, engineering, and construction people are the mainstays of the nation. Without them it would collapse overnight.

There is practically no unemployment in South Vietnam, as there was in 1964. In fact, as the United States steps up its construction program, there may be a manpower shortage.

One of the curious features of the country is the role of the Vietcong forces. They not only harass, terrorize, and fight the Americans and South Vietnamese forces but also exact "taxes" or tribute from American and native civilians.

It is common knowledge that U.S. civilian convoys of construction materials are halted at checkpoints by the Vietcong, who get paid for permitting the convoys to move on undamaged. The Vietcong's also intercept food convoys of natives and either exact "taxes" or take food for themselves.

At present, the major differences between U.S. policy and the present government of South Vietnam revolves around the role the Vietcong or Communist National Liberation Front would play at a peace conference.

Prime Minister Nguyen Cao Ky insists he will have no parts of the Communists. Americans are saying that, if necessary, the NLF should be represented.

Observers in Saigon believe that if the Ky government lasts that long, Washington will have its way in the end since Washington is footing practically the entire bill.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Mar. 1, 1966]

NEITHER HAWKS NOR DOVES; SOUTH VIETNAM NEWSMEN TREAD MIDDLE PATH

(NOTE.—This is the last of a series in which William P. Frank, who returned recently from Vietnam, reports his impressions of that nation and its people.)

(By William P. Frank)

Despite their first-hand knowledge of the war, few members of the 350-member press corps in South Vietnam can be classified as either hawks or doves.

Most of the newsmen, representing newspapers, television, and radio in many countries of the free world, would more accurately be described as "railbirds."

vents him from devoting more than about 3 weeks a year to inspection tours, he generally finds about 175 instances of improper procedures and other faults, including arrogant behavior on the part of officials.

"In Sweden, all officials must be polite and helpful," Mr. Bexelius said. "If they aren't, they have committed a fault and can be prosecuted. As a matter of fact, there were lots of such prosecutions in the 19th century, and I think there is no question that they contributed to the generally correct treatment of the public that is characteristic of Swedish officials today. In Sweden, of course, we have a state church, and when you look back through the old records you see many cases of clergymen being prosecuted by the ombudsman for treating their parishioners badly. That seldom happens any longer, though I did have such a case 2 years ago. Some children called on the rector of their parish and asked him to conduct a funeral service for their father. The arrangements were made, but unfortunately there was a misunderstanding about the time the service was to be held. When the rector arrived at the church, he found neither the children nor any other relatives or friends. This made him angry, and he started the service anyway. Of course, he had no right to do such a thing, so he was prosecuted and fined. I don't remember how much, but the amount is unimportant. Other clergymen all over the country learned about that prosecution, and the effect was to encourage them to be courteous to everyone, regardless of age or position. Nowadays, it is more likely to be judges than churchmen who are guilty of arrogance. Twice in the past 5 years I have had to prosecute judges who I discovered during my inspection tours had been impolite to witnesses appearing before them in court. Each had to pay a fine of 1,500 crowns, or about \$300, which is quite a lot. At least, it is enough to make other judges think twice before losing their tempers in court."

The other cases that the JO undertakes on its own initiative—about 25 a year—are the result of reports he has read in the newspapers. A few months ago, Mr. Bexelius recalled, he happened to see a short newspaper story about a new private dwelling of rather unusual construction that had been designed by an architect employed by a town-planning agency. Since architects on the agency's payroll are not permitted to do outside work, the JO started an investigation, and he found that about 50 of the architects regularly employed by the agency had accepted private commissions. "I had intended to prosecute the chief of the agency, but after I started the investigation, he became sick with ulcers," Mr. Bexelius said. "He told me it was my fault, so I stopped with a reprimand. I was satisfied with that, because I had already brought everything out into the open—how many outside jobs the architects in the agency had had, how much they had earned from those jobs—everything. The people got the whole story."

Of all the cases handled by the JO's office in the course of a year, only five, on the average, are prosecuted in the courts. Last year, there were four. All were actions against administrative officials, including the chairman of a housing council for being generally negligent in the running of his office, the chairman of a child-welfare council for improperly committing a father who had been lax in contributing to the support of his children, and a public prosecutor for failing to inform the court during a criminal trial that a state's witness had committed perjury. The fourth case grew out of an item that Mr. Bexelius saw in a newspaper about a one-day excursion to Paris that a Swedish charter-airline company had staged for promotion purposes. The article said that many prominent people had been aboard but mentioned

very few names. His interest piqued, Mr. Bexelius secured a passenger list and found that among the freeloaders was a high official of the National Board of Civil Aviation. Looking further into the matter, he discovered that the airline's application for a renewal of its license was pending before the board at the time of the trip. He also learned that the official who went on the junket had received permission to do so from the chief of the board. "So I prosecuted both the chief and the official who made the trip, and they were both fined," Mr. Bexelius said. "I know both these men. They are very honorable, of course. Certainly they would not be influenced by a one-day trip to Paris. But they are just not allowed to do such things. They shall not be in a position to be grateful to any person or any company. They shall be independent. Otherwise, people cannot have confidence in them or their agency, or even, to a certain extent, in any authority."

I asked Mr. Bexelius whether, in view of the number of times he is obliged to take action against people of his acquaintance, he finds that being the JO has a limiting effect on his social life.

He laughed. "No, I wouldn't say so," he replied. "Of course, many of my friends have been angry with me. Often, when I have to criticize a judge, he is a man with whom I have worked in court and know very, very well. Naturally, I don't like to criticize him, but I must. The ombudsman cannot be concerned about his popularity. It is no secret that high officials in Sweden—all of them—dislike the ombudsman. They say that he is always interfering in things he doesn't know anything about, and that they could do their jobs better if he would stop meddling, and so on. But all their grumbling doesn't mean a thing. Everybody knows that it is necessary to have an ombudsman."

RETIREMENT OF JOHN O'ROURKE, EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, John O'Rourke, longtime editor of the Washington News, has decided to face the hazards which retirement holds for a man still bursting with young ideas.

For 30 years, Washington has had the benefits of his reports and comments. He produced an excellent newspaper. He set a pattern of brevity. He insisted on copy that was lively and interesting. He mirrored the exciting times he lived through and felt with the rest of us. He uncovered the shoddy and dramatized the positive. He made rare contributions to good government and to the newspaper business.

The Washington Post, one of his longtime competitors, paid him tribute in an editorial and I ask unanimous consent for insertion of the editorial into the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1965]

AN EDITOR RETIRES

John T. O'Rourke was editor of the Washington Daily News for nearly 30 years and his retirement ends an era in Washington journalism. The three decades in which he served at the top of his profession were exciting decades for Washington, for the country, and for the world. John O'Rourke enjoyed the excitement and par-

ticipated in the life of his times with zest and enthusiasm.

He was in the best tradition of his craft. He was a good writer. He had a sharp nose for news. He had a heart easily stirred by misfortune and a temper easily roused by injustice or wrongdoing. His mind was alert to developments in many fields—aviation, art, and music were within the range of his most intense interest.

For many years he has been a leading figure in the Inter-American Press Association. He is known and admired by editors throughout Central America and South America. He has labored to lift up the standards of his profession. He has struggled to increase understanding among Americans North and South. He has fought for a free press throughout the hemisphere. His colleagues in Washington cherish him as a friend and respect him as a keen newspaper competitor.

VIEWS OF FCC COMMISSIONER LOEVINGER

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Commissioner Lee Loevinger, of the Federal Communications Commission, has recently on separate occasions spoken out in two areas of the Commission's concern. One statement was with regard to the role of the Common Carrier Bureau in the rate inquiry proceedings dealing with the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. The Washington Evening Star commented on his views in an editorial of January 29 entitled "An Odd Kind of Court."

The other area of Mr. Loevinger's public concern, voiced in an interview on "The Government Role in Broadcasting," dealt with television programing. The Chicago Tribune of February 1 reported:

Mr. Loevinger finds far more danger in my trying to impose my ideas of quality than in letting people and purveyors of television choose on their own.

In both of these approaches Commissioner Loevinger is showing an approach which tries to preserve rights which can be exercised by industry with a minimum of FCC intervention. I ask unanimous consent that the two items to which I have referred be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 29, 1966]

AN ODD KIND OF COURT

A private citizen haled into court might properly feel some uneasiness if he found the prosecutor privately meeting with the judge to suggest how the trial might be run, even to ruling on objections and tinkering with the way evidence could be submitted.

Yet that is roughly the position in which the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. finds itself in the current rate proceedings before the Federal Communications Commission. True enough, a regulatory agency isn't a court, and the affair is being billed as an investigation, not a trial. But the whole business apparently is a close enough parallel to have brought a stinging objection from one of the FCC Commissioners, Lee Loevinger, to the way the agency plans to run the hearings.

What disturbs both Mr. Loevinger and A.T. & T. is the role of the Common Carrier Bureau, an arm of the FCC. The bureau not

March 2, 1966

Favorable expressions for the Vietcong, Hanoi, or North Vietnam are rare, but the newsmen—most of them Americans—are often critical of the United States and South Vietnam war efforts. The newsmen also take verbal potshots at the social welfare programs undertaken by the United States and its allies in this war.

Because they have been exposed to the vast American installations representing millions of dollars and to the immense array of men and battle equipment, the newsmen are convinced that the Vietnamese economy is completely dependent on the United States.

Occasionally, a newsmen can be heard expressing his opinion that the war should be expanded, but we didn't hear any comments from reporters regarding the United States getting out of Vietnam.

Many newsmen, some of them 2-year veterans of the war, are not impressed with the U.S. effort as it now exists. Some believe the enclave idea will work.

The newsmen have this in common: They are depressed by the number of Americans killed or wounded and they are fearful that these numbers will continue on the increase. They know the ugly side of the war is getting worse.

Newsmen who attend the daily briefings in the small, air-conditioned theater in the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office (JUSPAO) in the heart of Saigon are constantly pestering U.S. officials who persist in giving scanty and sometimes obscurely worded reports.

It is not uncommon at these briefings to hear reporters, just in from the battlefield, tell more about what went on during a specific action than the briefers.

While the reporters appreciate the spot the briefers are in, nonetheless, some newsmen ask them questions like these: "How light are light casualties?" "What's the difference between a Vietcong atrocity and a Vietcong outrage?" or "When is a hut that's been burned not a home for someone but a Vietcong installation?"

When pushed into a corner, the briefers often agree to release more information provided it is regarded as "background data" and should be used only without attribution.

All in all, the news corps has a friendly relationship with the American military officials, principally because the military authorities have not clamped down any broad censorship, and appear to be trying to do their best to accommodate the press in getting stories.

In the field, the newsmen wear fatigues, boots, and always carry canteens. I only saw one carry a revolver—a television man responsible for a lot of camera equipment.

As in all other areas of news reporting, journalists who have been in Vietnam for a long time have established mutual trust with military authorities. This pays off.

However, service to the press varies with the branches of the service.

For example, with the 1st Infantry Division, the "darlings" of the press section, were newsmen from Birmingham, Ala., because Birmingham had recently "adopted" the 1st Infantry Division and the newspaper there were giving the division depth coverage.

With the 1st Cavalry Division, the press section was cooperative all right, but priority went to a battery of writers and photographers from the big television networks.

On the other hand, because Bill Sneed and I were to be in Vietnam for only 3 weeks and were always on the go, we didn't have time to develop news contacts with any one group.

This, however, did not count with the U.S. Marines at Da Nang. They treated us as if we were in a position to give them just as much coverage as the Associated Press or the United Press International.

The same went for the press section of the 7th Fleet stationed in Saigon. They put at the disposal of Sneed, a German newspaper-

man, and myself a two-engine plane that landed atop the aircraft carrier, Ticonderoga.

Had we been able to stay in Vietnam longer, we could have gotten out to the other vessels of the fleet on the same basis.

A few American newsmen express some admiration for the Vietnamese but chiefly when a Vietnamese news source will give them valuable tips.

Every newsmen in Saigon has two identification cards. One is the yellow, with red stripes, a Vietnamese press card which he never uses.

The other is the valuable blue press card, issued by the U.S. Defense Department. It is the magic key to many doors. Without his blue card, a newsmen might as well be in limbo.

The blue press card gets him into the PX's, the officers' open messes, and past some of the tightest security guards.

It is also his ticket for military planes when they are available. A newsmen can go into practically any U.S. air terminal in South Vietnam, show his blue press card, and get a ride, if there is room. He can make reservations for planes in advance and not be bumped, regardless of the military waiting list.

The American newsmen will be flown into a combat zone—if he wants to and if a plane or helicopter is available—but getting out is something else. There are priorities, particularly for the wounded, of course.

With very few exceptions, an American news photographer can take pictures anywhere in South Vietnam, except inside the U.S. Embassy and around certain types of planes and in the vicinity of certain kinds of artillery bunkers.

No one censors reporters' stories nor the work of photographers. However, there is security on information that is given on a hold for release basis. A reporter who violates this agreement will get into trouble, but this is true almost anywhere.

Two briefings for the press are held each day. One is at the Vietnam press headquarters in downtown Saigon, usually well attended but not always profitable as far as news is concerned.

Half an hour later, the U.S. briefings are held in the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office Building, always well attended.

It is also in that building where the newsmen make their contacts for going out into the field to contact the various divisions. The building also has a press lounge where some newsmen pick up their mail, and can meet friends and news contacts.

The Americans who run JUSPAO have such trust in the press that the building is never closed. Newsmen can wander in and out any time of the day.

I have seen Vietnamese civilians seeking to enter the building, present their identification cards but they are still searched.

Some of them who carry packages have to open them for scrutiny. I have never seen an American frisked.

Because of the problem of communications, not too many American newsmen associate with Vietnamese officials although the Vietnam press officials are extremely helpful to newsmen who want to meet Vietnamese personalities in government.

Neither the Vietnamese general police nor military police interfere with the goings and comings of the American newsmen.

While a newsmen has to stop to identify himself before an American MP, at a security checkpoint, I have seen American newsmen whizz past Vietnamese police and yell, "Press."

On the night, however, when the top-ranking Vietnamese officials left the Saigon airport for Honolulu to meet President Johnson, I saw a Vietnamese MP try to push an American photographer back.

The photographer struggled with the soldier and continued taking pictures. This would not have happened had the military policeman been an American.

OPERATION HELPING HAND

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, as residents of the American State closest to Vietnam, Hawaii's people react sensitively—like many Americans elsewhere—to the hardships being endured by the distressed people of Vietnam. They are concerned that they are not doing all that they might to ease the suffering of destitute civilians in Vietnam villages.

Recently, a project called Operation Helping Hand was started in Hawaii. It is being administered by the 25th Infantry Division, whose "Tropic Lightning" soldiers are stationed at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii. The Division's 2d Brigade, recently assigned to Vietnam and already engaged in combat, is distributing truckloads of needed articles collected in Hawaii to Vietnamese families.

The response on the part of Hawaii's people to Operation Helping Hand has been truly gratifying. Government officials, National Guardsmen, Boy Scouts, war veterans, schoolchildren, business firms, and thousands of private citizens joined in the massive drive and donated tons of materials. They included soap, toothbrushes, books, pencils, working tools, children's clothing, health and sanitation goods, foodstuffs, and training aids for vocational schools.

The donated items were assembled at schools, fire stations, supermarkets and other points, then transported to several warehouses. Soon they will be shipped to southeast Asia, to augment smaller collections sent earlier.

In addition, substantial cash contributions were collected.

The close cooperation between the military and the civilian communities in Hawaii made this joint undertaking a splendid success. I am pleased to report that Operation Helping Hand is already bringing aid and comfort to the hard-pressed Vietnamese people. At the same time the project is helping to build closer bonds of understanding with the Vietnamese people.

An informative article on the impact of Operation Helping Hand in Vietnam has been published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of February 25, 1966, under the headline "25th Delivers Gifts."

I also wish to call attention to an editorial in the Honolulu Advertiser which appeared on February 15, 1966, shortly before the drive began. These articles reflect the enthusiasm and support which the newspapers and all other groups and individuals in the community gave Operation Helping Hand.

I ask unanimous consent that the 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 Honolulu Advertiser, Feb. 15, 1966]

HELPING HAND IN VIETNAM

Hawaii gets a chance in a few days to put its help where it will do immediate and potentially far-reaching good in Vietnam.

March 2, 1966

The 25th Infantry Division's Operation Helping Hand is getting underway next week, and the people of Hawaii are offered a full partnership.

The State and county governments are supporting the drive.

The idea is to collect in Hawaii the many hundreds of daily household goods we take for granted—but which are badly needed in Vietnam—and ship them to the 25th in Vietnam.

The soldiers will use the goods to help the Vietnamese people and to win friends in the villages.

This friendship is a vital weapon for our troops and the South Vietnamese Government in combating the Communists.

Items to be collected February 25, 26, and 27 include such things as soap, saws, nails, hammers, shovels, sewing material, sporting equipment, toothbrushes, and other health-related aids, coloring books and crayons and other toy items.

A list was published in the Sunday paper and will be repeated. Cash donations are also needed.

The recent Honolulu summit talks with President Johnson and the South Vietnamese leaders put a great deal of stress on the "other war," the political war to win the loyalty of the people.

It is just this that Operation Helping Hand is concerned with, and it offers Hawaii a chance to participate in some shirt sleeve diplomacy.

The 25th Division, which began moving from Schofield Barracks the first of the year, calls the items "ammunition for peace" to win the villagers over.

Brig. Gen. Glenn D. Walker, of the 25th, makes the point that while the villagers aren't hostile, they aren't always friendly.

Since getting cooperation is vital to the kind of war we're fighting in Vietnam, Operation Helping Hand is no small matter. It could mean a real difference in the security of many men there.

Hawaii feels especially close to what's going on in Vietnam, as the response to earlier drives of this kind has shown. The 25th is composed of "our boys," as are the Kaneohe Marines who went to Vietnam earlier.

Collection points for the drive will be at fire stations, public schools, and most supermarkets.

Start saving some of the needed items now, and be ready next week to help both our fighting forces and the Vietnamese people caught in a long and bitter war.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin,
Feb. 25, 1966]

FROM THE ISLANDS TO VIETNAM: 25TH
DELIVERS GIFTS
(By Dale Kenery)

CUCHI, VIETNAM.—The hostility of villagers in Haunghia Province, 20 miles northwest of Saigon, melted into smiles today when trucks from the 2d Brigade, 25th Infantry Division, poured into the hamlet of Bacha laden with clothing, reading material, and other supplies from the people of Hawaii.

The shipment is the first in a massive effort throughout the entire Aloha State to help the Vietnamese people in the 25th Infantry Division's Operation Helping Hand.

The soap, school supplies, sewing materials, and clothing were delivered to the children of Minh-tan School, which is in Bacha, a small relocation village for refugees who have fled from North Vietnam.

In accepting the materials for his men from A Troop, 3d Squadron, 4th Cavalry, Col. Lynwood M. Johnson, Jr., 2d Brigade commander, said, "With these items and our medical aid program, we will be able to really convince the people of our sincere desire to assist them.

"The members of the 2d Brigade send sincere thanks and aloha to the residents of

Hawaii for furnishing supplies that will greatly benefit the Vietnamese families."

Helping Hand was launched over a month ago under a program conceived by Tropic Lightning Commander Maj. Gen. Fred C. Weyand, who recently informed Hawaii residents that their contributions will be carried along with ammunition and rations and will be personally given to the South Vietnamese people.

To date, the 25th has received the active support of all communities. Gov. John A. Burns, of Hawaii, Honolulu Mayor Neal S. Blaisdell, and the city council, the Hawaii Metropolitan Jaycees, and a number of commercial concerns anxious to give Hawaii's own division support in helping the Vietnamese people.

An estimated 18,000 pounds of materials were shipped from Hawaii last week as a result of the Jaycees' efforts throughout the State.

Weyand recently emphasized "In our assistance program in Vietnam we have already learned that medical supplies which heal the peasant and his family can be as valuable as artillery shells and a cake of soap for a Vietnamese family more effective than a bullet expended against the enemy.

"In short, Helping Hand will be an extension of our aloha to the people of Vietnam.

"Charity is not our goal. Instead, man lending a helping hand to his fellow man is what the Tropic Lightning soldier will use to secure the friendship so necessary in a country where suspicion and distrust are commonplace."

THE NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL COMMISSION

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. President, today the Secretary of Commerce designated the six New England States as an economic development region under title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. By so doing the Secretary has formally extended an invitation to these six States to form a New England regional commission. This commission will study both the assets and the deficiencies of the region and determine the steps necessary to insure the future economic growth and stability of the entire area.

What was begun today has been the hope of the New England congressional delegation and interested citizens for a dozen years or more. It also marks a change in our thinking as to how best to bring the reality of national economic growth to every area of the country.

The New England States comprise the oldest regional civilization and economy in the United States. They have been bound together historically and identified as one in their contributions to our Nation's history and development. Unfortunately, they have also been bound together in suffering the problems of economic decline. At one time New England was the center of our Nation's shipping and fishing industry; at one time this region provided the technology to clothe the Nation; at one time the people of this area were looked upon as the most efficient, productive, and energetic producers in our Nation. They still are. But events have occurred, in most instances totally beyond their control, that lessened the opportunities to use their skills and energies. As a result we have suffered the loss of many talented people—especially the potential of our youth.

No member of the New England congressional delegation has ever made the case that our region was fully debilitated, nor has it ever been suggested that our economic life was in need of a massive Federal program. But it has been recognized that down through the years we have suffered obstacles to growth that have left us with persistent economic weak spots that constantly hamper efforts at revitalization.

The first major recognition of New England's need for Federal assistance in meeting its own problems was stated by Senator Kennedy in the spring of 1953. In 3 days of discussion before the U.S. Senate he detailed those subtle weaknesses in New England's economic structure that constantly held us down, regardless of overall national economic growth. He stressed then as we stress now, that the strengths of New England surpass our weaknesses, and that our people need only to coordinate their economic energies as a region to overcome years of decline.

After more than 3 years of experience with the area redevelopment approach it became apparent that, helpful as ARA was in promoting economic growth in specific communities, long-term growth of the community demanded a broader approach. A change in emphasis was needed from that of complete reliance on programs designed to rescue single areas fully depleted to accelerating entire regions to meet their potential. There was a recognition that only when every region of our country is progressing at a rate similar to our national advance would the benefits of prosperity reach each individual.

I had the opportunity to express the need for a coordinated economic growth program among States in a Senate speech last February. I announced then that in discussions with the President, and members of his administration, I had received assurances that this new approach to regional development was being prepared for presentation to the Congress—and that the New England region would be included in any program eventually developed.

When the Economic Development Act was introduced in March, I was proud to cosponsor the measure and to begin work with my New England senatorial colleagues in preparing the case for our six States.

As a result of a thorough study of the New England economy, in terms of the guidelines proposed in the administration's bill, by regional experts at Boston University, the New England Senators were fully prepared to present the case for a development commission to the Secretary of Commerce on the date of the bill's passage.

This cooperation at the congressional level is today fully reflected in the actions of the New England Governors in accepting the Secretary's invitation to form a commission.

We now look to the future and the promise of coordination and agreement among several States for the economic benefit of all, regardless of boundaries within the region. For the first time we will be charting a course of economic action from a New England point of

March 2, 1966

4473

view. We will look to our basic resources, find those areas in which we have the advantage, and then move to maximize that advantage. This can be done by integrating the separate plans and programs of State and Federal agencies, and where development gaps remain we can seek new legislative solutions.

Long-range plans can be made to free our rivers from pollution and relieve our cities from the burden of urban blight. We can guarantee the preservation of those things that are considered unique to New England—our beautiful open spaces, our forests, lakes, and coastal areas.

The revitalization of our region will call back the many who have left and attract new manpower. The people of New England, their technical skills and the institutions and enterprises they have created will continue to be considered an enviable resource. Their presence will attract increased private investment and productive capacity to our area so that a broad-based stability will be created.

The problems of New England power, susceptible as we have seen to failure, can be reexamined to determine better ways in which to bring cheaper and more efficient power into our region.

Transportation networks can flourish, especially in rail freight and air travel. Rapid transit systems can be developed to insure the efficient and safe transit of people in and out of major urban areas.

These and other basic resource problems are in desperate need of study and coordination. And the people of New England who have long waited for their use of the opportunities that our region could offer are now assured by today's activities of an economic future that will parallel our Nation's progress.

THE BIG PICTURE IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a series of articles in recent issues of the Review, the bimonthly publication of the Defense Supply Association, deals with the existing situation in Vietnam, and, I believe, casts a revealing light on the urgency to complete conference action on legislation, passed yesterday by the Senate, to provide fiscal 1966 supplemental authorizations for military procurement.

The author of these articles, Lt. Gen. Andrew T. McNamara, U.S. Army, retired, is presently editor of the Review and executive vice president of the Defense Supply Association, an organization headquartered in Washington, D.C., which is composed of officers of the Armed Forces, key civilians in the Federal Government, and leaders of industry. This association disseminates professional information concerning supply and related activities of the Department of Defense.

General McNamara is one of our Nation's foremost experts in the field of logistics, having formerly served as the Quartermaster General, U.S. Army, and as the first Director of the Defense Supply Agency, a combined procurement and supply agency of the armed services. This Agency was created under the directorship of the present Secretary of

Defense in the early days of the Kennedy administration as part of the streamlining of the functions of the Department of Defense.

Because of the authoritative background from which General McNamara speaks, I feel his remarks merit the attention of the membership of the Senate.

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

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

[From the Review, January-February, 1966]

Many Americans have a mistaken view of how our policy was shaped in Vietnam. "Why force this on us?" they ask.

It is true that a percentage of American people want to know why we are involved in Vietnam. This feeling exists in spite of a wealth of reasons from responsible leaders of our country.

It's visible in many walks of life. The latest and probably most publicized is the youth effort coupled with demonstrations of questionable allegiance. The fact that Vietnam is remote from our shores adds to the fuzziness in their minds.

Contrariwise they cannot reason that failure to stop infringement of rights in other countries will inevitably lead to the challenge of these same democratic ideals but this time it will be in our country.

In addition they reason that we have troubles at home that are not yet solved. Thus they conclude hastily and erroneously that we are wrongfully in Vietnam, and on and on and on.

They run to words. Surely it must be apparent if they are students that the United States of America as a country is now international both in stature as well as commitment. It should be equally clear that communism is not confined to the borders of the Soviet Union.

If they are not students but merely malcontents, then there are several areas of action for them. They can continue their actions and perhaps gain sufficient voice so that law may be passed which would satisfy them. They could join peaceful efforts in other countries where their sensitive natures might fit better perhaps than here. (But they should realize that they could lose their right to express themselves in countries other than this if they prefer to leave us.)

But surely student or malcontent must realize that the United States was founded on the basis of freedom and justice. Since this is so, it is right and also just that of all nations, the United States should defend the principles of democracy, if not advance them.

Who would object to this? Certainly the proponents of communism would. Therefore, where the rights of freemen are being usurped it is proper that our Nation be present to align ourselves with those that seek the same ideals which created this Nation.

This great Nation of ours is not attempting to exploit Vietnam. It seeks to contribute to the stability of Vietnam.

It does not seek to do this by military means. It does seek to help the Vietnamese keep their independence. The presence of our troops and the loss of our men together with their Vietnamese comrades who are also suffering will accomplish this and in addition will serve warning that we want peace and freedom for all men. We Americans want it everywhere.

The three Presidents who have supported our policy have merely called the hand of communism which is steadily attempting to spill into areas not yet under their control. Our Congress has not involved us in an international scene, and this Nation is not being forced to consume such a policy.

We Americans want freedom in Vietnam just as surely as we want our own independence—and we want it for others wherever they live.

C. T. McNAMARA.

VIETNAM

(By Lt. Gen. A. T. McNamara, USA, retired, executive vice president, Defense Supply Association)

One of the comments frequently heard relative to South Vietnam and its problems with guerrillas for us pertains to its borders. Various statements are made that means must exist of closing the international borders of a country. This would simplify the problem and localize the guerrillas to those who are within the troubled country.

But a quick look at the map of Vietnam shows that the suggested action isn't quite as simple a job as the statement. In fact it's a real problem when you look at the length of the border and the type of border which exists in South Vietnam. It's roughly the distance between Washington and Los Angeles and better than half faces the sea. This border is perforated by rivers throughout and with large swampy areas in addition in the south or delta region. The border adjoining the neighboring countries is not well defined and is very woody.

To treat the question we sought an expression from a young captain of infantry, an obvious graduate of the Infantry School at Fort Benning and who had recent exposure to the teachings from the John F. Kennedy Center at Fort Bragg. Incidentally, more expressions from other levels will be developed in future issues.

His answer was short and incisive. There are means to accomplish just such a thing and, of course, it simplifies the problem greatly if borders can be sealed. But it's a tough job, he said.

It seemed almost like attending a school to have him list assumptions, such as when:

- (a) neighboring countries are sympathetic to the insurgents;
- (b) the bordering nations are capable of supplying mainly by land;
- (c) the boundaries are heavily vegetated, mountainous and not clearly defined;
- (d) the majority of citizens are loyal to the government body in power;
- (e) money, troops and resources are available to the existing government;
- (f) the nations supporting and supplying the country do not desire to provoke international incidents with bordering nations;
- (g) nuclear weapons won't be employed.

On the top of these assumptions he outlined some facts which bore directly on the problem as he saw it, such as when:

- (a) the terrain is difficult and vegetation is dense. This would favor guerrilla movements and the ease of their resupply;
- (b) the amount of assistance and resources obtained from any sympathetic bordering nation is substantial.

His discussion on terrain was fascinating. In difficult terrain and dense vegetation two measures popped readily to his tongue; i.e., saturate the difficult terrain with troops and defoliate the heavily vegetated areas. To defoliate would enable friendly forces to check more readily for hiding areas and escape routes. Our Nation, since it's covered with crab grass and broad-leaved weeds, should have a means to defoliate areas with some assurance of success.

A search was made and some pictures were found that show that our modern chemistry had indeed the capability of defoliating dense vegetation.

As a matter of fact about 8,000 acres of mangrove forest which paralleled about 50 miles of rivers, canals and roads were sprayed. The thought was to clear the vegetation from the sides of these arteries and thus give better visibility to our pilots.

About a month after spraying, the areas were checked and it was perfectly obvious that practically all the vegetation in the sprayed areas was dead or dying and almost complete defoliation had resulted.

Our captain was by now thoroughly warmed up to his subject. Terrain, he explained, helps insurgent forces. This is so because it can be rugged and difficult, it can be mountainous or swampy or it can be because of vegetation and therefore the effort must be expended to defoliate.

He talked of the hills of Klangsi, the mountains of Greece, the Sierra Maestra, the swamps of the Plain of Reeds in Cochinchina, the paddy fields of Tonkin, the jungle of Malaya—all of which give strong advantages to the insurgents.

Turning to another problem, we must understand that to occupy areas such as these requires large forces of men. It is realized, of course, that a country cannot at one time be entirely saturated. It has to be by areas. When this happens the insurgents or guerrillas merely fade elsewhere. It's like squeezing a soft balloon. The air merely pops into the ends. This was true in the Peloponnese which had been a guerrilla stronghold. When the area was saturated with loyal troops, the guerrillas merely moved to the Grammos area. It was simple for the guerrillas but hard for the loyal troops since it required a ratio of 7 to 1 loyal troops to guerrillas.

The picture became really clear as the captain said things can be accomplished but it's hard and costly in effort.

To be able to seal borders would help greatly because it would limit the enemy's freedom of action beyond the borders. This freedom has been one of the main factors which determined the duration of conflict in previous guerrilla wars. Greece was unable to crush the Communist insurgents until Yugoslavia no longer served as a support base to these armed bands who were fighting on Greek soil. It was equally true when the French were fighting the Vietminh who were able to make use of bases in China. To seal international borders they must be clearly definable. Many obstacles have to be erected. No gaps can be permitted insofar as surveillance is concerned. All means must be utilized to prevent penetration of the border. This of course includes diplomatic intervention.

In conclusion one can reason that dense vegetation can be stripped of its foliage enabling a satisfactory amount of observation, but apparently the only satisfactory way to deny difficult terrain from unwanted encroachment is to physically occupy that terrain. In addition, in order for a nation to survive strong internal insurgency movement, it must seal itself off from outside intervention sympathetic to the insurgents.

As the captain said: "In Vietnam, that's a tough job. Remember the length of that border."

It might be appropriate now to take a closer look at the land in Vietnam.

VIETNAM—ITS LAND

Vietnam is an old country, one of several located on the peninsula known as southeast Asia. It was conquered by the Chinese in the year A.D. 200 and dominated by them roughly 800 years before the Vietnamese broke away to rule themselves for some 400 years.

About 100 years ago, several European nations established colonial possessions in that area. Only Thailand remained independent throughout this period of colonial development. The other seven nations have achieved their independence since World War II. During that war, the Japanese Army invaded and occupied the whole area. The allied victory did not bring peace to that part of the world. One by one the colonial powers surrendered their claims either voluntarily or in response to the nationalists' movements.

When the French moved into this area in the late 1800's, the Vietnamese were called Annamites and their kingdom encompassed the area that is now North and South Vietnam, a part of Laos and a part of Cambodia. These were three of the postwar nations that had emerged from the former French Indochina. French rule ended in 1954 and the area was divided by the Geneva accords. Let me write about the Geneva agreements for the moment.

Present at the conference were the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, Communist China, Laos, Cambodia, South Vietnam, and the Communist Vietminh regime of North Vietnam.

The U.S. delegation did not take part in drafting the Geneva agreements and did not sign them. The United States was present to show its concern for the future of southeast Asia. In addition, the United States issued a separate declaration that we would abide by the agreements just as if we had signed them and would regard any violation by other parties as a serious threat to international peace and security.

Under these agreements, Vietnam was divided near the 17th parallel into two roughly equal zones. The agreements provided that at a suitable time general elections to establish a united government would be held throughout Vietnam. They have never been held.

The Geneva agreements further provided that everyone in Vietnam would be free to decide in which of the two zones he wished to live. More than 900,000 quickly left their homes in the north and moved to the south below the 17th parallel and the figure has grown to well over a million.

South Vietnam today consists of 44 Provinces roughly comparable to our States and 242 districts which are similar to our counties.

South Vietnam's 66,000 square miles is about 12 percent larger than Georgia's 59,000 square miles. It is a long narrow country shaped somewhat like a banana. It has a land and sea border some 2,200 miles long. Its sea border contains a myriad of inlets and coves and its land border runs through hundreds of miles of dense jungle and mountainous country. The length and nature of this border constitute the more arduous problems we face in our endeavors to choke off the infiltration of enemy forces and supplies.

The country is itself a land of curious mixtures. It has three distinct types of terrain. The coastal plain bordered on the west by high hills and mountains extends approximately 900 miles south from the 17th parallel along the east coast of South Vietnam. This plain contains small cities and populated areas; there are beautiful sandy beaches backed by rolling dunes, small winding rivers and wastelands of marsh and swamp; and, of course, the rice paddies.

An inland mountainous area, the Annamite Mountain chain, extends from northern Laos, southward along the northwestern border of Vietnam and through South Vietnam to within 100 miles of Saigon. These mountains are steep-sloped and sharp-crested; an occasional narrow pass cuts a reluctant door to desolate, dense jungle. Very few people live in this mountainous area, and roads and trails are few.

Extending north and south between the South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodian borders and the Annamite chain is a high plateau. The northern and northeastern parts of the plateau contain high mountains and dense jungle forests. In the central and southern parts the mountains level to large open plains covered with tropical grasses, the jungle forest becomes less dense and roads and trails are more numerous.

The Mekong Delta area extends south and southwest of Saigon and consists of extensive flatlands. The delta is interlocked with

broad, meandering rivers and streams which are connected by a network of canals and ditches. In these marshes and swamps are the rice paddies, for this is the true rice bowl of southeast Asia. Approximately half this area is continuously covered by water during the rainy season. The people generally live along the streams and canals.

Vietnam is tropical. The humidity averages above 80. There are two seasons: a wet season (monsoon) and a dry season—each about 6 months long. These seasons are reversed in the north and south—when it's wet in Saigon, it's dry in Hue.

In the southern delta region, the rains usually begin in late May and continue through September. April and early May are the hottest and most humid months of the year.

Along the central coast, the rainy season begins in October, causes periodic floods through December and continues with drizzles from January to March. July and August are the months when heat and humidity reach their peak. In pleasant contrast the highlands are usually cool at night regardless of the season.

Now let's take a look at the people of Vietnam.

VIETNAM—ITS PEOPLE

The people of Vietnam are an old people with a long and proud tradition of civilization. Until 1946 they were known as Annamites and fought fiercely for their national freedom. They were first conquered by China in the early second century and for 900 years considered a Province of China. But around the year 1000 a nationwide rebellion drove the Chinese out and the reestablished kingdom stayed independent for the next four centuries. Again China conquered Annam but this time was driven out after only 20 years and from this time, 1428, Annam managed to maintain a status of independence from China. A short period of colonization by the French, which started in 1863, changed Annam's status to a protectorate of France in 1884. The Japanese conquered the entire area in 1940 and this ended with the end of World War II. The Geneva Agreements divided the country in 1954 and thus established North and South Vietnam.

Vietnam's population is estimated at roughly 32 million with about 15 million in South Vietnam.

There are a great many ethnic groups in Vietnam. While the majority of the population are Vietnamese, there are enough dissident groups to create problems for a central government. Many of the small businessmen of the country are Chinese, most of whom were not citizens until 1954 when the Government authorized those Chinese born in Vietnam to take out citizenship papers.

Approximately 80 percent of the population live on farms—not farms as we know them but small parcels of land designed to maintain a family with just a little bit left over. Until just this past year, South Vietnam has continued to be an exporter of rice, one of its basic commodities.

South Vietnam possesses the material and human resources for a good society and the prerequisites for a normal, even prosperous life. So the U.S. assistance program was designed and in 5 years South Vietnam made substantial progress, such as:

One hundred and forty thousand peasants received tracts of farmlands.

Production of rice and rubber rose.

School enrollment tripled, matched by a similar increase in schoolteachers.

Three thousand medical aid stations and maternity clinics were established.

A National Institute of Administration was established to train Vietnamese for public careers.

Several hundred manufacturing plants were built.

Although the partition at the 17th parallel had left the north with a much greater share

March 2, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

4475

of Vietnam's industrial facilities, it was the south that achieved the greater economic advances. For example, in 1960 the gross national product of South Vietnam was about \$110 per person compared to about \$70 in North Vietnam. In the same year food production in the north dropped 10 percent; in the south it rose 20 percent.

The Vietnamese are generally considered to be friendly. Like Americans they speak if spoken to in the streets. They appear to be an intelligent people, anxious and quick to learn. They are a brave, courageous people and their soldiers are good fighting men.

They are a proud people. They are Vietnamese and proud of it. They don't want to be Chinese and they have proven they don't want to be French, that they don't want to be Japanese and they certainly don't want to be American. They have their own culture of which they are justifiably proud. It is part of their makeup. This great pride will enable them to win their battle.

[From the Review, March-April 1965]

VIETNAM

(By Lt. Gen. T. A. McNamara, U.S. Army, retired, executive vice president, Defense Supply Association)

In our January-February issue we touched on the logistics problems at Cam Ranh Bay, a fine natural harbor. Since that writing I've read a very descriptive article in the Military Engineer written by a Capt. Lindbergh Jones which furthers my comments and is, of course, a professional viewpoint. In order to stress the logistics headaches of over-the-beach logistics operations, I have reprinted (with permission) several of the magazine's excellent photos.

Sand is trouble. It is trouble to equipment. It is trouble to road crews. It is trouble to storage efforts. It is trouble to maintenance. It gets in your teeth, in your hair, and in your dreams. It is trouble in many forms.

Sandy areas provide, however, an acceptable alternative to ports and provide a means to empty vessels which, must of course, be unloaded as quickly as possible.

I'm constantly startled to see the lessons of World War II featured as new problems in Vietnam. One would think we had learned little from previous wars.

People who should know better comment bitterly about the backup of ships at ports in Vietnam as though it is something new. It isn't new. We had 200-plus vessels off Antwerp at one time in World War II. They could not be unloaded for months. They faced damage from enemy aircraft, submarines, and the then-new V-2 rockets. There was a reason for their arriving in numbers since they had to cross the Atlantic in the face of killer pack submarine attacks. Therefore they traveled in convoys which were protected as best the Allies could. Consequently many vessels arrived at one time. I might add we were very happy to see these vessels.

Today we have no submarines presently worrying our shipping, nor airplanes, nor rockets. Yet we had a backup. The reason is a simple one. We had off loading problems.

I mentioned to you in earlier articles that port capabilities were limited especially in Cam Ranh Bay and the other smaller ports.

I'm sure you looked at the front cover of our January-February issue, and noted the narrow pier with the two vessels alongside. Their booms can touch. The trucks have to be backed into loading position. Therefore off loading was slow.

At least it was several months ago when this lovely natural deepwater harbor was a quiet port with one pier. Now it bustles with activities. There are four piers of different capacities, one of which was towed from the east coast of the United

States. Our engineers are justly proud of their accomplishments and Cam Ranh Bay is one of the outstanding examples for it is now in full support of our troops. There is no backlog of ships at this port as of this writing. Before there were as many as 40 anchored in this 15-mile-long harbor. The timely phasing of logistic troops to far shore military efforts is most important. Military supplies can be moved in great quantity but until means are available to receive these goods problems mount up to great heights. Cam Ranh Bay is over its hump. Qui Nhon is next and will be another chapter similar to the spectacular logistics efforts of Cam Ranh—thanks to our professional logistic troops.

People who comment on military efforts assume many things. For instance the assumption that the vessel has been loaded properly and under good supervision is a common one.

Modern vessels frequently load and discharge at several ports. This causes considerable damage to cargo if carelessness in stowing has occurred. While a staff of carpenters is usually available in the general cargo trade to shore up cargo, sometimes their work is curtailed. Usually the excuse is that the sailing time of the ship will be changed or that overtime would have to be paid.

I don't say that cargoes are in fact improperly stowed, but I do say the assumption we make that all is well is a broad one and could be wrong.

It's the off loading that the military have to worry about. If something has been stowed wrong or heavy weather has shifted the cargo then the off loading operation really encounters additional problems.

Perhaps a flush type pallet has been used because this is the type that is commonly used in normal business operations within the States. Normal business is automating the palletizing efforts which they use. They dislike the wing-type pallet that the military use. As far as I can see the difference to them between the two types of pallets is miniscule.

But it is not so from the point of view of the stevedores or the crews that handle the bridles used in loading or off loading through the ships' hatches. The difficulties of hooking and unhooking the bridles on flush pallets at our ports and in ships' holds is a far more important consideration to DOD than the perhaps doubtful advantages of the flush pallet.

Think with concern. If you will, of unloading flush pallets into a DUKW or an LCT in choppy water. The boat crews would have to have to manually unscrew the ends of the bridles to release them each time the small craft received a pallet load. The same condition prevailed at the inadequate pier at Cam Ranh Bay where the ships discharged directly into Army trucks. Again the truck crews would have to unscrew each bridle to release the flush type pallet.

Our readers must be constantly aware of the tonnage that comes via airplanes in addition to that of vessels.

The Air Force has a great variety of services to render in a theater such as Vietnam. A cross section of photos will create an image of areas that, when physically covered by actual items and tonnage, reach fantastic figures. The demands on crews and their imaginative response to requests placed on them is an example one should consider.

There are many other areas such as maps, fuel and ammunition. All take skilled personnel to handle. Aircraft are hungry for fuel and when operating aircraft are great distances from home they must be refueled in the modern technique that is now normal.

To an old five-gallon drum man or a simple tank truck supplier such as myself there is a great fascination watching a refuelling operation in the air. The contrast between the old and the new methods certainly is

marked. It's really breathtaking. Yet part of the old steady pipeline of effort still occurs today as sea tankers plow through the Pacific swells in a steady column to the transfer points where the air tanker can load and perform its part in this great logistic effort.

Ammunition for bombing is a tonnage and distribution problem constantly facing the supply forces. A bomber requires a heavy load to cover its target.

Fighter aircraft carry a variety of weapons for their types of targets. Precision plays a great part of the teamwork of pilot, aircraft and supply man.

Steady effort is the price our Armed Forces must pay to keep up the pressure on an enemy.

MAINTENANCE

While I have mentioned problem areas of mud and sand, I haven't really touched on the subject of maintenance.

It's constantly with the company commander in Vietnam. Take a QM direct support company, for example. This is typical of what a commander has to face. One has his shower and bath elements spotted along a road for 60 miles from his base camp. His ration breakdown personnel and laundry personnel are also scattered. He faces a levy for 18 maintenance men and equipment. His Graves Registration personnel are constantly out on search and recovery missions for downed helicopters and their passengers.

In spite of this distribution of his strength, this commander is responsible for class I support of some 26,000 troops in the base area—a problem further enhanced by the fact this strength is composed of joint troops with different eating habits. He must supply class III supplies for the above force plus three hospitals.

He must handle his normal company functions. His day starts early and ends late. Actually were one to go by the book he should have another direct support company plus their equipment.

This stretching of men and equipment quickly brings him into the field of maintenance. He feels the need for new laundry and bakery equipment. Spare parts and repair parts are a real problem to him.

He knows however that he would never trade this experience or job. Maturity has suddenly been thrust upon him. He feels that the basic logistics schools must get to new blood in young officers. The ones he looks at just don't seem to give a damn. His staff sergeants who seemed so good in garrison life where all equipment is installed and maintained for them seem much less than good under field conditions. They should be the ones furnishing the knowledge and experience which a commander could accept and support. He cannot do this and in fact doesn't dare accept, much less support, their acts. The commander is thrown into unexpected details of maintenance.

For instance every washer and dryer he has is deadlined. They are powered by an M38 jeep engine. This is the type that had been sold to Korea and several other countries to include the repair parts. His resupply of parts fortunately is close by since a Korean division is a neighbor. Consequently, when four Korean jeeps were wrecked, by agreement needed parts were furnished to help his supply.

For power he is using two 30-kilowatt generators found in the command to power his washers and dryers because the 10 kilowatts mounted on the trailers simply won't carry the 18- to 20-hour workday and have long ago been burned out.

Maintenance is constantly with him. He can't stay out of it. He wishes he had spent more time when he was a student learning more about it.

He really knows that his officers and sergeants can produce. However, his team is new and he must get results. The respon-

sibility is his. He is the company commander.

(From the Review, January-February 1966)
VIETNAM

(By Lt. Gen. A. T. McNamara, U.S. Army, retired, executive vice president, Defense Supply Association)

In our previous issue I gave as simply as I could a description of some of the problems associated with the insurgents or guerrillas. Then I wrote of the land itself and also something of the people of Vietnam. I have been, of course, establishing the foundation and background on which and against which I propose to describe the logistic effort which our troops have presently established in Vietnam and must increase in order to support our military effort. I will add other items of interest to the younger officer.

We have a major logistic effort which faces our U.S. troops in a distant foreign country. Add to this the ingredients of well-trained enemy guerrillas, terrain which limits the use of modern weaponry, and people who have participated in war for 20 years, and you have a military dish that is difficult to consume.

A great curiosity is inbred in a good logistics officer. Where are we going, what does the area look like, can we use the type of equipment we were trained in, is there an ability to use local facilities, if any?

All are good and sound questions.

Let's assume we seek general knowledge first and then proceed to the specific. Also we will treat airfields later since in this distant country they play such a great role in our logistic support.

Because of limited seaports and severed roads, the U.S. logistic effort is a combination of several methods. Some ships go directly to a port and are completely unloaded. Some go to a port and are partially unloaded and are then diverted to another port. Some cargoes are off-loaded into smaller vessels. All shipments, because of proper marking and sound requisitioning, reach the proper units. The question of course—are they received on time? We will talk of this later.

A brief look at a recent map shows Saigon presently is our main port. Cam Ranh Bay, a magnificent harbor, is a second, and Nha Trang, Qui Nhon, Da Nang, Hue, and Quang Tri follow.

Quang Tri, Hue, and Da Nang are all deltas of small rivers and have limited elevation above sea level—perhaps 20 feet.

Saigon, the largest port, handles over 3 million tons of cargo per year. Nha Trang, Qui Nhon, and Da Nang handle one-half million tons together.

Extensive roadbuilding programs are in process of linking Qui Nhon to Pleiku, Nmh Hoa to Ban Me Thuot, and Pleiku to Ban Me Thuot.

Thirty-two kilometers of four-lane, paved highway link Saigon and Bien Hoa.

The majority of the country's highway bridges are of temporary, wooden structure and accommodate only single-lane, one-way traffic.

There are some 20,000 buses and trucks, plus 50,000 cars in South Vietnam.

All of South Vietnam's large cities have airports capable of handling jet aircraft and most villages have landing strips for short landing-take off type aircraft.

The shoreline of most of South Vietnam is hazardous to navigation because of the many scattered islands, rocks, shoals, and bars that lie off shore especially fringing the headlands except for Cam Ranh Bay.

Hue has the country's highest rainfall average of 116 inches annually. Saigon temperatures stays in the eighties. Dalat has the lowest recorded temperature of 13° F. and the highest is 108° F. at Qui Nhon.

The country's main internal transportation system consists of 1,400 miles of primary and 700 miles of secondary canals where canal barges, small motor junks, and sampans carry freight and passengers.

Two-thirds of South Vietnam's 15,000 miles of roadway are paved and the remainder is in poor condition. The system is bottlenecked by its narrowness, many ferry crossings, fords, sharp curves, steep grades, and low bridge clearances.

The physical conditions of the countries as evidenced above, added to the types of growth of plants, trees, and shrubs have created the necessity for enclaves or base areas from which our military forces can work.

Supplies which must be offloaded into small landing craft for movement into the beach move steadily ashore. They resemble a column of ants carrying small amounts of food to store for harsher times. In this Far East country the supply man has a problem of storage. To offset the rainfall he must store on dunnage, in a well-drained area and cover to protect from torrential rains or burning sun.

He must have roads through his dump in order to quickly reach his items and his location plan must be accurate.

Local labor creates identification headaches. Security for 360 degrees is needed around each point and you must accurately check your firing lanes so your colleagues are safe from your fire. Ask for and tie in with their fire plan also.

The logistic problems paramount in the mind of officers or logisticians are many and varied.

First let's acknowledge that there are some basic problems that seem to be present in all military areas regardless of countries. Ports present offloading problems especially if a narrow river connects it to the sea. This is the problem at Saigon, the largest port which presently handles the heavy percentage of our cargo. The port itself is part of the city with the piers parallel to the river bank. The river poses some problems. It is narrow and winding. Many ships put their bows into the mudbank and let the tide swing the vessel around.

Saigon has an airport and warfare brings storage problems to airports. Rainfall creates storage problems as the Saigon airport evidences. Some items must be protected from mortar fire.

Cam Ranh Bay is one of the finest natural harbors in the world. Presently it has but one long narrow pier in use. Ships unload on both sides. Trucks have to back up to the pier to get their loads. This creates a bottleneck. Another long pier has been recently constructed. The bay has lovely sand beaches on which LSTs discharge their loads. Vehicles can be quickly offloaded and assembled in defined areas and beach headquarters can be rapidly established.

Sand creates storage problems. It is difficult to move tons. But items must be collected and moved to storage points. Winds move sand rather rapidly and sometimes erode it from under stacks and they tumble. Sometimes the wind piles sand around and in items and they must be dug out. Ferries, homemade type, are of great assistance in quiet water.

While we are laying in this heavy logistics effort, there are other American officers assigned as training teams to various Vietnamese units who must not be forgotten. They have a unique assignment which presents difficult and challenging features to our young officers.

Let's consider a Vietnamese Ranger Battalion. Normally the Americans assign one captain, one first lieutenant, two noncoms who are light weapons infantrymen and one private first class or specialist fourth class radio telephone operator. Generally they

carry two radios such as the PRC 25, a member of the new family of radios.

The captain's job consists of offering tactical advice and staff advice. The team generally tries to help in any area where their assistance is needed. Sometimes they dig for these trouble areas since people tend to ignore problem areas in the hope that time, et cetera, will straighten them out. In garrison, as we all know, they make out strength reports, after action reports and monthly summaries plus a unit evaluation. These have to do with materiel, men and overall combat effectiveness.

These reports serve to alert American channels of troubled areas or expected trouble areas. Then the advisers in these areas can confront their counterparts with the facts in an attempt to help them solve the problems.

Operations are normally conducted during daylight because during the night the unit must return to secure the compounds assigned to them to protect.

The American team's job is to accompany the battalion on the march. Usually the lieutenant with one sergeant is placed with one of the leading companies. This gives him a good vantage point where he can observe movement, etc. He checks in with the captain who is accompanied by a sergeant and his radio telephone operator. They stay with the Vietnamese battalion commander. The captain, through his communication media, has contact with the tactical operations center and observer aircraft, usually L-19's. This enables him to call in for medical evacuation, air strikes both direct and indirect, and for armed helicopters for support in ground operations.

In addition to the above, the captain must effect any specific instructions he has received from higher headquarters. His job, therefore, is to advise, communicate with the air, and pass on all timely information to higher headquarters.

Most of the young company commanders like this type of assignment. As one put it: "It's interesting, challenging, tiring, sometimes boring, and damned frustrating. But I'm glad I'm here and not with an American unit. I have full freedom, am trusted and seeing things from their point of view—a view all too often overlooked."

Practically all officers with Vietnamese Ranger Battalions emphasize the fact that different terrain features, vegetation, etc., create unique problems for each area and that there are few common problems. One officer said " * * * so I wouldn't know about area problems or their tricks of the trade unless I was there. It's funny, isn't it?"

All officers spoke of the mortars as their worst problem. One said: "My worst fear is mortars. I never realized what a weapon that was until they chased us all around 1 day. The next fear is booby traps and mines. These guys are pros."

THE ROLE OF THE LAWYER IN THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. President, William Allen, president of the Boeing Airplane Co., has observed that:

No movement in history for the improvement of man's condition and for the establishment of justice has ever succeeded without the presence, the influence, and the leadership of great and courageous lawyers. No such movement, once established, has been maintained against opposing forces without the aid of great and courageous lawyers. (47 A.B.A.J. 981) (1961).

This observation by Mr. Allen, a lawyer turned businessman, finds ample confirmation in the lawyer's dominant

March 2, 1966

whether this Nation can afford "guns and butter," it is equally important that attention be focused on whether we have, and will have, an adequate supply of qualified manpower to staff and implement our expanding domestic programs and military commitments. The Nation's ability to meet our manpower needs will depend largely on the availability of quality educational opportunities in higher education—on the ability of our colleges and universities to house and educate our youth—and on the resources, private and public, that can be mustered to guarantee that no student of ability is denied an educational opportunity because of financial reasons. The President yesterday called attention to this matter and urged the Congress to strengthen our national endeavor in the area of higher education. His message on education demonstrates the continued interest and unyielding determination of the administration to work toward "a national goal of full educational opportunity" set last year by the President.

The successful legislative response to the administration's requests for expanded and new Federal programs in higher education is indicative of the growing awareness in Congress and across the country of the value of education to the individual and to the Nation. The President's education message emphasizing that "our education programs must be administered wisely and well" and his legislative program in higher education stressing examination and extension of existing programs rather than the implementation and establishment of new ones, mirrors, I believe, the mood and feeling of so many in the educational community—that it is time to stop, look and listen—to study, evaluate and perfect before we venture into new areas.

In accordance with the President's requests, the Congress will be asked to reexamine two of the most successful Federal education programs. The Higher Education Facilities Act under which our colleges and universities are receiving grants and loans for the construction of academic facilities will be considered for extension and funding at a level which is consistent with the demands being placed upon our schools to provide the instructional space needed for the predicted increase of nearly a million and a half students in 1967 and the even larger number expected in future years.

Testimony before the Special Subcommittee on Education, letters received from college presidents and administrators, and discussions with members of the educational community demonstrate clearly not only the value but the necessity of providing Federal assistance for construction purposes. Fortunately Congress will have an opportunity to re-evaluate and study with the knowledge that strong administration support will be given to a continuation of the program.

Attention and consideration will also be given to the provisions of both new and the long-established student loan programs. Concerned college presidents, administrators, students and parents

were, I am sure, reassured with the President's message to the effect that he is proposing an orderly transition of the national defense education student loan program to the guaranteed program so that no eligible student will be deprived of the needed financial assistance. The administration's bill which I have introduced today contains a number of provisions designed to effectuate this orderly transition. Certainly these provisions must receive very careful scrutiny by the Congress and to this end the Special Subcommittee on Education will begin public hearings in the very near future. Prompt attention to this matter is necessary in order to insure that our colleges and universities and our students will be advised of the exact and final provisions just as soon as possible.

May I take this opportunity to comment on another part of the President's message. We are all aware of the hospital crisis in almost every major American city. As the urban population continues to grow, ever greater strain will be placed on already inadequate resources. The "Father of Medicine," Hippocrates, observed several centuries ago that "Healing is a matter of time, but it sometimes is also a matter of opportunity." In his health message, the President recognizes the need to provide those opportunities for healing and I wish to offer special congratulations on the program he has recommended to construct and refurbish urban hospital systems badly in disrepair. Advances in knowledge are always welcome. But to have the know-how and not the means to apply it can have little practical value. I am, therefore, very pleased by this evidence of the President's leadership in what should be our joint determination to transfer the learning of the laboratory to the world of people by help in updating of hospitals, equipment, and the training of personnel.

VIETNAM

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

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, history alone can ultimately determine whether or not America has chosen the right path in South Vietnam. Its decision will be inexorable.

We, here and now, must move in the direction that the needs of the present and the lessons of the past dictate. We cannot vacillate. We dare not hesitate.

Whatever the justice of our original involvement in South Vietnam may have been—and men may debate the ethics of that initial involvement until little green apples turn into big red grapes—the inescapable fact in that we are involved.

Yesterday, by a vote of 392 to 4, this body authorized \$4.8 billion for military procurement to make certain our men in uniform have the means with which to carry out this Nation's obligations in South Vietnam and other areas of the world where similar obligations exist.

There have been, and will continue to be, efforts to explain what yesterday's vote meant and what it did not mean. I wish to state that my vote in favor of the authorization clearly and emphatically expressed my support of President Johnson's determination to halt Communist terrorism and aggression in South Vietnam.

Recently, a major Arizona daily newspaper, the Phoenix Gazette, carried a significant editorial concerning America's role in Vietnam. There is not an abundance of occasions on which the Gazette and I agree editorially. I include the editorial and a newsletter distributed to my constituents last month for the study and comment of the Members of the House.

[From the Phoenix Gazette, Feb. 17, 1966]

NO EASY WAY IN VIETNAM

As any soldier knows, the only way to win a battle is to attack the enemy and destroy him. So, too, is that the only way to win a war, a fact that President Johnson quite obviously realizes, for all of the unsolicited advice to the contrary.

The President has indicated that he stands ready to commit still more men, more equipment and more arms—whatever is necessary—to enable the allied forces to search for the enemy, find him and destroy him in Vietnam.

Surprisingly, there has been some sentiment, notably that expressed by George F. Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to Russia and to Yugoslavia, and by retired Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, for the United States to adopt a Maginot Line concept in Vietnam.

Kennan said the U.S. forces should simply "dig in and wait" for a Communist peace bid. Although Gavin endorsed "search and destroy" operations against the Vietcong, he opposed the additional commitments of troops that may be necessary to conduct them effectively.

Kennan's tactical formula, which he disclosed in testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, would lead to unmitigated disaster for the United States. Granted the initiative, the Vietcong could consolidate control in vast areas of Vietnam and seize still other territory. Ultimately, the whole countryside would fall to them, except those small areas where the waiting Americans were dug in, and even those might well become untenable.

The Communists are not likely ever to bid for peace under such circumstances. The American forces ultimately would have to come out of their holes and fight, under even more adverse circumstances than they face now, or, worse yet, retreat from the Indochina peninsula.

General Gavin is worried about the dangers of overcommitment in Vietnam, and his concern is valid, to a point. The demands of the Vietnam conflict have reduced the American strategic reserve—forces that could be deployed in a new or intensified emergency—to a distressingly low point. Still, the answer is to reconstitute the strategic reserve, not to commit fewer troops than needed to destroy the enemy in Vietnam.

Of course, there is unpleasantness involved in mounting a destructive attack on the Vietcong. It may require a substantially larger Military Establishment, which means higher draft calls and possibly a mobilization of citizen-soldiers. Too, offensives always produce casualties.

However unpleasant the task, though, the fact remains, as it has through history, that there simply is no other to win. That is the way it must be in Vietnam.

The number of older Americans is increasing rapidly, at a rate second only to the increase of the population between the ages of 5 and 14. And today the very old age group—those 85 and over—exceeds 900,000, an increase of close to 1,000 percent since 1920.

Congress has recognized this new demographic preponderance of older citizens and its accompanying growth in problems by devoting increasing legislative attention to this group. In the last session alone, the historic medicare proposal came to life. And last session also saw the birth of the Older Americans Act, certainly not as far reaching as medicare, but definitely significant in terms of its commitment to our older citizens.

In fact, Congress has been actively and prolifically legislating in the interests of our elderly Americans for the past several sessions—in the fields of health, welfare, research, and expanding opportunities for productive activity by the elderly. It would seem that the various standing committees in the House are gaining through this increased experience a broad acquaintance with the problems and troubles which confront the elderly.

Why, then, just at the time when more knowledge is being gained by the committees which handle legislation affecting the elderly, is it desirable to create a Select Committee on Aging?

I can see the reasons clearly. As matters stand now, legislation for the aged is handled piecemeal and is created individually. A select committee with the duty of conducting research and studies, with the duty of holding hearings and collecting information, can contribute an overview and a perspective on the general condition of the aging in the United States. It can channel our legislative energies, show where coordination will be useful, and educate all interested congressional parties to the priorities for action.

It can serve as a center for specialization—providing experts with general knowledge about the problems of the elderly in relation to the specific areas of health, welfare, social, and cultural needs.

Especially now that the framework of legislation has been laid to assist the older American meet his needs, we must turn to the more subtle problems facing an elderly citizen. "Man cannot live by bread alone," neither can an elderly person find joy and satisfaction in his later years merely by knowing that his heaviest health needs will be partially shouldered for him, or by knowing that his meager pension will keep him fed and clothed and warmed.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz stated the problem of the older American accurately when he said:

It doesn't make sense that the doctors and scientists can do so much better about removing the physical aches and pains of old age than the rest of us are doing about ending the bitter bruises of discrimination against older people.

One subtle problem facing the growing group of our population that is over age 65, is how to use their more robust

health and the long years of life that they can expect to enjoy to some useful end, when the trend of our society is to retire people out of the labor force at an early age.

Another problem is whether to permit the elderly to be grouped together in enclaves within existing communities or within special communities of their own when they are still quite capable of contributing their full measure to the mainstream of our society.

These are areas where much research must be done before we can reach valid conclusions. These are areas where there are very few experts and very little in the way of history. These are areas where we must seek out, collect, and coordinate opinion.

In short, these are areas where a special select committee could function very effectively—serving the Congress, its senior committees, and above all the elderly citizens of the United States by gathering the knowledge and experience from which we can plot our future courses of action.

The Senate instituted its Special Committee on Aging 5 years ago. It was prompted to this course of action by the realization that the problems of aging cut across all legislative fields of interest, yet that there was no mechanism for insuring that coordination of action could take place. Such coordination could work for an interrelationship of action and for a minimum of duplication and waste.

The committee in the Senate has accomplished a great deal in its first few years and it has greatly enlarged the knowledge of the Congress on what the problems of aging are.

The House is no less in need of the assistance of experts and research in conducting its legislative duties. Indeed, the proliferation of programs for the elderly virtually obligate us to educate ourselves as fully as possible in order to legislate more wisely and effectively.

I hope that my fellow Members of Congress will see the need as clearly as I do and support the creation of a Select Committee on Aging in the House and my Resolution 191 which is as follows:

H. RES. 191

Whereas there are now more than seventeen million persons in the United States age sixty-five and over—a group representing more than 9 per centum of our total population and more than 15 per centum of our adult population; and

Whereas this group of senior American citizens is expected to exceed twenty million by 1970—thus continuing it as the most rapidly growing segment of our entire adult population; and

Whereas this group is faced with serious and continuing problems, including employment, housing, medical care, education, pensions, and meaningful use of retirement years; and

Whereas these problems have produced and will continue to produce serious strains on the fabric of our national life making it incumbent upon us to discover what social and economic conditions will enable our senior citizens both to contribute to our national productivity and to lead satisfying, independent, and productive lives; and

Whereas the problems of our senior citizens, while calling for action by various leg-

islative committees, are themselves highly interrelated, requiring coordinated review and recommendations based on studies in depth of the total field—studies which of necessity must range beyond the jurisdictional boundaries of any existing committee; and

Whereas the problems confronting our senior citizens are of such vital national concern as to require the full-time attention of a select committee of the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a nonlegislative select committee to be composed of fifteen Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of any and all matters pertaining to problems of older people, including, but not limited to, problems of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding retirement activity, of securing proper housing, and, when necessary, of assuring adequate care or assistance.

No proposed legislation shall be referred to the committee, and the committee shall not have power to report by bill, or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

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

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

ADMINISTRATION'S REQUEST FOR EXPANDED AND NEW PROGRAMS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. KREBS) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, at a time when widespread concern is being expressed over the question of

THE SENNER VIEW—REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

(By GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.)

(NOTE.—During recent weeks, I have received an increasing amount of mail concerning South Vietnam. This complicated and frustrating problem involves every one of us. So that the people of my Third Congressional District may know my position on our involvement in South Vietnam, I am reproducing here a letter I recently sent one constituent.)

DEAR TRAVIS: Thank you for your recent correspondence sharing with me some of your thoughts relative to Vietnam.

I have been briefed by President Johnson, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Ambassador to the United Nations Arthur J. Goldberg, and other administrative officials. It is my conclusion that these public servants are doing everything possible to secure for the South Vietnamese people the right of self-determination in choosing the type of government they want to represent them. Further, that they are exploring every reasonable avenue to stop Communist aggression in South Vietnam, and to preserve peace throughout all of southeast Asia.

I thought that you would be interested in a tally of the war survey taken of Congress by the U.S. News & World Report (Jan. 31, 1966) which gives the compilation of the replies of 237 Members of the House of Representatives and 35 Senators. A copy of the same is enclosed, together with my comments thereon.

Of late, there seem to be five types of letters addressed to me by individuals: (1) total withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam; (2) the use of thermonuclear weapons, regardless of the consequences; (3) when do we win the war in Vietnam? If not—why not? (4) continue the lull in the bombing of North Vietnam and seek a negotiated peace; and (5) turn the war in Vietnam over to the United Nations peacekeeping teams.

I am sure that all of us are for peace; and that all of us are against the ugly and terrible menace of Communist aggression, forcing its will upon people. However, as President Johnson said, three Presidents—President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson—have expressed their intention to live up to our commitment as indicated by this country's expressions to the Geneva accord of 1954, the first U.S. military assistance being furnished in 1954 by President Eisenhower. President Johnson has told the American people that we did not choose to be the keeper at the gate, but there is no one else; that our word and our commitment, given to the South Vietnamese, will be kept and whatever our men need in guns and moneys will be provided.

I have faith in President Johnson and his advisers in attempting to bring this matter to a quick and just solution with a minimum loss of life to mankind. I can only hope, with you, that this war will be brought to a successful conclusion, with honor and the freedom that we are seeking for the people of South Vietnam. I hope, too, that this can be accomplished as quickly as possible and that our boys will be able to return to their homes.

With warmest personal regards to you, I remain,

As always,

GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.

TALLY ON THE WAR SURVEY OF CONGRESS

A questionnaire was sent to all Members of Congress.

Total number of replies: 272. This is more than half the membership of Congress.

Included in the 272 replying were 35 Senators, 237 Representatives.

Each Member of Congress was told: "This survey is completely anonymous and you need not sign the questionnaire unless you wish to do so." Some Members signed their replies. Most did not.

Each question called for a "yes" or "no" reply. Additional comment also was invited.

Some of those responding did not answer every question.

Counting only direct "yes" or "no" responses, the column at the left shows how the Members of Congress replied to each of the nine questions.

HOUSE AND SENATE POSITION	SENNER POSITION
1. In your opinion, is it vital to the United States to save South Vietnam from a Communist takeover? House: 206 yes, 20 no. Senate: 28 yes, 6 no.	Yes.
2. Does the United States have a vital interest in the future of southeast Asia? House: 219 yes, 10 no. Senate: 28 yes, 6 no.	Yes.
3. If the Communists will not talk truce, should North Vietnam be hit harder? House: 190 yes, 23 no. Senate: 25 yes, 6 no.	Yes. Insofar as hitting "harder" applies to military strategic targets and a complete and effective blockade of strategic war materials and personnel in North Vietnam.
4. Do you think North Vietnam should be bombed into submission, if necessary to win? House: 155 yes, 45 no. Senate: 16 yes, 13 no.	If by "submission" is meant total annihilation of the North Vietnam population, my answer is "No." If, on the other hand, submission means rendering the military ineffective to continue its policy of aggression in South Vietnam, then my answer is an unequivocal "Yes."
5. Is the use of tactical atomic weapons unthinkable? House: 87 yes, 118 no. Senate: 22 yes, 10 no.	The word "unthinkable" is misleading here, for military, political and economic demands of the war in Vietnam require a thorough evaluation of every possible action and reaction. Therefore, to think of tactical atomic weapons is proper. As to their actual use, I would be strongly opposed except as a last resort in defense against nuclear aggression.
6. Should war be confined to ground operations, rather than ground war plus bombing of the North? House: 17 yes, 203 no. Senate: 5 yes, 27 no.	No.
7. Is this actually a good time to cut losses and to get out? House: 12 yes, 205 no. Senate: 3 yes, 30 no.	No.
8. Should we withdraw to coastal enclaves to avoid a bigger war? House: 19 yes, 192 no. Senate: 4 yes, 25 no.	No.
9. Should the war be allowed to return to its purely guerrilla phase? House: 10 yes, 195 no. Senate: 1 yes, 22 no.	No. As long as the terrorists and aggressors remain in South Vietnam they must be searched out and rendered ineffective. The South Vietnamese people should have the right of self-determination of their government by free elections.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that official business back in the district prevented me from participating in the vote yesterday on the defense authorization bill.

If I had been here I would have voted in support of the legislation.

The President has my full and complete support in his actions in the Vietnam crisis, and I am only sorry that I was not able to be here yesterday to affirmatively express my support by voting for H.R. 12889.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DAGUE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today and tomorrow, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 60 minutes, March 3, 1966; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. VANIK (at the request of Mr. PATMAN), for 60 minutes, March 3, 1966, immediately following Mr. PATMAN; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RONCALIO, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POOL, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY of New York (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RESNICK (at the request of Mr. KREBS), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. CELLER and to include an article, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$572.

Mr. CELLER and to include an article, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$286.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS and to include a letter from a constituent.

(Mr. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD and to include a press release from the State Department.

Mr. HALL to revise and extend his remarks made in debate on H.R. 9963.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURTON of Utah.

Mrs. BOLTON.

Mr. QUILLEN in two instances.

Mr. MIZE.

Mr. REIFEL in two instances.

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. YOUNGER in two instances.

Mr. SAYLOR in two instances.

Mr. FINO in two instances.

Mr. DEVINE.

Mr. MICHEL in three instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. MORSE in three instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho in five instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. MATHIAS in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KREBS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RONCALIO in two instances.

Mr. CORMAN in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. MACKIE in five instances.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. ABBITT in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. GIBBONS.

Mr. TAYLOR in four instances.

Mr. HUNGATE.

Mr. EVERETT in two instances.

Mr. GREIGG.

Mr. GILLIGAN in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in eight instances.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan.

Mr. MACHEN in two instances.

Mr. BOLLING in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAMS in three instances.

Mr. GRABOWSKI in four instances.

Mr. BARING.

Mr. FYQUA in two instances.

Mr. STRATTON.

Mr. MULTER in three instances.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 251. An act to provide for the establishment of the Cape Lookout National Seashore in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 3, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2120. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements, fiscal year 1965, Virgin Islands Corporation, Department of the Interior, pursuant to the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 851 (H. Doc. No. 398); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

2121. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report that authority vested in the Secretary of Defense to pay special pay, in addition to other pay prescribed by law, to certain officers, was not exercised during calendar year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 306 and section 310, title 37, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2122. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the 25th Semiannual Report of the U.S. Information Agency, for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 80-402; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2123. A letter from the Assistant Director for Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2124. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination of financial statements of Public Housing Administration, fiscal years 1965 and 1964 Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2125. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 6 of the Southern Nevada Project Act (act of October 22, 1965 (79 Stat. 1068)); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2126. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a coordinated national safety program and establishment of safety standards for motor vehicles in interstate commerce to reduce traffic accidents and the deaths, injuries, and property damage which occur in such accidents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2127. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2128. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report of orders entered in certain cases, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d) (8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2129. A letter from the Commissioner, Im-

migration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report of visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries of such petitions third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2130. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the 31st Annual Report of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, pursuant to the provisions of section 4, second, Public Law 442, approved June 21, 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 10721. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to improve its benefits, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 12762. A bill to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard; with amendments (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13196. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the opportunities for training of medical technologists and personnel in other allied health professions, to improve the educational quality of the schools training such allied health professions personnel, and to strengthen and improve the existing student loan programs for medical, osteopathic, dental, podiatry, pharmacy, optometric, and nursing students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13197. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote and assist in the extension and improvement of comprehensive health planning and public health services, to provide for a more effective use of available Federal funds for such planning and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13198. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to further promote and assist in modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities through grants for amortization of indebtedness incurred for that purpose, direct loans, and guarantees of loans, and through grants for the planning of such modernization, and to authorize grants for development of new technology systems and concepts in the provision of health services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13199. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act so as to authorize grants to air pollution control agencies for maintenance of air pollution control programs in addition to present authority for grants to develop, establish, or improve such programs; make the use of appropriations under the act more flexible by consolidating the appropriation authorizations under that act and deleting the provision limiting the total of grants for support

In Washington we hear voices clamoring for the scrapping of laws that require American ships be built in American shipyards—this in total opposition to our Nation's balance-of-payments difficulties—this despite the devastating blow it would deal to America's shipyards which would stand to lose annual revenues of \$500 million, with employment and associated industries suffering as well—this in spite of the fact that every other nation which aspires to greatness supports and encourages its ship operators and shipyards. It is both penny and pound foolish. Other prophetic voices in Washington predict that air transport will dominate the movement of men and materials in all future emergencies—yet as of today, over 95 percent of the troops and supplies are moving to Vietnam in ships.

We are the world's richest nation—its greatest importer and exporter, yet our maritime fleet is permitted to linger in strength far behind the fleets of numerous other nations. Though we strive to excel and exceed in all else that we do, America seems content to drift toward the day when we will find ourselves a second rate maritime power—if we aren't that already. There continues to be no true evaluation of this sorry situation—no purposeful actions that are intended to correct or remedy—no clear-cut planning that will insure Americans the security and prestige of a strong fourth arm of defense. If I had to characterize the efforts by Washington with respect to solving the problems of our merchant marine over the last decade, I would say the industry is being studied to death.

We see constant reminders that the Soviet Union moves rapidly in the construction of a mighty merchant fleet. Indeed, this program—the building of ships for the U.S.S.R.—has become the leading industry of Poland and East Germany. Though in all other areas the Russians must contend with a strongly competitive America—here, in the construction and maintenance of a merchant marine, they find themselves unrivaled and seemingly the only contender in the race. These are facts that sicken.

It is well and fitting that our country should compete zealously with the Russians in space explorations and in the race to the moon. But certainly it is a paradox that with our desire to lead the world in this respect, we seem to care so little about dominance of the seas. The American philosophy is steadfastly dedicated to preserving freedom and maintaining peace throughout the world. In planning for this American dream of a peaceful and progressive world, we must recognize that there will always be a need for ships—ships to protect and police—ships to carry our products to all corners of the world—ships to trade with the great family of nations and thereby enrich, develop and enlighten each port that they touch.

Despite all these rather elementary and very obvious facts, the latest shock from Washington is that the Congress has been asked by the Department of Commerce to appropriate enough funds for the replacement this year of something like 13 ships. We greet this news with disbelief. As the list of ships that carry our flag on the trade routes of the world grows pathetically smaller—and as the Russians resolutely move to build hundreds of ships—we are only making token replacements. I hope you can understand and share our utter despair.

The function of government is to support all means that will contribute to a country's progress, protection, affluence, and prestige. We do this now in many areas of our society. Yet, of all the billions that comprise our annual budget, only a fraction of 1 percent is applied in any manner or form to our merchant marine. The seriousness of our shipping plight does not arouse a Government that seems indifferent nor a public that seems unaware. The days when our packets and clippers controlled the sealanes of the

world are now far behind us—and our shipping arm continues to wither to the delight of all our adversaries.

Let us hope that America will experience a reawakening to this vital consideration. American shipping, shipbuilding and repair are still strong enough and resourceful enough to rectify these omissions if given the opportunity, but time is fleeting. It would be a splendid accomplishment to solve and conquer the mysteries of outer space—but might it not seem a rather hollow victory if, at the same time, our Nation surrenders the seas of this world to others?

Our company observes its 50th birthday this year with a minimum of confetti but with a great deal of pride. We feel the problem of recognition and support of the maritime industry, of which we are a part, will someday be accepted and implemented because it is in the national interest. We will continue to speak out on this issue, work diligently, persevere, exercise ingenuity and grow. We look forward eagerly to the opportunities of the future. We subscribe to the American dream of a contended and prosperous family of nations—and you may be sure that Todd will be ready, as always, to serve the ships of that community.

NINTH MISSION—THE DELAWARE AIR NATIONAL GUARD COMPLETES FLIGHT TO VIETNAM WITH VITAL CARGO FOR THE DEFENSE OF FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Delaware Air National Guard has just completed its ninth mission to southeast Asia; this flight, too, was to Vietnam.

The mission was to transport cargo vital for the defense of freedom. Taking part in this flight were men from Delaware and Pennsylvania.

I am advised by Col. Clarence E. Atkinson, aircraft commander, Delaware Air National Guard that—

This flight is the ninth mission to southeast Asia for the Delaware Air Guard since December 1, 1965, in which our civilian airmen have done their part in support of the military effort.

The men listed below have given voluntarily of their time and effort, taking leave from their civilian jobs and families to support the regular military Air Force in transporting material to the Far East.

I commend the members of the Delaware Air National Guard who participated in this mission on a voluntary basis, and who took time from their civilian jobs and their families to support the regular military Air Force in transporting vital material to Vietnam.

I include as part of my remarks the following letter which I have received from Col. Clarence E. Atkinson:

142D MILITARY AIRLIFT SQUADRON,
DELAWARE AIR NATIONAL GUARD,
New Castle, Del.

Representative HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McDOWELL: Again the Delaware Air National Guard has completed a flight to Vietnam with vital cargo for the defense of freedom.

This flight is in ninth mission to southeast Asia for the Delaware Air Guard since December 1, 1965, in which our civilian airmen have done their part in support of the military effort.

The men listed below have given voluntarily of their time and effort, taking leave from their civilian jobs and families to support the regular military Air Force in transporting material to the Far East.

We will continue to inform you each time Delaware is represented on the fighting fronts of the world.

Best regards,

Col. Clarence E. Atkinson, Aircraft Commander, Delaware Air National Guard; Capt. Richard Simon, New Castle, Del., Pilot; Lt. Donald Eyre, Claymont, Del., 2d Pilot; Lt. Col. John Caulfield, Dover, Del., Air Force adviser; Maj. Harold Morrison, Wilmington, Del., Air Force Adviser-Navigator; Lt. James Sisson, Media, Pa., Navigator; Sgt. John Quigley, Wilmington, Del., Flight Engineer; Sgt. Richard Harada, Newark, Del., Flight Engineer; Sgt. Ben Phillips, Wilmington, Del., Loadmaster; Sgt. Paul Lane, New Castle, Del., Crew Chief.

VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the American people are deeply troubled—and deeply divided—about events in Vietnam. Our growing involvement in that war has also been of great concern to me. Although I had read everything I could about the struggle and its history, I felt that my understanding was only two-dimensional without a personal visit to Vietnam. I made such a visit in mid-December, and this constitutes my report of that trip to Congress, the Nation at large, and my constituents in the 28th Congressional District of New York.

There are two parts to this report. First, my observations of what is happening. And second, my analysis of why they are happening.

At the outset, let me stress that I went over with an open mind and a completely objective attitude. I was not trying to reinforce any predetermined opinions about the political and military situation there.

My main reason for going to Vietnam was to visit the servicemen from the 28th Congressional District, to bring to them holiday greetings, and to assure them that while everyone back home did not agree with the administration's policy in Vietnam, we nevertheless appreciated what they were doing there and intended to give them all the support we possibly could.

I also wanted to learn everything I could from my personal observations and conversations with the people there, not only the generals but also the fighting men, the Vietnamese civilians, refugees as well as peasants in the villages, and the American civilians. I arrived in Vietnam late on Sunday, the 19th of December, and left on the 27th.

During that time I traveled some 3,200 miles visiting most American installations, including Da Nang, Chu Lai, Bien Hoa, Pleiku, and Lai Khe. I spent 1 day aboard the aircraft carrier, U.S.S. *Hancock*, and 1 day visiting a city and two villages in the Mekong Delta to observe the operations of the civilian AID missions there. One of my special reasons for wanting to be in Vietnam at this par-

March 2, 1966

ticular time was to attend Chanukah and Christmas services in these outposts. I had Christmas dinner at the special forces camp at Tanh Linh. I was briefed at the Military Assistance Command Headquarters in Saigon by General Westmoreland and Major General Sternberger. And I visited our sick and wounded at a field hospital in Da Nang, the naval hospital in Saigon, and the 3d Evacuation Hospital in Tan Son Nhut. I had many opportunities to talk to men of all ranks from all over the United States.

There is no question that the GI's know the reason and the purpose behind their presence there. They have a sense of dedication and their morale is high. They lead a tough life. For many troops it is a hardship tour with workdays of from 14 to 16 hours and the constant threat of death nearby. For others the greatest enemy was boredom and complete isolation. Many officers told me that these men are far better equipped than the men they had commanded in World War II and Korea—from the standpoint of training, physical ability, arms, and willingness to do the job.

Most of my traveling was done by airplane and helicopter. I learned very quickly that we do not control the roads in South Vietnam either by day or by night.

Other than rides to and from Tan Son Nhut airport, the only time I drove any distance at all was from Phu Bai to Hue. A distance of about 9 miles. The only railroad running in South Vietnam is between these two points.

This lack of ground transportation routes is a unique aspect of this war. There are no frontlines. In a conventional war, once a position is captured you know you can bring your supplies up from the rear. But in South Vietnam, like in the days of Indian fighting in this country, each of our bases is like an isolated fortress, and the war is fought by expanding the perimeters of these fortresses. Even though our military strength is superior and our bases are secure within their expanding perimeters, the jungle roads between them are controlled by the Vietcong. Two battalions—1,500 men plus tanks and armored personnel carriers—were required to push a convoy of supplies from Bien Hoa to Phuoc Vinh, a distance of 25 miles.

This condition exists throughout South Vietnam. While we have sufficient supplies flowing from the United States to Vietnam, a bottleneck starts at the ship unloading facilities and continues to get worse as we try to move our supplies to our bases inland. The bases can only be supplied by air. Roads, where they exist, are generally miserable. They are mere trails that turn into mud 2 feet deep during the rainy season.

One unique aspect of this fortress-fought war is that, as our perimeters expand, we find that we are providing sanctuary for the civilians. Wherever I went in Vietnam there were refugees coming into the areas controlled by the Government. Refugees are created by many circumstances.

True, some people became refugees because their homes were destroyed by bombardment. But most of them are escaping from the terrorism, forced conscription, extortion, heavy taxation, and food confiscation of the Vietcong. I spoke directly with the refugees, through an interpreter working for our AID Mission. Over and over again I heard the same story.

Living conditions were such under Vietcong control as to make life virtually unbearable. I have pictures which I took of two men who look like they just came out of Dachau. They were from the village of Tanh Linh. About 5 months ago they were riding with 14 other people, men and women, in a bus to Saigon. The bus was stopped and the passengers were taken from the bus. After working at forced labor for the Vietcong, with very little to eat, they were turned loose in the jungle when they would no longer work. Only three made their way out of the jungle. One died immediately upon arrival. When I visited the hospital on Christmas Day the other man had died and the last of the three was on the verge of dying. As a matter of fact, this condition was so critical that we flew him to Saigon in my helicopter.

During my stay in Vietnam I invariably met the chaplains of the Army, Air Force, and Marines—and to a man they felt wholeheartedly that we should be in Vietnam. Many of them confided to me that they had questions and doubts before coming there, but, after being there and seeing how the Vietcong operated, seeing the determination and the ambition of the South Vietnamese to live a decent, free life, they were enthusiastic in their support of our Vietnam policy.

Our soldiers and officers also have developed a dual role in Vietnam, helping the civilian population to rebuild. The GI's and Vietnamese civilians seem to have a mutual respect and liking for each other. You can walk down any village street and immediately find yourself surrounded by what seem to be thousands of children, all yelling "O K O K" which is Vietnamese for "hello".

GI's, in whatever spare time they have, can usually be found washing children, building schools, building orphanages, running parties for Vietnamese children, distributing clothing to civilians, or helping a Vietnamese farmer build a pigpen or a chicken coop. In Kon Tun, which is up in the central highlands and the scene of much of the bitter fighting in Vietnam, the boys from one of our infantry battalions have raised \$5,000 to buy materials for an orphanage. When the materials come in they are going to help these people build the orphanage and I am sure they are going to continue to support it after it is built.

I did not find any hatred of the Vietnamese people by the Americans or resentment of Americans by the Vietnamese people.

Not once did I hear the Vietnamese referred to as "gooks" or "krauts" or "limeys" or any of the other disparaging names that soldiers in the past have adopted for foreigners.

Our people there know that our job is not only to establish peace but to leave

a country that will be equipped for peace—a country in which the lifespan of the average person will go up from its present 36 years.

I was never completely aware of the fact that the Vietcong controlled various areas of the country from the time the Japanese left. There are many areas like the Mekong Delta, the outskirts of Saigon, and up through the central highlands where there was never any government other than the French Government and the Vietcong. Even the Japanese did not control many of these areas during their occupation years.

This control should not be confused with popular support. It is very interesting to note that the Vietcong was never effective in the big cities such as Saigon, Hui, Da Nang, and other cities where there were groups of people together who could defend themselves from the Vietcong. But out in the countryside it was a different story.

They could control the countryside, but again, I believe the vast majority of these people were controlled by Vietcong terrorism rather than out of a philosophical commitment to communism.

As we and the Government of South Vietnam have succeeded in establishing beachheads in what used to be completely Vietcong controlled country, we are now seeing a very interesting phenomenon. Now that they have a choice, the people are voting—with their feet. They are leaving the areas under Vietcong control and are coming into areas under Government control.

I saw this demonstrated very graphically in the Mekong Delta. Mekong is probably one of the richest and most fertile farming areas in the world. This area has been under the complete domination of the Vietcong as far back as 1940. Recently, however, the Government has been able to win the people over to its side because of the terroristic and repressive nature of the Vietcong regime.

The refugee problem we read about is just that. People are becoming refugees from Vietcong control. Very often when we think of refugees we think of people leaving their homes and traveling great distances. In Vietnam, a refugee may have come only 2 or 3 miles—but the difference in those 2 or 3 miles is that they are safe from Vietcong taxation, repression, and terrorism.

American civilians, working for the State Department in our foreign AID program, are doing an outstanding job in helping these refugees build new lives outside the totalitarian regime of the Vietcong.

I will long remember the day I visited the provincial capital of Answan and the village of Ca Mau. I was greeted at the airport by the province chief and all the local officials. Contrary to what many people believe, all of the local officials—the mayors, the province town councils, and so forth—are elected popularly. They live in constant fear of assassination by Vietcong terrorists, along with school teachers and other leaders.

I do not know of anywhere in the world I could have received a warmer greeting. They had banners out for me.

March 2, 1966

The AID mission, which is called U.S. Operation Mission, is concentrating on helping the Vietnamese people to help themselves. We are providing the tools and commodities. The Vietnamese are providing the ambition and the work. We are bringing in agricultural experts from all over the world to show the farmer how to get the best yielding crops and the most out of his land. We are introducing a new breed of pig that will increase the farmers' income and help to diversify their diet.

We are providing concrete so they can build schools. We are drilling wells because fresh water is one of the problems in the Mekong Delta. We are doing everything possible to raise the standard of living in those areas—and the people are responding.

They are responding by building homes, and businesses. By building schools. By providing teachers. The Saigon government is responding by instituting needed social and political reforms.

There is a great demand for education for the children because where the Vietcong were in control there were no schools. There was military training but no schools. When the Vietcong gain control of an area, the first thing they do is shoot the teacher and blow up the school. I saw one of these destroyed schools in Ca Mau.

I met with local Vietnamese officials. Of course, some were good, some not so good. I met some that were truly dedicated. I was particularly impressed with the provision chief of An Xuyn. He walked among his people, he was interested in his people. His only request of me was to tell the people of America what conditions really were and what the Vietnamese really wanted—schools, hospitals—a better life. I think it would be presumptuous of any American to think that a Vietnamese is any less sensitive to the values of human life than we are. They have tasted freedom and they like it—and they are willing to fight and die for it.

I do not know all of the answers about Vietnam. I am not sure that I even know all of the questions. But I do believe that our Nation is mature enough to find the answer to the "why's" which are searing our consciences.

If we are to honestly address ourselves to the "why's," then we must go back to World War II when the Japanese left, France made Indochina—later called Vietnam—a member of the so-called French Commonwealth, a political entity which entailed some self-government. But then France reneged and reduced Vietnam to the status of a colony. It was this attempt to convert the Vietnamese back into a completely dominated colony which gave Ho Chi Minh his first foothold in a popular movement.

Starting back in 1939 in the Yung Ning Forest, Ho Chi Minh initiated the first Communist movement in southeast Asia. During World War II his followers joined with others in forming the Viet Minh, which was a coalition of Vietnamese troops working and fighting for independence. When France eliminated all vestiges of self-rule, the Viet Minh once

again became active. It is important to remember at this point that the Viet Minh, while led by Ho Chi Minh, was a coalition representing a broad spectrum of Vietnamese, whose common goal was independence.

As we all know, the war against France culminated in her defeat at Dienbienphu. At this point Ho Chi Minh was the victor and he wrapped himself in the cloak of an agrarian reformer; the leader of a peasant revolution. His Communist sympathies were not apparent to the casual observer.

Now we come to the heart of the problem—the Geneva accords of 1954.

Those who disagree with the course of action pursued by three American Presidents—Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—come back to these accords and ask, "Why were not free elections held as provided in the accords?"

But I would first like to ask another question: "Why did the accords call for free elections in the first place?"

Ho Chi Minh was at the high watermark of Communist domination of Vietnam in 1954. At that time the Vietminh, under his leadership, controlled all of Vietnam except Saigon, Danang, and Hue.

A complete power vacuum existed. The French were beaten. The English had their hands full in Malaya and indicated they wanted no part of the fight in Vietnam. And the Americans had already declined to aid the French defense of Dienbienphu. For all practical purposes, Vietnam belonged to Ho Chi Minh.

The question now is why did Ho Chi Minh agree to the partition, which meant withdrawal of his forces to the northern part of the country and giving up his hard-won gains, and to the free elections?

I think we all realize that totalitarian regimes avoid free elections at whatever cost. Why then should Ho Chi Minh all of a sudden agree to free elections, since he already had what he wanted?

It is my belief Ho set the stage for one of the most cynical acts since Hitler signed the Munich agreement. He was planning a rigged election to pull off a major political and psychological coup.

Keep two facts in mind. One, that Ho Chi Minh was in control of the entire country and most significantly of the Mekong Delta—a rice exporting area, in a part of the world where millions of people go to bed hungry.

And, two, that he was a totalitarian leader agreeing to free elections. Let us remember that the war Ho Chi Minh had just won was not a war of communism versus capitalism. It was a war of colonialism versus nationalism. The post-war world had seen many such confrontations: Indonesia, Algeria, Ghana—and so Ho Chi Minh decided to go one step further.

Suppose, if you will, that he had decided to prove what the Communists were preaching throughout southeast Asia and throughout the rest of the world—that communism was the wave of the future and that the people freely preferred communism—and that Ho wanted to have elections to show the world once and for

all that he could establish a Communist regime not by force of arms, not by midnight coups, but by democracy's most cherished weapon—the free election.

If Ho had this in mind, he would have done exactly what he subsequently did do.

He agreed that all Vietnamese who wanted to leave communism could go South with the understanding that his followers would go North. Many Vietnamese did indeed go South, leaving farms and homes their families had owned for countless generations.

But Ho never moved his people north. Sure, the young boys went north for military training. But his many Communist followers whose homes were in the south, remained in the south where they conducted terroristic guerrilla warfare against the non-Communist Vietnamese. They received support and assistance and direction from Ho, who, from Hanoi, continued to maintain iron-fisted control over most of the country's land area and population, in violation of the Geneva accords. His bases and military hospitals stayed right where they always were in South Vietnam. After agreeing to the establishment of an independent Saigon-based Government, he subverted his own agreement by doing everything he could to destroy that Government.

So let us remember that it was Ho Chi Minh, not the United States, who violated the Geneva accords.

Many people in this country are under the impression that the Vietcong are villagers and peasants in the rural areas who revolted against the oppression of the Diem regime. This is not true, for the simple reason that the Diem regime was never established outside of Saigon, Danang, and Hue. Even to this day there are large areas of South Vietnam that have never been controlled by the Central Government in Saigon.

The Eisenhower administration realized that to hold these elections would be to fall into the trap so cleverly set by Ho—that free elections could not possibly be held under existing conditions, and that the Vietcong would be the victors in a rigged contest. Furthermore, I am convinced that Ho firmly expected that the Diem regime could not survive, and that he would win the country after its collapse.

The Diem regime, however, did survive for a number of years, and during this time—until Diem himself became corrupted by power—actually extended the perimeter of freedom in Vietnam, and won growing support among the South Vietnamese people.

One of the reasons Ho is now so intransigent is that his scheme backfired and he no longer has any hope of regaining the dominant political position he enjoyed in 1954.

Fighting between the Vietcong and South Vietnam has been going on continuously since the French withdrew. This has been bloody fighting between the Vietcong and South Vietnamese—not American or other foreigners—who have been trying to get the Vietcong yoke off their necks. This is something we often tend to forget—that the South

Vietnamese have been engaged in this war for many years. It is not only Americans fighting against the Vietcong today. Hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese were fighting first, and are still fighting for their country's freedom. And nobody has ever forced them to fight.

Our involvement in Vietnam began with our desire to see the South Vietnamese people have an opportunity to live in a free society, and our wish to contain Communist expansion down from China and North Vietnam. Three Presidents—Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—and statesmen like Adlai Stevenson, have defended our commitment there on the basis that, while it is not the ground we would have selected for ourselves, it is the ground where events have decided that the line against Communist expansion in Asia must be drawn. We have drawn such lines against communism before, in Greece, Turkey, and Germany. I genuinely believe if we allowed Vietnam to be swallowed up, the next battlefields would have been in Thailand and Laos.

I heartily support President Johnson's policies in Vietnam because he has tried to walk the middle ground between two dangerous and equally unacceptable alternatives. A withdrawal of U.S. forces would abandon the country to the Vietcong and set the stage for further Communist aggression. At the other extreme, he has properly refused to follow the advice of hawks who would bomb Hanoi and other northern population centers. Our military buildup has had one purpose: To demonstrate the strength of our determination to Ho Chi Minh in the hope of bringing him to the conference table and discussing ways to establish peace and freedom for Vietnam.

True, we have escalated the war in Vietnam. But let us not forget that the North Vietnamese have done the same. The difference is a matter of degree, not of principle. And the reason we have escalated was not to pound the other side into submission, but to force them to the conference table, where our differences could be discussed and reconciled.

Furthermore, the administration recognizes the importance of bringing real social and economic reforms to the people of South Vietnam. We are not going to win the war by bombing, but by winning the people's allegiance with educational opportunities, homes, jobs, more productive farms, better health, and more democratic government. This administration realizes that this is more than a war of arms. It is also a war between systems of living. If we can open the door of opportunity for the Vietnamese and help him to a better life, we will have taken the high road to winning the war of arms.

President Johnson's peace offensive, combined with suspension of the bombings of North Vietnam targets, was recognized by most of the world as a sincere effort to begin the walk to the peace table. But it takes two to make this walk, and no response came from Hanoi. The shooting and killing could end tomorrow if Ho Chi Minh decided to sit down and talk with us.

The Vietcong may have the capability of terrorist attacks and banditry for many years to come, but it is becoming increasingly difficult for them to operate with the freedom and on the scale that they operated on in the past.

As our military superiority increases, I am proud to say our soldiers have accepted their unique dual role, and are helping the people of Vietnam stand on their own two feet. Daily more refugees move into the refuge of the government villages, going back into the fields by day, and returning to the village at night. While it is true that many of them have been forced to become refugees by bombings and military action, the majority arrive because they hate and fear the Vietcong, and for the first time have an opportunity to escape. We have fanned the spark to be free, and our soldiers have taken steps to see that the spark stays alive and spreads.

We here at home can do no less than support them enthusiastically, with faith in the ultimate victory of freedom for the Vietnamese people.

A BILL TO AMEND THE BUCK ACT— TITLE 4 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

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

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Buck Act—title 4 of the United States Code—to grant congressional consent to State and local taxation of privately owned properties in Federal "enclaves" under specified conditions. I am pleased that the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], is also sponsoring this legislation.

This legislation is recommended by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to remove the tax immunity of the properties of private persons and businesses which results only because they happen to be located within Government installations over which the Federal Government has exclusive legislative jurisdiction and the States therefore have no jurisdiction. This condition prevails only in a small percentage of Federal installations. In the vast majority of them, the Federal Government does not exercise exclusive legislative jurisdiction and private persons within them are therefore subject to generally applicable State and local laws.

Properties owned by the Government will not be affected by this bill.

The proposed legislation would carry forward a congressional policy first established in 1936 with the passage of the Hayden-Cartwright Act and subsequently extended in 1940 by the Buck Act and further extended in 1947 by the Military Leasing Act. In this series of acts, Congress consented to the application of gasoline, sales and use, income, and several other categories of State and local tax laws within Federal "enclaves" in the interest of both the equal tax

treatment of private persons within and without these Federal areas and of State and local revenues.

Legislation to grant congressional consent to the taxation of privately owned properties in Federal enclaves has been introduced in Congress in past years but has failed to gain support, apparently, because of the absence of any assurance to the Congress that the States would parallel the exercise of taxing rights with the provision of services and privileges to the residents of these enclaves and to their families. In some areas these residents are denied health, welfare, and educational facilities and other privileges of citizenship provided to other residents of the State. The bill I have introduced would solve this problem by making the consent of Congress to the imposition of property taxes conditioned upon certification "that persons living and working in areas under the exclusive Federal legislative jurisdiction within the State are afforded substantially the same rights and privileges and tax supported services as those available to other residents of the State."

The revenue impact of this legislation on local finances will be relatively small, but its contribution to the improvement of Federal-local relations will be large.

The unequal tax treatment of property owners in substantially identical situations, differing only in the respect that the location of their properties is inside or outside Federal enclaves by accident of the form of government ownership of property, has long been a source of intergovernmental friction. The legislation will be very beneficial to some individual jurisdictions, particularly in the Western States where 50 percent of the acreage under exclusive Federal legislative jurisdiction is located, and should speed the extension of full privileges to the residents in these Federal areas.

DEMOCRACY—WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

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

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an excellent essay entitled "Democracy—What It Means to me" which was the winning speech of Mr. Mike Byrne, of Henderson, Ky., in the Voice of Democracy Contest conducted annually in each State by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Mike Byrne is a high school senior and I believe that the depth of his views will impress each Member of Congress.

The essay is as follows:

DEMOCRACY: WHAT IT MEANS TO ME
(By Mike Byrne, senior class, Holy Name High School, Henderson, Ky.)

Often I have sat on the banks of the Ohio and inhaled the life-giving breath of freedom. Freedom is the essence of democracy in America. The rabbit scurrying away to find a haven in the undergrowth; the massive oaks that seem to climb to the apex of our world but always with the infinite freedom to climb higher and higher; the stag on the opposite bank that rubs noses placidly with its mate; the endless blue of the sky