

May 16, 1966

10171

Alaska although ample opportunity exists. In fact, the Soviets have consistently opposed high seas salmon fishing, holding, as we do, that such a practice makes it impossible to implement proper conservation measures. We are in a much better position with the salmon resources regarding information needed for conservation regulation since, unlike the ocean perch and other species the Russians may be taking, it has been exploited and under management for many years.

I trust this information will be helpful.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD L. MCKERNAN,

Director.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was encouraging to note that the threat to Columbia River salmon from Russian fishermen appears to be negligible, at least at this time.

I look forward with great interest to the recommendations which the Bureau plans to make in the near future regarding appropriate action to be taken in this matter.

THE VIETNAM CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Everett Herald, Saturday, May 7, 1966, "Two Years Ago."

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

[From the Everett (Wash.) Herald,
May 7, 1966]

TWO YEARS AGO

Suppose a U.S. political leader running for re-election this year campaigned on the following platform:

1. American boys should not be sent to fight in Viet Nam because it is an Asian war.
2. U.S. planes should not bomb supply lines in North Viet Nam.
3. Bombing North Viet Nam is likely to involve this country in a major land war with Communist China.
4. The U.S. should confine itself to an advisory role and provide equipment to South Viet Nam.

Would the politician be elected? Or defeated? The New York Herald Tribune notes that this is the stand President Johnson took in the Presidential campaign of 1964—just two years ago.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle, April 13, 1966, "The Viet Crisis We Now Face."

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

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 13, 1966]

THE VIET CRISIS WE NOW FACE

The buddhist political crisis in South Vietnam has confused, disturbed and frustrated officials in Washington. Well it may, for the evidence of 1963 showed beyond question that the Buddhists held the ultimate strings of popular control over South Vietnam. They showed they could bring down the Nge Dinh Diem, the Catholic dictator, and eliminate him, which was a relief to us. For at the time, the Buddhists were on our side, or, more accurately, we were on theirs.

The Ky government is clearly on the losing side of a political showdown. This threatens

to compromise the reasons for the American presence in Vietnam. It is the President of the United States who, at Honolulu, embraced General Ky; and it is General Ky who is not long for power. If the bland Buddhist pressure in the city streets and villages continues to grow in the days ahead, it will undermine the Ky regime.

For the Johnson Administration, the American position in Vietnam is subject to the most disheartening speculations and ironical afterthoughts. The basis of our being there, it has been said like a litany, is the long-standing United States "commitment" to a succession of South Vietnamese governments to support their opposition to a Communist takeover.

However, so far as has been heard from Secretary Rusk or the President, we have no "commitment" to support the government in Saigon against a takeover by its own people.

Underneath all this turmoil, the GIs know that one of the messages which the demonstrators are giving out is that Americans are not welcome in their country. It is to the American forces that our keen sympathies go. As one said to Jack Folsie, "If they don't want us, what are we here for?"

THE PRESIDENT AND VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in recent days, President Johnson has sought to cover up the collapsing situation in Vietnam with increasingly blatant appeals to national honor for its own sake, not for the sake of practicality or likelihood of success or true national American interests.

The Nation heard him use the occasion of the Democratic fundraising dinner publicly to denounce and ridicule the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on Vietnam and China. Why? Because it has been the Foreign Relations Committee hearings that have exposed to public view the bankruptcy of the Johnson foreign policy.

Those hearings have revealed the immorality, the uselessness, and the illegality of the slaughter in Vietnam, a slaughter perpetrated as much by the United States as by anyone.

The administration cannot withstand this public discussion of the war in Vietnam any more than it could withstand an analysis of its Dominican intervention by the Foreign Relations Committee chairman.

So it is necessary for the President to try to upstage the committee as he did by summoning General Ky to meet him in Honolulu, and then to denounce the hearings in their entirety.

I extend my tribute and support to the chairman of our committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, whose statesmanship in these matters has reduced to disrepute the foreign policies of the United States based on bombs and bayonets.

In the last week, the President has stopped talking about peace and negotiations altogether; he has had little to say about elections in Vietnam. He gives every evidence of total adherence to the advice of his military leaders who believe armed force is the best answer to everything and who are bent on war with China, in my opinion.

It is now up to the American people to demand that the war in Vietnam be stopped. They must demand that the

administration stop killing American boys to keep General Ky in power. They must demand an end to a war that sees American soldiers go out to kill the Vietcong while the soldiers of South Vietnam fight each other. They must refuse to allow American forces to continue fighting a war to keep Ky and his flunkies in power against the wishes of a majority of people in Vietnam who are not even controlled by the Vietcong.

I hold in my hand today's Washington News, with the headline "Vietnam on Brink of New Civil War." I ask unanimous consent that the article connected with the headline be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President let us face it. We are escalating a war to keep a military junta in power that has no appreciation for the meaning of the word "freedom" and could not care less.

The present outbreak in Vietnam, demonstrating the further instability on the part of the puppet we have been supporting, calls upon the President of the United States to issue a request for a cease-fire now, to stop killing these American soldiers.

My President does not have the slightest moral right to send another American to his death in Vietnam, in the light of the civil war within the civil war in Vietnam.

That is why I have been heard to say—and I shall continue to say it from coast to coast—that the President must be stopped with ballots, for it is the only way left to stop his bullets. We have no right to be shooting those bullets in South Vietnam now, in view of the shocking record that has been made by the Ky regime and the previous military puppets that the United States has set up in South Vietnam, in open violation of the Geneva accords.

We must call a halt to the flow of American blood to defend General Ky so he can impose his own bloody rule upon the helpless people of the South.

Every day the war continues, more lives will be lost needlessly, for the rotten foundation of the South Vietnam Government becomes more precarious every day. General Ky and his fellow militarists do not want elections, and I predict he will arrange things so there will be none in which anyone can place any confidence.

It is still a criminal offense in Vietnam to be a "neutralist." Who is or is not a "neutralist" will naturally be decided by General Ky. The world has already heard that "Communists" and "neutralists" will be fought by the Ky government. As is customary in Vietnamese elections, North or South, the election, if it is held at all, will be controlled by the means of controlling the candidates allowed to run.

In fact, I have heard nothing in the discussion of these proposed elections that offers a prospect of their being meaningful. They can be a decoy, however, to American public opinion. They can mislead American public opinion into

May 16, 1966

the false assumption that these elections mean something. These elections, for the most part, will be metropolitan elections in areas under the control of the Government.

Mr. President, I shall be proud to have the RECORD show that I was the first in the Senate to call for international supervision of these elections, as some months ago I called for international supervision of the elections in Guatemala, where a democratic administration was not in charge of the election machinery.

We can be sure that any elections in South Vietnam under this tyrant and corruptionist Ky will be featured by carefully screened candidates, just as all candidates were screened by Ngo Dinh Diem in the elections he conducted.

By the time only Government candidates are allowed to run for seats, what kind of "election" do you have? You have the same kind the Communists conduct, where only the candidates of the Communist Party are allowed to run for office and they then poll 98 or 99 percent of the vote.

That is what Americans are dying for in South Vietnam, and they are dying for nothing worthwhile. They are dying for nothing productive of freedom. They are dying for nothing more than the personal ambitions of a few local leaders of South Vietnam who do not have the confidence or backing of their own people.

Above all, they are not dying for any American interest in Vietnam, for the American interest lies in getting the fighting stopped, not in escalating it.

The American military has no means of stopping the fighting. Its only suggestions and recommendations are for expanding it and increasing it. That is why I share the fears of Arthur Schlesinger, when he fears that the President has lost control of American foreign policy. The control over American foreign policy has passed to the Pentagon, and the Pentagon is maneuvering this President and his country ever closer to war with China.

This morning the Foreign Relations Committee met for its first executive session in connection with the foreign aid bill. I served notice on the committee that I shall insist upon exercising all parliamentary rights, to assure that no action is taken by the committee on the foreign aid legislation without a quorum being present and without full and extensive discussion of the relationship of this bill to the Military Establishment and its plan for international intervention.

It is through the foreign aid bill that much of the disaster of American policy has been carried out. It is through the foreign aid measure that Secretary of Defense McNamara expects to carry out a goal of American policy, which he described before the committee last week as one of seeking "stability" throughout the less developed countries of the world. At Princeton, the President called it "forces of disorder" that must be opposed in Asia. Stability and order are something the Secretary of Defense wants military aid for, because where stability is not imposed directly by American force of arms, he hopes to see it imposed by arms given

by us to local armies, under a military dictatorship or the direction of a military junta.

Not long ago a very highly respected Republican came over to my seat on the Senate floor. He asked me whether I thought President Johnson could control the Military Establishment of the United States. I asked him what he meant by that. He said he believed the Military Establishment was so in charge of the war in Vietnam that he questioned whether the President could carry out any Vietnam policy of which the military did not approve. It has long been my opinion that if the President wanted to find a political settlement of the war, he could not do it because the military now has such a vested interest in a direct confrontation with China that they will not allow our presence in Vietnam to be dissipated or eliminated for any reason. This is a fear I repeated to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee this morning, and which I said I thought had to be a part of our discussion and decision on the aid program.

Never has pursuit of freedom for South Vietnam been an object of American policy. Pursuit of containment of China and the possibility that war in Vietnam could lead to war with China has been the object of military policy in Vietnam.

As the Ky regime falls apart in Vietnam, the President is pressed into more and more blatant contortions of history to seek to maintain the image of American purity. His Princeton audience heard him say that American intervention in foreign countries was justified on the ground that "not one single country where America has helped mount a major effort to resist aggression, from France to Greece to Korea to Vietnam—not one single country where we have helped—today has a government servile to outside interests."

The President conveniently neglected to say that none of the countries where we have intervened is servile to anyone except the United States. The governments of Korea and Vietnam are today creatures of the American Treasury and the U.S. Defense Department. Without both, those governments would disappear. Their countries would not necessarily disappear, but their present governments would. Much the same is probably true of Greece, whose political adventures in Cyprus that have so debilitated her economy and politics are largely subsidized by Uncle Sam. Of the countries the President named, only France can lay claim to not being servile to any outside interest.

I regret hearing the President of the United States continually tell the American people such a simplified and glorified version of international events, a version always calculated to reassure us that everything we do and everything we touch abroad is gilded with selflessness and crowned with success. I am sorry to hear him misrepresent the effect of American interventions in the world, because he misleads the American people when he tries to tell them we no longer are the sole support of Korea or Vietnam or Greece or Turkey, or Taiwan, because we are. More often than not, where we

have intervened, we have created another dependency for American taxpayers to support and American soldiers to defend, and dying in the defending.

That is the record of the postwar era. That is why we have troops stationed in hundreds of thousands outside our country, in numbers not matched by all the other countries of the world combined.

There is no other power on the face of the earth that maintains major military establishments and bases and forces outside of their jurisdiction, except for this little remnant of British support in Singapore and Gibraltar; and the British are not going to be in Singapore indefinitely. They have already learned that no Western power can maintain a dominating foothold in Asia. We have not learned that lesson yet. And how many coffins have to come back from Asia bearing the bodies of American boys before our Government learns that sad lesson?

Mr. President, I shall be proud to have my descendants read that I have not cast a vote for this war, and, short of a declaration of war, I intend to cast no vote to support it, because this is an inexcusable, immoral, and unjustifiable war.

As I said to my friend, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], who is sitting in the Senate Chamber, as I go through these airports—and I go through several every week—I see hundreds of American boys, 18, 19, 20, and 21 years of age, on their way to Vietnam, where they did not ask to go. On the basis of our present escalating of war, I think that 15 percent of them will never come back.

As I see these boys, I ask myself the question: "By what moral right are we doing this? What is the justification for this?" All the semantics of the President of the United States cannot change the sordid fact that we are without a scintilla of legal or moral right to kill these boys.

That is the reason why I say to the American people: "You are the only ones left to stop this. You have got to stop it with your ballots by defeating those who are supporting the war."

It does not make me happy to say so. However, this is the issue facing the American people, and this happens to be their constitutional right and prerogative. I repeat that we can stop the killing only with ballots now, unless the Congress at long last wants to assume its constitutional trust and proceed to impose on this Democratic administration the constitutional checks that the forefathers wrote into the organic law.

With the defeat of 50 or more Members of Congress in November, I want to say to the American people that we have a chance to stop the war. However, if the American people reelect to Congress or send to Congress men and women that will rubberstamp this President in carrying on this shocking war, in my judgment we will end up in a war with China and the American people will die by the hundreds of thousands, for it will be the beginning of world war III.

I have been heard to say so many times that in my judgment that is what the

May 16, 1966

exactly as he did 17 years ago, the same must be said of Dean Rusk, who became Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East in 1950 and whose views of U.S.-Chinese relations remain in the same antiquated and dangerous rut along with Mao's.

The same program translated the slogan uttered by small school children to the effect that "if the American soldiers come to China, they will be buried in our soil." The commentary went on to describe this as evidence of China's "belligerence" toward the United States.

The recitation of recent Chinese history before our Committee, and the extent to which it has rebutted official doctrine that China is another Nazi Germany that must be surrounded with military power has provoked some familiar old charges of "appeasement" and "apologists for Chinese communism."

But what has been surprising is the extent to which this review has been accepted calmly by the American public. What our hearings did was to reflect not a fear and apprehension of China among the public, but the extent to which official policy clings to old myths and fears that no longer reflect public opinion.

The dust has settled in China. Her Communist regime is here to stay. While India has staggered in her effort to mobilize and organize her economy and depends upon hundreds of millions of dollars worth of gratuitous food from the U. S., China has managed to feed a much larger population by paying hard dollars for what she needs from the West. Most significant of all to the American public, in my opinion, has been China's development of a nuclear weapon.

However primitive it may be, and however impossible for her to deliver upon U. S. cities from the air, nonetheless Americans no less than the Soviet Union or China respect force and power. A country that commands nuclear power commands far more respect among the American public than one that does not, no matter what ideology guides

So since our hearings began, it has become respectable in Congress, among academicians, the press, and the public to point out that isolation is a bad thing for China because she is a nuclear power. So is the isolation of any nuclear power a bad thing for the United States, and it is on this basis that many of us believe American interests and security would be better served with Peking in the U. N. than outside it.

Diplomatic recognition is perhaps less urgent; but it is nonetheless unfortunate that those who seek to transfer our containment policy from Russia to China continue to overlook the diplomatic relations we had with Russia and the extent to which they enabled us to judge Russian purposes and reactions firsthand.

The body of "Kremlinologists" and such State Department Soviet experts as George Kennan, Charles Bohlen, and Llewellyn Thompson did not develop their body of knowledge and judgment about Russia purely from U-2 plane pictures, from questioning of refugees, from statistics published by the Communist government, and similar intelligence sources. They were in Russia; they knew and talked to Russian leaders at high and low levels; they lived in the country and saw the people and how they lived.

Sixty-eight years ago we had toward China what we called the policy of the Open Door. It sought to maintain for American commercial interests equal access to the Chinese empire with European imperial powers. It opposed exclusive rights extended to any one European power and demanded that the United States receive from China whatever extra-territorial or trade concessions any other nation received. The "Open Door" was looked upon by some as the best China could hope for, and it kept her from being colon-

ized by one outside power. Yet it also meant that every western power could walk all over China together and not just one at a time.

Since 1949, we have sought the opposite. We have had a Closed Door policy toward China. Under it we perpetuate the greatest myth of American foreign policy which holds that Chiang Kai-shek on Taiwan is the government of China. Under our closed door policy we permit no trade, and we limit human travel to a tiny handful of public health specialists, selected journalists, and academicians, which China does not admit.

Under the Closed Door policy, we have sought to close her off to other countries as well. British recognition of Peking is belittled, French recognition was opposed by the United States, Japanese and German recognition is forestalled by immensely strong U.S. representations, and we do all we can to limit trade from western nations, most particularly Japan and West Germany.

Despite our diplomatic efforts, despite her recent failures in poor countries, and despite the constant exhortations by the Secretaries of State and Defense that China is a voracious monster, out to devour Asia today and tomorrow the world, most industrial nations are moving toward more normal relations with her. Japanese trade with China is small but growing, and recently moved ahead of the volume of her trade with the Soviet Union. The consortium of European firms headed by Germans to construct steel mills has apparently gone ahead despite protests by the State Department.

In fact, as China's commercial and technical relations with the Soviet Union have atrophied, her commercial and technical relations with the West have grown. Britain, France, West Germany, Japan, Canada—most of our key allies—have sent trade missions to China. They have found that trade with mainland China is possible, practical, and can be quite profitable. In fact, NATO-associated nations accounted for \$223 million worth of imports from Communist China in 1964 alone.

OPPORTUNITY TO OPEN THE CLOSED DOOR

I suggest that China is burgeoning economically, and technically, far beyond the limits of our capacity to contain her with military force alone. We are satisfied to say that China is isolated because of her own actions, but she is isolated because we have for 17 years done our best to keep her that way. The Chinese are quite right in pointing to the ring of American bases which confront her on three sides as a source of fear to her national security. And the testimony and speeches of our leading cabinet officials make clear that our dominant attitude toward China is that if she makes one false move, we will pulverize her with nuclear weapons.

Officialdom in Washington has brainwashed itself to the extent that Chinese airbases are called "sanctuaries," just as though they had no right to fly 30 miles across their border over North Vietnam, but we have every right to fly thousands of miles from our borders to bomb North Vietnam. The containment dogma that allowed the Soviet Union a rather ample ring of Soviet-dominated countries around her borders does not permit any such ring of Chinese-dominated countries around her borders, for if the Chinese do what we did in the Dominican Republic, that will be aggression.

We need something more than a simple change of policy in Washington. We need a change of official mind and attitude. We need to have a new Open Door policy toward China. It must take into account her status as a near-great power; her interest in protecting her borders just as Russia and the United States have done by assuring countries nearby that are not hostile if not downright friendly or communist; her legitimate claim to the seat assigned to China in the United Nations Charter.

We need to begin seeking trade at least in non-strategic goods.

We need to start talking to her and to other affected Asian countries about a settlement of the status of Taiwan, for we use Peking's ferocity about Taiwan as the excuse for our bad relations; but we have been quite content to let it go at that, and to keep the issue of Taiwan around for just this purpose.

We need to stop being satisfied with China's isolation. We need to mount a diplomatic offensive that will open the door of normalcy between China and the rest of the world.

We need to stop talking about sanctuaries and how easy it would be to bomb her nuclear bases and start talking about how China can be brought into the community of nations at all levels and in all fields.

We need a massive effort on the diplomatic and economic fronts to open the door to China once again, for ourselves and for all nations, not for exploitation but on the basis of full national equality. This should be our offensive.

China is the last of the emerging nations remaining outside the community of nations. It is not good for her, but I do not suggest these changes in American policy for her sake, but for our own.

I do not believe exclusive reliance upon military containment is a sound, reasonable, or productive policy for this country any longer. In my opinion, it stands to lead us to war far more certainly than to peaceful co-existence.

Within the foreseeable future, China will be a genuine nuclear power; by the end of the century, she will make up half of the world's population. I am interested in finding where our interests lie in the Pacific that can be defended without costing more than they are worth, and I am interested in achieving a condition that will enable us to live in peace with China. I do not believe this condition can be achieved without a diplomatic effort commensurate with our military effort. To that end, I believe we should initiate a calculated, sustained, and overt effort to rebuild normal relations between our two countries.

RELATIONS WITH UNDEVELOPED WORLD

Finally, I would like to discuss generally our policies toward Latin America and the rest of the poorer nations of the world. Much of what I shall say applies also to China and Southeast Asia, for they, too, must be counted among the poorer nations of the world.

One of the saddest statements I heard in our hearings this year was uttered only Wednesday by the Secretary of Defense. In discussing the \$917 million military aid budget, Senator FELL asked him whether all the references the Secretary had made to what are called "civic action" programs by indigenous armies really exemplified an "elemosynary intent."

The Secretary replied with what I think has become the epitome of American policy toward these countries on whom we heap military assistance:

"Well, I just think that instability is a danger to our peace and security, and that instability may come from communist or noncommunist causes. It isn't only communism that is causing revolution in the world today. I have the figures here, there have been 160 or 180 political disorders in the last several years, five or six years. And perhaps no more than half of those have been caused by communists, but all of them are a danger to us, because all of them disrupt the peace of the world, and when the peace of the world is disrupted, nations can very easily come into conflict one with another, and it is extremely difficult for the great powers to separate themselves from those conflicts."

"Instability" is what we fear and oppose in the undeveloped world, not privation nor

May 16, 1966

injustice nor lack of opportunity, but instability. And whether communist inspired or not, the Secretary of Defense tells us that all disorders "are a danger to us," because they might involve the great powers. So as a great power, we have promptly involved ourselves in them, in an effort to preempt the political field for ourselves.

In many ways, the most tragic of these interventions has been in the Dominican Republic, about which Mr. Frankel probably knows as much as I do! In keeping with the view expressed by the Defense Secretary, the Administration found that a disorder which was not communist inspired at the outset was not controlled by the American embassy, either, and therefore it regarded it as a danger to American peace and security. So acting upon endless false representations from our embassy in Santo Domingo, the President ordered a virtual occupation of the Dominican Republic by American military forces, in total and complete violation of our treaties with the Dominican Republic and other nations of the hemisphere.

In my opinion, that intervention did more to help communism in Latin America than any other course we could have followed. It remains to be seen from the scheduled election June 1 whether we have brought stability to the Dominican Republic, even at the cost of many American and Dominican lives, or as in Vietnam, whether our intervention will merely widen and intensify the conflict it was intended to suppress.

In what I thought was a mild, restrained, and helpful address, the Chairman of our Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, sought to review the circumstances of that intervention and draw some conclusions from them that would help us avoid similar situations in the future.

Among his conclusions was this:

"The movement of the future in Latin America is social revolution. The question is whether it is to be communist or democratic revolution and the choice which the Latin Americans make will depend in part on how the United States uses its great influence. It should be very clear that the choice is not between social revolution and conservative oligarchy but whether by supporting reform, we bolster the popular non-communist left or whether, by supporting unpopular oligarchies, we drive the rising generation of educated and patriotic young Latin Americans to an embittered and hostile form of communism like that of Fidel Castro in Cuba. . . . I think that in the case of the Dominican Republic we did close our minds to the causes and to the essential legitimacy of revolution in a country in which democratic procedures had failed."

As one who was pleased to support the findings and conclusions of Senator FULBRIGHT, I am dismayed to find that even this week, the State Department refuses to understand what is really going on in Latin America.

Thanks to the New York Times, I have read that State Department aides have apparently succeeded in censoring the views of a prominent American labor leader, who is part of our delegation to the Inter-American Conference of Ministers of Labor. I read in a May 11th dispatch from Caracas the following about my good friend, Joe Beirne of the Communications Workers:

"In the first version of his address—copies of which soon became scarce because they were destroyed by aides of the United States delegation—Mr. Beirne declared: 'When we speak of nonviolent change, the priority, if it should come to that, is on change, not on non-violence.'

"He also said, 'We believe in obtaining social reforms through lobbying and voting rather than by fighting, but if anyone were to take away our rights to lobby, to strike or to vote, you can be sure we would fight.'

"State Department aides here would say only that Mr. Beirne would not speak today and that the only speech they knew of was being 'translated.' But a copy of the new address showed considerable softening of Mr. Beirne's remarks."

Mr. Beirne is also quoted as telling newsmen: "I am sticking by my address and if you can't get a copy I'll show you mine in longhand."

The "translation" of Joe Beirne's speech was not into Spanish but into State Department language that will once again put stability and order ahead of change in order of importance.

That is where we are going wrong everywhere in the world. We are forgetting that the first message of America to mankind was not the Alliance For Progress, nor the Marshall Plan, nor NATO, nor the Four Freedoms, nor the Declaration of Independence. Our first message was the shot heard round the world from Lexington, and there are still some of us in the Senate who will never believe that shot was fired on behalf of stability, or even order. It was fired on behalf of change.

Yet from Latin America to Europe to Asia by way of the Middle East, we trust to military power to maintain stability with as little change as possible. Out of our immense wealth, we can sustain such a policy for a long time. But as we are finding in Vietnam, what military force can prevent it cannot always solve, and what it can start it cannot necessarily finish.

Our effort to bring peace and stability to Southeast Asia by armed force has only brought an ever-widening circle of war's disruption. Still the escalation goes on, but now we are hearing of "mutual escalation" rather than American escalation. The only prospect for the future in Vietnam is one of more troops sent, more installations in North Vietnam to be bombed, and more warnings to China that her planes will have no "sanctuary" if they interfere.

In closing I offer you something Carl Sandburg once wrote about the American Civil War. It surely has application far beyond that conflict, for he called it "Hammers Pounding":

"Grant had a sledgehammer pounding and
pounding and Lee had a sledgehammer
pounding and pounding
And the two hammers gnashed their ends
against each other and broke holes
and splintered and withered
And nobody knew how the war would end
and everybody prayed God his hammer
would last longer than the other
hammer
Because the whole war hung on the big
guess of who had the hardest hammer
And in the end one side won the war because
it had a harder hammer than the
other side.
Give us a hard enough hammer, a long
enough hammer, and we will break
any nation,
Crush any star you name or smash the sun
and the moon into small flinders."

Today, the United States possesses the power to smash our world into small flinders. But do we possess the will, the capacity, the desire, the intellectual means to help the world cope with its shifting problems by peaceful means?

That is the test for this generation.

EXHIBIT 3

VIETNAM: THE TURNING POINT

(By Jean Lacouture)

"Here Is Your Enemy," by James Cameron. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 160 pages, \$3.95.

On the screen an old peasant woman stands amidst devastated houses and fields; like 25

million men and women in both parts of her country she wears black silk pajamas. Her left sleeve hangs empty. The picture dissolves quickly and those who see her on the television film that James Cameron, an English newspaperman, has brought back from North Vietnam will forget her—unless they have also read his book, "Here Is Your Enemy." It is dedicated to the "old lady who lives in the village of Naah Ngang, in the Thanh Hoa province of North Vietnam which is unfortunately near a strategically important bridge."

The bridge as far as we know still stands [Cameron writes], but the old lady had her left arm blown off by one of the bombs that went astray. She was more fortunate than her daughter, who was killed. She said: "I suppose there is a reason for all this, but I do not understand what it is. I think I am too old now ever to find out."

Most Americans are not too old to understand and are living far enough from the bombed bridges to appraise soberly the Vietnam policy pursued in their name. Indeed they have more information available to them about the war than any other nation that has ever fought in a remote foreign land. Now, at a moment when the war seems to be reaching a turning point, James Cameron's book and film give us the first perceptive report we have had in years on the lives, reactions, ideas, and leaders of the enemy in the north.

Cameron was the first Western correspondent admitted to Hanoi since the beginning of the bombings. "Why I was selected out of a clamoring multitude of serious newspapermen is an enigma to me," he writes. "It could have been the fact that I had insisted on going, if I went, on my own terms, uncommitted and unsponsored." In any case, it was a fortunate choice. Cameron is not a neutral observer—he has been critical of both the Conservative and Labor positions on Vietnam—but he seems less susceptible to the passions and resentment we might have expected from a French or American reporter. An English liberal with long experience in Asia, he is able to distinguish between the totalitarian Communist apparatus which rules in North Vietnam and the authentic drive for national identity and independence which has made the Vietnamese revolution possible.

Much of Cameron's book will be familiar to those who read his dispatches in *The New York Times* and the *London Evening Standard* last September. What emerges most clearly from the second reading is his sense of the ordinary Vietnamese people he met during the winter of 1965 when American bombs were falling on the transport and communications systems throughout the country. Cameron is not a sentimentalist but he was enormously impressed by the remarkable courage and cheerfulness of the Vietnamese in the face of death. Indeed the most important contribution of his book is to show that the stoicism of the Vietnamese is one of the most important, and most neglected, factors in the debate over Vietnam—as important as the follies of French colonialism, or the calculations of Secretary Rusk. Western leaders have not understood that bombing operations that might produce panic and disruption in their own countries have had remarkable little effect on a people who resisted French "mopping up" operations for eight years and are led by an old man who has spent one third of his life in prison and another third shaking off the agents of various colonial police forces.

So far from terrorizing and disrupting the people [Cameron writes] the bombing seemed to me both stimulated and consolidated them. By the nature of the attacks so far, civilian casualties had not been very great, but they had been great enough

May 16, 1966

to provide the government of the Vietnam republic with the most totally unchallengeable propaganda they could ever have dreamed of. A nation of peasants and manual workers who might have felt restive or dissatisfied under the stress of totalitarian conditions had been obliged to forget all their differences in the common sense of resistance and self-defense. From the moment the United States dropped its first bomb on the North of Vietnam, she welded the nation together unshakably . . . even in their own interests the U.S. planners failed to recognize the reality of a society like this. A bomb here, a bomb there; a family eliminated here or there; . . . these were troublesome, infuriating; they were not disabling. The destruction of a bridge or a road—in Western terms it could be disastrous. Here it was a nuisance.

One might add that since the resumption of the bombing the rate of North Vietnamese infiltration into the South has quadrupled; the number of American casualties has risen; Northern influence in the South has increased along with the prestige of the Communist cadres in the Vietcong. Moreover, the membership of the PRP, the Communist organization within the National Liberation Front, has tripled during the last year.

No doubt Cameron's book will be dismissed—as his articles were dismissed by *Time*—as a "conduit for North Vietnamese propaganda," naive in its uncritical presentation of talks with North Vietnamese leaders. But Cameron writes, It seemed to me from the beginning that I of all people was most likely to be handled with circumspection and to receive in official conversations the most distilled official line." On the other hand, his observation of the effects of the war on the North Vietnamese are his own and they are important. Those who have served as a "conduit"—if not as a source—for official American propaganda justifying the bombings can learn from Cameron's report how badly this policy has failed.

The events of the past month make Cameron's book all the more pertinent. The bombings in the North have become even more severe, while the demonstrations in the South seem to have made a political solution more possible. At least some of the more fragile American myths have been exploded and the hard political questions that have been obscured by Washington's rhetoric are coming into the open. Can the war be justified as a "defense of free men against a foreign invasion" when thousands of people have been openly demanding an end to dictatorial government, not to mention the American presence itself? Do all the non-Communists really want a powerful American army to fight in Vietnam until the last Vietcong is killed or driven North? If not, what is the basis of the American commitment?

These questions can at last be raised largely because of the agitation of the Buddhists in their Northern stronghold of Hue and Danang as well as in Saigon. But the intentions of the Buddhists are not easily discerned, for they have been reluctant to announce their concrete political aims. Tri Quang and his followers have advocated "absolute peace" and "absolute nationalism," while shrewdly improvising ways to undermine the military dictatorship. If their views seem abstract or contradictory, this is a characteristic of Vietnamese political life. Nationalism and Communism have long been intermingled in the Vietnamese revolution; so have the desires of the South Vietnamese for reunification and their resentment of Northern domination. In much the same way it is extremely difficult to distinguish the religious principles of the Buddhists (and often the Catholics) in the South from their political activism.

But it should be made clear that the Buddhists are a relatively new force in South Vietnamese politics. They did not begin to make their influence felt until the early Sixties when the pagodas and monasteries became centers of resistance to the oppressive (and largely Catholic) Diem government. The recent demonstrations are the Buddhists' third political offensive. The first created the situation which led the army to bring down Diem in 1963; the second ended in the fall of Khanh in 1964. Their current campaign is a direct reaction to the mounting intensity of the war and the increasing numbers of civilian casualties all over the South. (According to the recent testimony of Representative ZABLOCKI of Wisconsin before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, it is estimated that at least two civilians, and perhaps as many as six, are being killed for each Vietcong soldier.)

"This cannot go on!" is the Buddhist slogan. It is aimed not only at the war itself but at the recent national humiliation which is summed up by the word "Honolulu." For the Honolulu meeting exposed the nearly total failure of a great Western power to understand public opinion in a small country, where feelings of oppression and resentment have been smoldering for years. In organizing the conference Washington had hoped not only to strengthen Ky's position but to encourage him to be more flexible politically and to undertake social reforms. However so far as most Vietnamese were concerned, Washington had already shown unprecedented contempt for their country by imposing Premier Ky on them in the first place; to them, the meeting was no more than a summons from a foreign general to a cocky lieutenant—a glaring example of Saigon's "abject" dependence on Washington. The following week Tri Quang warned an American visitor that a wave of anti-American agitation was sure to follow; Obviously a considerable part of the population shared his feelings.

The crisis that broke out on March 10 may well have set a hopeful process in motion. It has shown Washington that the Vietnamese cannot be treated simply as pawns to be managed by native dictators, but that they are in fact a volatile and touchy people with a complex politics of their own. And in South Vietnam itself Washington has begun to act with more political acumen. Although General Ky was foolish enough to claim that Danang was in Communist hands, and the U.S. Airforce was available to help "liberate the city," no serious reprisal was allowed to take place; and William P. Bundy, the Assistant Secretary of State, was unusually calm in his appraisal of the situation. Furthermore William Komer, the new White House advisor on foreign affairs, met with Tri Quang in Hue soon after the crisis erupted. He listened to his complaints against the Ky government and then forwarded a letter from Tri Quang, to Mr. Johnson. In this letter the Buddhist leader requested that the United States support the convening of a Vietnamese national Congress that would settle peacefully the political and military future of Vietnam would, in particular, decide whether U.S. forces should continue to be present in the country.

The promise of elections on August 15 seems to have pacified Tri Quang, at least for the moment, but we may be sure that the continuing presence of American troops will remain the central question of the future. Tri Quang and his colleagues will have more to say on this subject. Their elusive neutralism may turn out to be quite incompatible with any permanent foreign military presence.

Thus the basis of the American commitment in Vietnam has been thrown into doubt. Until now Washington's professed

aim has been to allow the South Vietnamese to choose their future freely. The recent campaign of the Buddhists could finally make such a choice feasible, but it may also mean that the Vietnamese will eventually demand the removal of the American garrison. The question must be raised, however, whether some leaders in Washington are committed not to "self-determination" but to preserving South Vietnam as a military base for the containment of China. In a remarkable essay in the *April Commentary*, George Lichtheim suggests that the essential American motive is to maintain a strong American presence in Vietnam—particularly the enormous air base now being built at Cam Ranh—in preparation for the day when Communist China will possess a nuclear force. Furthermore, in his interview with a correspondent of *Le Monde* George Ball defined Washington's view of an acceptable Vietnamese neutrality as the absence of foreign alliances—but said nothing about foreign bases.

The hypothesis that certain American authorities are anxious to have a large permanent base in Vietnam may help to explain certain aspects of American behavior in the past; its intransigent opposition to direct dealings with the Vietcong, for example. However, the policy has not been publicly stated or defended and it remains unclear why the U.S. should need a base in South Vietnam at all, in view of its other strong installations in the area as well as the Seventh Fleet. But if such a policy were to be adopted, an espousal of neutralism by the Buddhists would make them, for American purposes, the allies of Chinese imperialism and they would soon be swept aside. Tri Quang could easily find himself in the same position as Juan Bosch did last year.

Obviously Washington is about to make vital decisions. The rainy season in the South will start in two months and this will sharply limit air operations and therefore the efficiency of General Westmoreland's troops. We may also expect that attempts will be made during the next two months to reconvene the Geneva conference—possibly as a result of General de Gaulle's visit to Moscow. When this happens, the international pressures on Washington to participate will be heavy. President Johnson would be well advised to undertake his own diplomatic efforts first.

In this situation Washington may reckon that it has two months to win the war. As General Ridgeway has recently written in *Look*, the war could be won if the full force of U.S. air and naval power were brought to bear on the enemy. But the price would be genocide: Much of Vietnam would be turned into a desert occupied by Marines, a result the General believes unworthy of American traditions and not justified by the threat of China. Meanwhile another experienced observer, J. K. Galbraith, has warned that the country is running an "intolerable risk" of provoking Chinese intervention as it launches heavier and heavier bombing attacks on the North.

At the same time certain hopeful, if little-publicized, diplomatic developments have taken place: Along with the recent negotiations with the Buddhists they may help to provide an alternative to genocide and further escalation. It seems clear, for example, that new and very discreet contacts have been made with the Vietcong. For over a year negotiations have been underway to obtain the release of Mr. Hertz, a U.S. official held prisoner by the Vietcong. First, Paris attempted to intervene with Hanoi on Mr. Hertz's behalf; then Senator ROBERT KENNEDY stepped in. Four months ago Hanoi let it be known that the National Liberation Front insisted on conducting its own negotiations concerning the prisoner. After some hesitation Washington made con-

tact with the Vietcong and several meetings followed. So far as is known, a dialogue is now secretly taking place somewhere in the South between the U.S. government and the NLF. Apparently no results have been achieved so far, but at least a channel of communication has been established.

Official doctrine is also changing. While Vice President HUMPHREY denounced Vietcong "assassins" in Honolulu, Charles Bohlen and Averell Harriman hinted at a more flexible U.S. position: The Vietcong, they said, might back candidates in the next election and thus participate in a South Vietnamese government. And later, after Senator KENNEDY's statement on Vietnam, Bill Moyers stated that no groups could be denied participation in the public life of South Vietnam, provided its representatives had been duly elected. This "Moyers Compromise" would seem to be the last authoritative word on the subject. Neither Hanoi nor the NLF has as yet rejected Senator KENNEDY's suggestion that the Vietcong might participate in a coalition government (the first "goal of war" of the NLF), although Peking called it a "new imperialist maneuver." Whether or not this is of any significance remains to be seen.

Let us suppose that the American leadership finally rejects the course of escalation and decides to bring the war to an end. The logical objectives of such a policy would be: (a) to restore the moral prestige of the United States in Asia and in the world; (b) to allow the South Vietnamese to create their own independent state which can prepare a future merger with North Vietnam and co-exist with China; (c) to promote the development in South East Asia of a broad movement based on both neutralism and nationalism—a movement that would include the political tendencies of both India and Indonesia and would establish friendly relations with Japan.

Is it possible to suggest precisely what steps should be taken to implement such a policy? A peaceful settlement might be pursued in three stages. At first, every effort must be made to encourage the local forces in South Vietnam to come forward and take their place in the political life of the country. If democracy has any chance in Vietnam it will succeed only by the vigorous political activity of the groups that genuinely represent Vietnamese society—the Buddhists, Catholics, trade unions, students, army, Cao Dai, and "Hoa-Hao" among others. These are the famous "chickens" that Mr. HUMPHREY wants to protect from the hungry "fox." But if they are bold enough to challenge a regime supported by the U.S. army there is good reason to believe they will be able to resist threats to their integrity in the future. Tri Quang may favor neutralism and negotiations, but he is not a man inclined to yield power to any competing group.

Recently there has been a tendency in the United States to make glib jokes about Vietnam's political "instability." But it remains to be seen whether people who have refused to support a series of despicable dictatorships openly backed by foreigners—the regimes of Bao Dai, Diem, Khanh, and Ky—have proven their instability or their desire for identity and freedom. Should the Vietnamese be called "irresponsible" and "ungovernable" because they reject the rule of an unknown jet pilot trained by the French at the height of the Algerian war?

We can now say that the first step toward a peaceful settlement of the war was taken this Spring, although many questions remain in doubt. Will elections be held on August 15 to form a National Congress? Will this assembly meet only to write a South Vietnamese constitution and decide on the form of a future civilian government? It is possible to arrange reasonably fair elections under present conditions? In any case, a

Constitutional Convention might be able to work out procedures to form a more permanent congress made up of delegates representing all the significant groups in the South. Until the signing of a cease fire, a number of seats could be held open for the representatives of the NLF. Meanwhile the Congress would set up a caretaker government that would eventually deal with the NLF and prepare the way for its return to legitimate political life.

During the second phase the military leaders on both sides would meet to work out a cease fire: Representatives of the American and South Vietnamese armies would negotiate with leaders of the Vietcong and their Northern Allies. But this will be a harder task than the first because there is no evidence that the Vietcong have abandoned the theory that a long struggle will bring them total victory as the U.S. grows weary of the war. Indeed one of the great tragedies of the conflict is that both sides are so badly informed about the firmness of the other's intentions. Undoubtedly the hard-line Communists in the Vietcong want a long war. For one thing it brings them new recruits. Communist membership has grown from ten thousand since 1951 to almost a hundred thousand at the present time.

The principal effort of American policy must therefore be to provide political opportunities to those revolutionaries who have not become "professional warriors." Unlike the guerrilla fighters who *enjoy* the adventure and power of warfare, many of the Vietcong followers are exhausted. Senator Kennedy's proposal is therefore sound, because it may strengthen the position of those revolutionaries who would like to convert a military into a political struggle. However while the Vietcong is a most efficient machine of war, its political and psychological skill may not match its fighting power. This is probably one reason why its chiefs prefer war.

The only chance of persuading the guerrillas in the South to accept a cease fire is to speak to them directly and not through Hanoi or at an international conference. They have not forgotten the 1954 Geneva conference when their interests were submerged in a deal among the great powers (and the less-than-great Vietnam). The Southern combat forces were sent off to the North while the country remained in "reactionary" hands.

Many of the same guerrillas have now returned to the "Maquis" in the South and have resumed fighting. It is true that they now depend on the North and the nations of the Communist bloc for much of their support; and any agreement with the guerrillas would eventually have to involve Hanoi as well as the great powers. But since the guerrilla chiefs are wary of being duped again by an international deal—and are enjoying the prestige of battle—they are quite capable of sabotaging an agreement made without their full consent. Therefore any efforts to make peace must start with them—if peace is the goal.

Once a cease-fire agreement is in prospect, the third stage—preparation for self-determination—should begin. The opposing forces must agree on the procedures for a nationwide referendum. It should be pointed out that, unlike the FLN in Algeria, the NLF leaders have unequivocally admitted that their movement cannot fully represent the South Vietnamese people. This has been made clear not only in public statements but in the allotment of public seats on the National Council to volunteers—who are not volunteering. Is it possible that the two incomplete assemblies—the National Congress and the NLF committee—might merge to form a fully representative parliament for South Vietnam?

No matter how it is organized, a referendum would reveal the full diversity of South

Vietnamese society. It is entirely possible that the NLF will appear as a "major factor of the South Vietnamese political scene," as George Carver has recently written in *Foreign Affairs*. It is also quite likely that the Congress will reflect the various zones of influence in South Vietnam, with Buddhists predominating in the Hue and Danang areas, the Catholics around Saigon, the Dalists in the West, and Hoa-Hao in the South West. The Vietcong may be expected to predominate in the East (Zone D), the South, and the Quang Ngai area, which lies between the strongholds of the Buddhists in the North and the Catholics in the center of South Vietnam. In Vietnam, as in most countries, men have a stronger political appeal than ideas: The referendum might therefore be more effective if it were to choose a head of state rather than a cabinet government drawn from different factions or parties—but this would require the non-Communist groups to agree upon a common candidate, something that seems highly unlikely at the moment. The key to the political situation and to a workable balance of power among the forces in the South will be the possibility of cooperation between the Buddhists and the Catholics. The Vatican is now trying to bring this about with the help of the new liberal Catholic groups which center around Mgr. Binh and the Archbishop of Saigon, and are now providing a counterforce to the reactionary traditions of Vietnamese Catholicism.

It should be clear that no solution will be acceptable to Hanoi unless there are guarantees of close ties between the two Vietnams before the country can be reunited. It is far from clear how long reunification itself might take. Ho Chi Minh estimated that it might take ten years when I spoke to him in 1962, while in 1965 an NLF spokesman in Algiers thought fifteen years more likely. It could take a long time indeed.

Finally, it will remain for international negotiation to guarantee the results of the peace talks, perhaps making use of an enlarged version of the International Control Commission of 1956 (India, Poland, Canada) to supervise the referendum and protect Vietnamese neutrality. As a matter of fact, international negotiations among the Great Powers have secretly been taking place since 1964. It is rumored that Secretary General U Thant now plans to request a leave of absence from the United Nations in order to concentrate on the Vietnam question. This will put him in a better position to deal with the Asian Communists who distrust his organization but trust him personally. Something may also come of General de Gaulle's trip to Moscow, as well as new interventions by Pope Paul VI. Harold Wilson may at last choose to display his diplomatic talents by assuming his position as cochairman at a reconvened Geneva conference. He could then count on the assistance of Canada whose delegate at the International Control Commission has kept in close touch with Hanoi).

The next two months will be decisive. The United States can certainly hold South Vietnam and impose a military government simply by threat of force; it can retain a firm grip on its "enclaves" and bases without worrying about popular feelings. The Vietnamese have been subjected to treatment of this kind for many years. Even if this Spring's uprising has demolished some of the myths on which American intervention has been based, it cannot be expected to end power politics.

Washington has intervened in Vietnam four times: first, from 1950 to 1954 it supported France in her fight against Asian Communism; second, from 1954 to 1963 it supported Mr. Diem, "the defender of freedom"; third, from 1963 to 1965 it sent American troops to fight in the South; fourth, since 1963 it has extended the war to all of

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10181

May 16, 1966

Vietnam. There is no reason why there should not be a fifth stage during which it holds on to the large base of Cam Ranh, in case there is to be a sixth stage—a great war against China.

We can only hope that it is not too late to attempt a different policy, one that would place reliance on the Vietnamese themselves—all the Vietnamese—to maintain their integrity in the face of whatever forces may threaten it.

EXHIBIT 4

DETROIT, MICH.,
May 11, 1966.

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

We support you completely in your convictions on foreign policy and wish you success in their implementation.

Mr. and Mrs. VICTOR LINDEN.

PACOIMA, CALIF.,
May 12, 1966.

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

Your stand on Vietnam wonderful. Administration and public must hear it again, again, again.

MIKE MARGULIES.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 11, 1966.

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

God bless you for your speech today May 11 before the Senator Fulbright Committee.

Mrs. HELEN LOMAN.

HADDONFIELD, N.J.,
May 12, 1966.

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

We agree with your courageous stand on Viet Nam. Urge continuance of valiant effort.

SALLY and DICK PRYOR.
SYLVIA and KEN NEWCOMB.
RUTH and JOE KRAUSE.

DEL MAR, CALIF.,
May 12, 1966.

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

A thousand thanks to you for your courageous onslaught upon ugliness in our precious land.

ELIZABETH D. NEWTON.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

The following message sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson. "Please listen to Senator MORSE before it's too late for our country, our people, and the world."

Mr. and Mrs. W. J. LITTLE.

BAKERSFIELD, CALIF.,
May 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: Thank God there are men like you.

Dr. HARRY GORAN ALTAFFER.

PASADENA, CALIF.,
May 11, 1966.

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

Congratulations on your stand before Foreign Relations Committee live this a.m. Especially in regard to Americans get matter before U.N. and get U Thant out. Is this the

way to defend the vested interests in war profits and bloodshed. How long before all of us will be silenced. Since peace is not considered profitable.

A SINCERE CITIZEN.

NEWTON, N.J.,
May 21, 1966.

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

Heartily endorse your stand (Senate Caucus Room) yesterday. Johnson venture Vietnam far greater folly than Crimean War.

FRED FARR.

ORELAND, PA.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You have made me angry because you never made your point crystal clear today you were clear erudite and I must say I agree with your point of view President Johnson should go to the United Nations he should put us on record there to call the colors of the Nations of the World and then we should go to the brink the tree of liberty need blood shed for nourishment, sir, as said by Thomas Jefferson.

HOWARD W. DYSON.

WEST ORANGE, N.J.,
May 11, 1966.

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

I applaud and salute you.

Mrs. ALEX PORTNOFF.

DES MOINES, IOWA,
May 11, 1966.

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

Please don't fail our Americans negotiate a just peace or bring our boys home now.

Mrs. ROBERT L. STAPES.

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO,
May 11, 1966.

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

Thanks for your tireless efforts for peace blessed are the peace makers.

Mrs. WILLIAM DAGGETT.

MONSEY, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

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

Agree on a cease fire and enforcement in Vietnam through the efforts of the U.N.

Mrs. MARY ANNE LEVY.

DAYTONA BEACH, FLA.,
May 11, 1966.

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

The magazine "Nation" year 1927 the British Ambassador Turner and the American Ambassador MacMurray gave permission to the Chinese war lords to violate the sovereignty of the Russian Embassy at Peking China and 30 Chinese girl clerks were taken out and strangled." Louisville Courier Journal April 26, 1966, "are Lodge's fears of Vietnam vote his own, or the President at best his (Lodges) remarks seem to be a prelude to a vote of no confidence in the election at worst they could be a warning that we will not accept a vote that doesn't please us if this is Mr. Lodge's view it is one thing. It is something else if it was relayed to him from Washington." Both the Vietnam and Korean wars were and are designed for the recapture of China for the American dollar patriots highest regards to you Senator MORSE and Senator FULBRIGHT.

GEORGE EDWIN ENGLISH.

WHITE PLAINS, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

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

Your arguments re Vietnam are very convincing. I have so wired Johnson, McNamara, and Rusk.

Very truly yours,

MARION GLASS.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
May 11, 1966.

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

Please continue to ask questions and make decisions which will lead to peace.

Your admirer,

FRANCES P. FRIEDMAN.

BOSTON, MASS.,
May 11, 1966.

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

I think you are very right.

JEAN GUSTAFSON.

VAN NUYS, CALIF.,
May 11, 1966.

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

I support your views that we should get out of Vietnam, however, if we must fight our soldiers should have the best equipment possible. The reports of shortages are disgusting and unforgivable. As the mother of a newly enlisted marine I want to do anything I can to support your cause and please consider me as a volunteer.

Mrs. MARILANE PERKINS.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
May 11, 1966.

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

Your vigorous and courageous defense of peace and morality is a highwater mark of American patriotism today. You have our support.

Mr. and Mrs. ALAN SHAW.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

You are the greatest. What is the U.S. Senate for? The Constitution states you represent the people. Let's keep it that way. No 5-year aid. Make them ask for approval each year.

LA NEIL.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,
May 11, 1966.

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

Please accept our thanks and amen for your courageous stand against the illegality of the dirty war in Vietnam.

LESTER A. DAVIDSON.

OKNARD, CALIF.,
May 11, 1966.

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

Applaud comments to McNamara. Hope fellow colleagues see validity. U.N. still exists. Let's use it.

Three grateful mothers,

KAREN OLSON.
KAY MIKITA.
COLLEEN DALPORTO.

10182

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 16, 1966

PARKRIDGE ILL., May 11, 1966.

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

Millions of Americans agree United Nations main function is to intervene and help in Vietnam. McNamara should be investigated, psychoanalyzed for saying decisively Russia and Red China will not merge and inferring we have unlimited military power. All efforts must be used immediately to end war or what good urban renewal etc., if we are conquered. Please give your last breath to terminate war along line suggested at this morning's hearing.

Mrs. PFEGEN.

BERKELEY, CALIF., May 11, 1966.

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

We support your position in opposing our present policies in Vietnam. America needs your courage.

MIKE SOBILOFF.

HOUSTON, TEX., May 11, 1966.

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

Propose stand of immediate elections as requirement of continuation of military aid. This will give us an out either way.

E. H. PALMER.

RICHMOND, VA., May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Give 'em hell.

Dr. D. E. WHELESS.

HOLLAND, MICH., May 11, 1966.

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

I agree, if the Vietnam issue was put to the voters today, Johnson would be clobbered worse than Goldwater and his war mongers were in 64.

D. M. HATLEY.

STORRS, CONN., May 10, 1966.

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

U.S. action in Vietnam in contravention of UN charter articles 52 regional peaceful settlement of disputes and 53 section NE if such action is justified by SEATO. Articles 51 and 54 are violated by unilateral nature of intervention.

ADREA HELMS.

MENDOCINO, CALIF., May 10, 1966.

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

Congratulations on your courageous stand against Rusk. Please reopen televised Senate hearing on Vietnam.

EMMY LOU PACKARD.

MENDOCINO, CALIF., May 10, 1966.

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

Congratulations on your courageous stand against Rusk. Please reopen televised Senate hearing on Vietnam.

BYRON RANDALL.

MONTCLAIR, N.J., May 10, 1966.

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

Strongly support your courageous efforts to bring about a just peace in Vietnam.

R. C. CAMMERER.

BARRINGTON, R.I.

May 9, 1966.

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

Please insist upon bringing out the legality of this war.

Mrs. CARLTON H. CURRY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

May 9, 1966.

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

Bravo, we applaud your efforts to end the horrible war in Vietnam.

ERIC and NAOMI FONER.

SIERRA MADRE, CALIF.,

May 9, 1966.

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

A small element in the American ferment. Thank you for your representation hearings.

Mrs. MARION BEARDSLEY.

WILMINGTON, DEL.,

May 9, 1966.

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

Congratulations TV today. Following night letter sent to President Johnson: "Nazi war criminals were prosecution of American war criminals—decent people sickened by pictures in pamphlet called the unspeakable war. Now circulating inhuman burning by napalm. Now torture by nausea gas. Have wired WAYNE MORSE to start movement demanding immediate resignation of Johnson, Rusk, McNamara."

CRUSADERS FOR PEACE,
K. A. HORNER,

President.

MARIE HITCHENS,
Secretary.

MILLBRAE, CALIF., May 9, 1966.

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

Request open hearings with testimony by international law witnesses legality U.N. Vietnam position.

MARTHA ROZEN.

DENVER, COLO., May 10, 1966.

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

Bravo for your views in the Senate hearings today. Admire your courage keep up the good work.

WILLIAM HANNAH.

SEATTLE, WASH., May 10, 1966.

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

Please accept our congratulations for your continuing courageous opposition to the Vietnam war.

DWARD ALICE DAVID,
PATRICK FHEL.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,

May 9, 1966.

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

Concerning today's Senate hearings, your courageous defense of our constitutional government advances the cause of freedom throughout the world, and is a further step toward a world of law for suffering humanity. All men everywhere stand in your debt. May God grant you victory and long life in this noblest of causes.

DAVID B. LORD.

WORCESTER, PA.,

May 9, 1966.

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

We support your proposed hearings on the legality of Vietnam war gracefully.

WALTON and NICOLITA GETTER.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,

May 10, 1966.

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

We strongly support your stand on Vietnam and respect both your rationalists and humanism.

Dr. and Mrs. JAMES R. ROBINSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

May 10, 1966.

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

Count us as two grateful citizens of the many in our land you speak to and for when you ask about questions in committee of our unhappy involvement in the Vietnam war.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBIN KINDEAD.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

May 10, 1966.

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

Thank you Senator for effort to get us out of Vietnam. How can we help?

Mr. and Mrs. MAX SCHUFFMAN.

WINNETKA, ILL.,

May 9, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Keep it up; we're all for you and so are many friends here.

JAMES ZACHARIAS FAMILY.

NEW HOPE, PA.,

May 9, 1966.

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

Bravo, magnificent.

Mr. and Mrs. FRANCIS L. LOVETT.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,

May 9, 1966.

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

Congratulations. For God sake keep it up. You have the country behind you.

FELIX GREENE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

May 9, 1966.

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

We support your stand on U.S. foreign policy. Thank you.

JAY and KELLY TWIGG.

HAYWARD, CALIF.,

May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: We wholeheartedly agree with you views and course of action.

Mr. and Mrs. L. ENRIQUEA.

REDOAK, IOWA,

May 9, 1966.

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

South Vietnam legally is separate nation? If not, then with which military dictatorship have we made treaties? Is interference in a civil war justification for threatening the safety of the world? I believe we are the aggressors in this inglorious conflict. The executive branch of our Government has proved it is incapable of wisdom in global

May 16, 1966

strategies and power policies. Congress would be wise to challenge such leadership. Respectfully.

GRETCHEN GITTINS
Mrs. Bert Gittins.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 9, 1966.

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

Our great admiration for your courageous stand regarding Vietnam. Please enlist more Senators to help end this senseless war.

Sincerely,

Mrs. HELEN SAUER.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 9, 1966.

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

Please continue as you have this morning in the questioning of the Secretary of State. Please continue to bring the truth to the people of the United States. Millions of our citizens support you completely. With our deepest thanks.

ALFRED LIPSEY.

NEW YORK, N.Y., May 9, 1966.

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

That was a very good talk you made today before the committee and hope you get the Secretary of State to answer to your satisfaction.

H. K. WHITEHEAD,
Seamans Unit P.O. No. 1.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Great praise for your stand on Vietnam. Deeply appreciate efforts. Bring truth to American people.

Mrs. W. A. PEEK.

CHERRY HILL, N.J., May 9, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your position taken at Senate Foreign Relations Committee meetings.

Mr. and Mrs. STANLEY WEISS.

MIAMI, FLA., May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work. We're all behind you.

Mrs. ROY T. RUSSELL.

GREAT NECK, N.Y.

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

Your courageous voice our bulwark against mass destruction. We humbly thank you.

RUTH BLUMENTHAL.

MODESTO, CALIF.,
May 9, 1966.

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

We are all back of you. Please keep with it.

ELEANOR HAUN.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
May 9, 1966.

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

Hail to a great American. God bless you Senator MORSE. Wish you would be our President. Very sincerely good American citizen.

MARK PETERS and MANYA PICKUS.

No. 80—20

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Our wholehearted support in your intelligent unequivocal questioning entire U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Dr. and Mrs. SIDNEY VOGEL.

SEATTLE, WASH., May 9, 1966.

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

Our continued admiration and prayers for your courage and actions.

Mr. and Mrs. ALDEN H. BOWES.

WHEATRIDGE, COLO., May 9, 1966.

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

Much support here your pursuit of facts on foreign aid and Vietnam. Glad someone supports own honest conviction.

Mrs. RALPH D. BARNHART.

RICHMOND, VA., May 9, 1966.

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

I wish to thank and support you for your statements and views made this morning on our country's legal obligations concerning our administration's actions in Vietnam. I, too, would like a clear, concise, undisputed decision defining our lawful rights in our Vietnam policy and whatever this decision, see the administration confine its activity to boundaries and restrictions of that law.

JOHN H. FARMER.

ASBURY PARK, N.J., May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Committee Meeting,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations your stirring, eloquent speech. God bless you. Fight to stop needless war and loss American lives. World War I veteran.

MARK DORIO.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., May 9, 1966.

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

Cheer for your speech. May your wisdom prevail. Americans should not be killed for Ky.

Mrs. WALTER GARDNER.

MARS, PA.,
May 9, 1966.

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

Don't give up. Many American citizens support you.

Mr. and Mrs. M. H. HUBBS.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Armed Services Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

Please ask Mr. Rusk what free people he is under the impression we are aiding in Vietnam.

RAY E. DEBARRA.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate House,
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo Senator MORSE for factual intelligent position on Vietnam. My unequivocal support.

Mrs. CHLOTTE SHATZ.

DETROIT, MICH.,
May 9, 1966.

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

Your speech on TV wonderful. Seems you alone understand the majority of American people and are speaking our thoughts for us. If there is anything we can do to help please let us know.

God bless you and keep up the good work.

Mrs. B. MORRIS.

WILWAUKEE, WIS.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Investigating Committee,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on the stand you are taking on part of the American people being informed. Not misinformed. Our full support.

Mrs. ELEANOR SCHUSTER and EMMA BARNES.

WALKERSVILLE, MD.,
May 9, 1966.

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

God bless you on your stand war in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. W. C. SIMMS.

HARWICHPORT, MASS.,
May 9, 1966.

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

Keep at it, please. With you.

M. N. PARSONS.

JANESVILLE, WIS.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your outstanding speech of today keep up your strong aspiration.

Mrs. CHARLENE KLIEFOTH.

ARLINGTON, VA.

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

You are wonderful. A concerned citizen. There must be something I can do to help.

MARY JENKINS.

HAVERHILL, MASS.,
May 9, 1966.

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

Thank God for a man like you in our Government.

Mrs. G. BALUKAS.

WALLED LAKE, MICH.,
May 9, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: Watching you this a.m. on TV. We're with you 100 percent and we're Republicans. This country needs more men like you.

ALBERT and CLARA KRUSAC.

RICHARDSON, TEX.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your John F. Kennedy view today, May 9. Keep up the good work.

MARTINA LANGLEY.

May 16, 1966

DES MOINES, IOWA.
May 9, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.:I'm a Republican. I think you're doing a
good job. Listening to you now. Keep it up.
DONNA MCCUEN.PORTLAND, OREG.,
April 13, 1966.DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Would this not be
a propitious time to renew our attack on the
administration's Vietnamese policy? It
seems so obvious that the people there don't
want our military forces there. Let us save
lives and not worry about saving face.Please, help as you have in the past to cor-
rect the horrible mistake of the present war.
Thank you.

Mrs. RUTH ROPER.

TILLAMOOK, OREG.,
April 15, 1966.Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:Could this be our opportunity to get out
of Vietnam and save our apparent face. Re-
member opportunity strikes but once. Let
us get out of Vietnam now.

Respectfully,

BOYD B. HARTMAN.

MILWAUKIE, OREG.,
April 15, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for your
continuing courageous efforts to bring home
to the administration the folly and the
senseless tragedy of Vietnam. We need more
like you in Washington.

Yours respectfully,

FLOYD O. HARVEY,
Father of Two Boys.EUGENE, OREG.,
May 6, 1966.DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: I wish to
congratulate you for your courage to stand
up for what you think is right. Especially
your stand on the Vietnam issue. I believe
if this was left to a vote by the people
whether or not, that all American troops be
withdrawn from Vietnam it would go over
by a big majority, as one very seldom talks
to anyone, but who thinks the U.S. should
withdraw all troops and should never of
been sent there in the first place.

Yours very truly,

W. S. KING.

APRIL 25, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:Heartily endorse your Vietnam position.
Urge continued vigorous pressure for intel-
ligent humane Asian policy.

ROBERT C. CROCKETT.

PORTLAND, OREG.

FOSSIL, OREG.,
April 28, 1966.DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am typing this
letter to let you know of my dislike of our
policy in Vietnam. I could, at the first of
the Vietnamese war, see some point of our
being over there. After all, the United
States of America stands itself out as a
worldly protector of the underdog. But as
of this last month or so I see no reason for
staying in Vietnam. The Vietnam conflict
is going to accomplish the same thing the
Korean conflict did and that is get a lot of
our boys killed and wounded and that's all.
We accomplished nothing in Korea and we
will obtain the same thing in Vietnam.As of lately I see less reason for being
over there because the North Vietnamesewant us out and the Buddhists and a lot of
the people of South Vietnam want us out.
So why in the name of God don't we get out
of Vietnam and stop being aggressors. Be-
cause aggressors is just what we are.

Sincerely yours,

DON NICKELSEN.

LAKE OSWEGO, OREG.,
April 14, 1966.Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you for the
valiant stand you have taken to end this
futile strife and the slaughter of our fine
young men in Vietnam.In the beginning of the war, I favored our
efforts to support the Vietnamese people, but
events have proven we are wrong in continu-
ing this war.There is no doubt in my mind that the
United States should not be fighting to sup-
port the Vietnamese people when they do
not want us there, they do not understand,
deserve, nor appreciate our fine young men
who are giving their lives to help them, when
even the Vietnamese women kill our wound-
ed soldiers.This war is an outrage to thinking people.
If there is fear of the spread of Chinese Com-
munism, let us support the surrounding
countries that welcome our support and
efforts.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. GLADYS L. CRAWFORD,
Mrs. A. G. SIEBERTS.PORTLAND, OREG.,
April 13, 1966.Hon. Senator MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is a relief to know
that we have a Senator from Oregon who
really works for what he believes is right.
My husband and I both agree wholeheart-
edly with you in regard to your views on
Vietnam, as opposed to those of President
Johnson.I am expressing the views of many people
who feel as I do in regard to Lyndon John-
son's unfair treatment of our boys and grand-
sons. It is a disgrace that the leader of our
country would excuse his prospective son-in-
law from military service and give him a
plush job in Washington, D.C., and send our
loved ones to fight in Vietnam. I should
think that he would realize that this action
belittles him in the eyes of many.When will his eyes be opened to the fact
that our boys are fighting for a country whose
people do not want our help or our presence
in their country?Mothers and grandmothers represent a
sizable vote in this country. This I assure
you, will be felt at the next Presidential elec-
tion.

Sincerely,

MILDRED O. SMITH.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
April 11, 1966.To Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.DEAR SIR: I think it is about time for this
constituent to let you know that I am defi-
nitely in favor of your actions regarding
our foreign aid and also our expressed
opinion of our action in Vietnam.I am sorry we haven't another 50 senators
like you in the senate. I am speaking as a
World War I veteran.More power to you and I wish you every
success.

Sincerely,

WM. P. CADY,

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
April 21, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. SenatorDEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend
you for your stand on Viet Nam. It is a
wonderful thing that there are still some
legislators who have the courage and inde-
pendence of mind to speak out as their con-
science bids.

Sincerely,

CHARLES J. PHILLIPS.

CORVALLIS, OREG.,
April 19, 1966.Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to thank you
for helping to bring these Senate Hearings
to the public. There are a lot of things I
didn't know about that was brought to my
attention.Also I want to commend you on your stand
on this war and sticking with it. My hus-
band has fought 2 wars and has retired this
year. I am glad he is retired.

Good luck and keep up the work.

Thank you,

Mrs. ROBERT L. TEATER.

PRIMEVILLE, OREG.,
April 18, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your stand
on Vietnam.

Sincerely,

Mrs. PAUL MICKEL.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an American citi-
zen and an Oregonian, I am greatly con-
cerned about the present situation in Viet-
nam.After much consideration and study I am
convinced that you are definitely right in
your opinion and I fully support your views.I hope that you and Senator FULBRIGHT
will be able to persuade the President and his
advisors that our foreign policy at this time
is not what it should be.Please encourage all Members of the Senate
to oppose our position in Vietnam.A concerned citizen with much displeasure
in our American foreign policy.

Truly yours,

Mrs. DELORES CROTTY.

PORTLAND, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an Oregonian and
a concerned American I want you to know
that I am actively supporting your opposition
to the present policy in Vietnam.I hope that you and Senator FULBRIGHT
will be able to swing some of our Congress-
men and the President against our position
in much of our foreign policy.I want you to know that I am proud of
your stands and am grateful for a leader such
as yourself.

Sincerely,

MADELINE DRAKE.

RAINIER, OREG.

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.,
April 13, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.DEAR SIR: We have followed your stand re-
garding Vietnam with keen interest and sin-
cere support. We feel, as do our friends,
that it is most urgent for those who rep-
resent our State to speak out in no uncer-
tain terms about this terrible debacle in
which this Nation is now engaged. We con-
cur that Asia is for the Asians.It is the responsibility of our adminis-
tration that was elected by the people to de-

May 16, 1966

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400070010-0

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - SENATE

10185

vote itself to the immense and critical problems in our own country first and foremost. We deplore its poor judgment and resent the high-handed manner of Secretary of Defense McNamara.

We commend you for stoutly supporting your convictions and we depend on you to continue to be the voice of those of us who have the same ideas.

Very truly,

BUFORD E. BOYD,
MARGARET A. BOYD.

MILWAUKIE, OREG.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an interested and concerned Oregonian and American, I want you to know that I support your convictions against our stand in Vietnam.

I believe the time has come when we should look more constructively at our own foreign policy.

The efforts on behalf of yourself and Senator FULBRIGHT to stop the war have, in my opinion, been of the highest concern and concentration for world peace.

I wholeheartedly support your convictions and your stands.

Sincerely,

CECIL E. FITZELL.

GRANTS PASS, OREG.,

April 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR: Keep up the good work. I want you to know that you have my support in your stand as regards the war in Vietnam. Our presence there is obviously illegal in respect to international law and I believe that we must pull our troops out before any lasting peace can be effected there. You are one of the few people in our national government who have my respect and my vote.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN JEDDELOH.

BEAVERTON, OREG.,

April 20, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: "It requires a real man or woman to stand alone on a moral issue in the face of the crowd."—Eleanor Roosevelt.

Our family want to let you know that we admire your stand on the Vietnam issue.

It seems a sad commentary on the courage of the President to deplore the bombing of a church in Alabama, or the murder of persons sympathetic to those deprived of their civil rights, yet to condone, nay, to order the wholesale bombing of villages in south-eastern Asia. They are people, and they suffer grief at the loss of loved ones just as you and I.

And, why the precision, and seeming almost delight, in counting the Vietcong dead while the euphemism, "American casualties light"?

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT F. MYERS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

March 15, 1966.

U.S. Senator MORSE.

HONORABLE SIR: I would like you to know that you have my utmost respect for your great effort and courage in trying to bring this useless war to an end. I am with you all the way. The great loss of our boys and the great expense their home folks are put to doesn't make sense to me. If you can run for President in 1968, you may count on my vote. I feel you are about the best American left there in Washington.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. KATHRYN MAYBERRY.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

March 5, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want you to know that we are very grateful for the stature of your leadership at all times and particularly in the Vietnam matter.

The copy of your Senate speech in January on the subject gave us information we are glad to have.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH BRUNER.
W. E. BRUNER.

MARCH 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations, on the bold stand you're taking on what is right and not swayed by the large majority, on the Vietnam situation and others.

In the last issue of U.S. News & World Report of March 14, 1966, is a very good article, "What United States Can Expect From Allies in Vietnam," and in this article, it seems the whole world is against us. When the whole world is against us, how come so few people in our Government are so blinded by pride that they cannot use good judgment? Also, quote at top of page 32, "It's largely a U.S. show." But, to this I can add, showoff of our might and strength. How long?

Practically every person I talk to feels just as you do. Keep up the good work. I'm behind you.

Yours truly,

HENRY NUSZBAUM.

PORTLAND, OREG.

MCMINNVILLE, OREG.,

January 31, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please keep up the good work, and get us out of Vietnam if possible. We are back of you 100 percent.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES S. GREEN.

EUGENE, OREG.,

April 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: My wife and I back you 100 percent, re: Vietnam.

I would say 85 percent of the people agree with you on this issue.

You next election, will, I feel sure, give you, your largest majority of your distinguished career.

Cordially,

AL HOFFMAN.

MARCH 26, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for doing all you can to expose what we are doing in Vietnam and the Near East. I find it hard to live with the guilt feelings I have over our actions in the world and I worry for my 16 year old son. There must be something that we common, ordinary citizens could and should be doing to prevent escalation and to change our direction. But what?

Again, thanks for being our spokesman and may you continue to abound in health and energy.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GEORGE H. ALLEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

March 10, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: I want to express my gratitude to you for your integrity and courage, in the

face of great opposition and pressure, in leading the opposition to the foreign policy of President Johnson. As a voting citizen, I must share the responsibility of the conduct of our country. The shame I feel over what we are doing to the people of Vietnam is somewhat alleviated by being represented by a man who steadfastly upholds the constitution, our U.N. obligations, sanity, and human decency. I feel that President Johnson has betrayed the people, in that the people voted for him and repudiated Goldwater, in the belief that they were voting for a policy against war. At least Goldwater was frank. I resent the President's subversion of the constitution; his fatuous assumption that he can achieve a "consensus" by lies and misrepresentation; his phony peace offensive; and his hypocritical concern for the people of Vietnam.

I applaud your vote against the appropriation to continue and escalate the war. I am in favor of Senator GRUENING's bill to prohibit sending draftees to Vietnam. I believe in negotiating with the N.L.F., the legitimate government of South Vietnam, and the force we are fighting. I believe that the only alternative to stopping this war by negotiation is more escalation, leading to a war with China, and probably the third world war.

Thank you for upholding legality, decency, and sanity. I believe the tide is turning, and I hope that by election time the vote will be overwhelming to endorse your views.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN M. BLEVINS.

SALEM, OREG.

MARCH 26, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to thank you for your efforts in behalf of the American people. Some friends of ours who were visiting in New York, when introduced to some VIP's in New York, were told, "You people should be proud to be Oregonians, you have the only Statesman in the Senate". There may be a couple of others but for the most part we feel as the people in New York expressed themselves.

We are proud of you, we feel terrible that you have to stand alone and take so much abuse from those politicians. Even people who may not agree with you always, admire you.

What Johnson doesn't seem to have caught on to is that we didn't elect him—we voted against Goldwater.

We are very disillusioned Americans—we sent our son to college seven years for a good education and so that he would be a good citizen—now the army has him.

God bless you Senator MORSE as you stand alone for decency in government.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. D. G. BAIRD.

PORTLAND, OREG.

ONTARIO, OREG.,

March 28, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have always admired your deep convictions and your ability to stick with them, whether I agreed with you at the moment or not.

In the Vietnam issue, at first I found myself more or less unconcerned, later concerned and wanting to fight quickly and get it over, but the more I have studied the issue I am wondering why we are involved in their dispute. Daily the news seems to back up your position that we are involved in a squabble in which if peace were to come quickly we couldn't put our finger on any

May 16, 1966

particular group capable of calling themselves a stable government or having any control. In many ways it appears we are fighting a war simply to satisfy the rich Vietnamese mandarin who is doing all he can to goad us into continuing because of the rich profits he can derive therefrom. As for the ordinary little people I am convinced the majority do not want the present ruling class they have in charge of their country in power at all and will always continue to fight until they are rid of them.

It's a puzzle to me how a President of the United States can wage war, sacrificing our men and wealth due to his own personal whim, without giving constitutional authority to the Congress to debate and make this decision. This I feel is for the Congress to determine—not a power drunk group of adversaries forcing their will upon the people.

Perhaps as these pine boxes arrive from Vietnam, carrying the remains of precious loved ones, they should carry the inscription stenciled thereon, "Compliments of Lyndon B. and Lady Bird Johnson and their fellow cohorts."

Just at this time it appears to me Lyndon Johnson and his friends are doing a magnificent job of building the Democratic party image into one of a monster with the blood and guts of little people spilling from its jaws, paunch full of corruption.

You'll be in the Senate long after this crowd of phonies are forgotten.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT L. JOHNSTON.

EUGENE, OREG.,
April 20, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want to assure you that the National Commander of the American Legion does not speak for all the members concerning the escalation of the Vietnam war. Members have been asked to write the President, Senator FULBRIGHT and our State Senators to back the war effort. We have attended a number of different posts where this letter was read, many without comment. Comments after the meetings leads us to believe more letters will be written against the war than for it. We feel that even if we could be sure that this is a war against the Communists how sure can we be that we have won the peace even if we win the war, even if we destroy their country completely? We certainly can't expect them to love us for throwing our millions into their country to build it up again. Money can't pay for lives, theirs or ours.

We've already lost face all over the world so we can't lose any more by staying in. If we would put our own house in order and show the world how a real democracy can work we would have a good chance to win the peace.

Thanks again for representing us so ably. It is so easy to just nod and say we agree with you without telling you, so please excuse this belated letter on this subject. We are proud of you.

Sincerely,

IRA and ELSIE WILLIAMS.

APRIL 21, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Despite biased, one-sided newspaper editorials condemning your views, you have many staunch supporters in Oregon and the Nation. It is gratifying to peace-loving citizens to see a Senator with your courage expressing his convictions, despite loud-mouthed opposition from those who prefer war and slaughter.

I, like thousands of others, cannot supply

a satisfactory answer to the question, "Why are we in Vietnam?" The millions wasted on this illegal, useless and undeclared war could produce untold benefits if utilized instead on worthwhile domestic projects.

Keep up the good work—we're with you.

Best regards,

DON NIXON.

LINCOLN CITY, OREG.

ANNA'S FLOWER SHOP.

Woodburn, Oreg., April 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We are very pleased with your stand on the war.

Oregon has a great statesman in you. The more we study the present administration, the more we realize you are right. We feel it is a privilege to live in Oregon, more so when we have a man in Congress that speaks his mind.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT AWA FIELD.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
April 19, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have fought you on other issues, but on Vietnam, you have my 100 percent backing.

The administration gave us poor leadership when they stopped being advisers in Vietnam.

But the problem is getting us out of this mess. God speed in this endeavor.

Yours very truly,

RON SYMONS.

RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS
(QUAKERS), PACIFIC YEARLY
MEETING,

Portland, Oreg., April 20, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: As Quakers we feel a real sense of frustration and despair over our government's present military involvement in Vietnam. We have continuing faith in the attitudes and outlooks of yourself and Representative EDITH GREEN toward the problems in Vietnam. We are appalled at the reports of atrocities committed on both sides and by the saturation bombing committed by our forces in Vietnam.

We cannot understand the position of the Johnson administration which appears to advocate the liberation of people by taking their lives and ravaging their land. Believing that there is that of God in every man to which we must minister, we fervently urge the President to initiate negotiations for peace including all factions which are a party to the conflict and further urge an immediate cessation of bombing as a first step toward peace.

Sincerely yours,

MULTNOMAH FRIENDS MEETING,
HOWARD J. RICHARD,

Presiding Clerk.

MAY 9, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I take a few moments to comment on your continuing struggle in our foreign situation.

In my business in this small community of Vernonia I have yet to find anyone in agreement with the administration's policy in Vietnam.

I personally congratulate you for your honesty and determination and feel certain justice will prevail when the American people awoken to the perils of where this present situation will lead us.

This letter is of little help, I realize, but I will be most willing to help whenever possible.

Very truly yours,

DAVIES CHEVROLET Co.,
JAMES R. DAVIES,
Owner, Democrat Committeeman, Precinct No. 4, Vernonia, Oreg.

MAY 1, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I think you should know that the people of Oregon are behind your stand on Vietnam. I have written a letter to President Johnson pointing out that I disagree with his policies, in the hopes that this will show that not all Americans are supporting our policy in Vietnam.

It is possible that your stand is a form of political suicide. Be that as it may, I admire deeply a man who will stand up against overwhelming odds because he believes something to be wrong. When a person stakes his entire career and future on an unpopular point of view, to me he qualifies as a true hero.

Even if I disagreed with your stance about Vietnam, I would vote for and support you, now, because you have demonstrated beyond any doubt that you are a man of the highest form of integrity.

One hundred percent behind you (even if I am a Republican).

JOEL C. BARBER.

EUGENE, OREG.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
May 10, 1966.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am so happy that you were right on the spot in asking that the committee hold a public inquiry into the legality of the American position in Vietnam.

Congratulations to you for continuing to be a persistent foe of American involvement in the Vietnamese struggle. I think you would be surprised at the friends you have.

Sincerely yours,

ROY A. GAGE.

RAINIER MANUFACTURING Co.,
Rainier, Oreg., May 10, 1966.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your appearance on TV last night wherein you made your dissenting opinions known to Secretary of State Dean Rusk regarding the Vietnam situation was most gratifying to us, and to everyone that saw you in action that we have spoken to.

It is very gratifying to know we have one representative from Oregon that has the courage of his convictions, and hope that you will soon "take on" Dean Rusk for allowing the continuation of the excessive amounts of our logs going to Japan to the detriment of existing Oregon industries.

Please be assured of our continued support in your efforts to convince the present administration that the American people are not a bunch of sheep to be bamboozled by fancy phrases, and as a last resort, raise taxes to cover misjudgments.

Kindest personal regards, and may you long represent us.

Respectfully yours,

DON V. BELLAMY,
Vice President.

MAY 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I've just finished viewing the last televised Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing. I've been

May 16, 1966

10187

very pleased that they have been televised whenever possible. They have been extremely helpful to myself and others in clarifying many situations which we found confusing. Most importantly, the purpose of the hearings has certainly become more understandable.

I am anxious that Defense Secretary Robert McNamara would not indicate which 3 nations are giving us considerable assistance in Vietnam. Why is this considered confidential information? I can't imagine why the American people should not know which nations are really willing to help us.

I agree with your stand on the Vietnam war. I cannot see that any commitment was made that should have resulted in such a tragedy. The United Nations should have been approached at the very onset. Without their approval and assistance we had no right to take it upon ourselves to handle that volatile situation, almost entirely alone. I only pray that we can get out of that horrible situation before it's too late.

I, and many others I know, also agree that military and other assistance to nations that constantly throw vile accusations and brickbats at the United States should be cut back altogether. The fact that Russia would then step in and fill the gap is certainly to be expected, I say—so what? They're doing it anyway but with things as they now stand, we are actually helping them arm our enemies! Let Russia have the added burden of supplying the additional military assistance to those nations we drop as a result of their open animosity. By continuing assistance, we're only two-faced and playing both ends against the middle in the eyes of the world; and I might add, in the eyes of our own countrymen. By dropping our aid, we move the responsibility to Russia's shoulders for an added expense to their budget; and in the meantime, we can devote this money to better use—I hope.

I'm sorry to say we were unable to attend the rally at Benson High School last Sunday, but my husband and I did attend a reception held Saturday night and met both Howard Morgan and Robert Vaughn. I was quite disappointed at not seeing you personally.

Thank you so much for your time.
Best regards from,
Mrs. VICTORIA (BEN L.) RUSSELL.
PORTLAND, OREG.

MEDFORD, OREG.,
May 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: Keep up the good work. I am behind you all the way. We wouldn't be in the mess we are in if we had more men like you working for us.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHAS S. METZ.

HOOD RIVER, OREG.,
March 6, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your stand on Vietnam.

I am utterly opposed to this war.

Sincerely yours,

RETA P. HAUSEN.

HON. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: This is the first time I have ever written to a public official but I just had to let you know, there is one family of Oregonians, who is for you 100%.

I thank heavens there is somebody back in Washington, who has the courage of his convictions and is not afraid to have them known.

You are, as far as we are concerned, a realist in the midst of this emotional upheaval concerning Viet Nam.

My husband and I, and my father-in-law believe you to be right.

Once more Senator, more power to you, good luck, and God bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. OTTO KUHNHAUSEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.

LAKE OSWEGO, OREG.,
March 6, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: There is no need to go into details as to why I support your position on The Viet Nam issue, but I do think it necessary that the thousands of us who agree with you let our voices be heard so that you will continue to raise your voice for us.

Sincerely,

JACK RADOW.

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S
AND WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION,
LOCAL, 8,
Portland, Oreg., March 4, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Executive Board of Local #8, I.L.W.U., Portland Oregon wish to extend their whole hearted support in your effort to end the War in Viet Nam.

Your courageous effort is indeed worthy of the support of every American. By ending the war and settling the Viet Nam issue through the efforts of the United Nations, it will prevent the needless sacrifice of many thousand of American boys.

The billions spent on war can pay for help to improve the living standard of the underprivileged through a realistic foreign aid program.

We hope that you and your friends in the Senate will continue your fine effort in the cause of World Peace.

Very truly,

CARL H. ANDERSON,
Secretary, ILWU Local #8.

GRESHAM, OREG.,
March 6, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your Viet Nam policy 100 per cent. In fact more than 100 per cent for I feel we should get out of there entirely.

The time has long since past when one country, however powerful, can dictate to another country, however weak, the form of government the latter should have.

I admire your courage and urge you to maintain your position. Speak out, our country need you!

Sincerely yours,

E. G. LARSON.

ASTORIA, OREG.,
March 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: If only we had more men like you and Governor Grunning in Washington. We could look hopefully into the future, so many of my friends who hear what you stand for do admire your courage—to stand up against the war hawks.

I wish you well and am for you and your policies 100 percent.

Yours truly,

Mrs. J. D. WARILA.

PORTLAND, OREG.

Senator MORSE: The purpose of this letter is extremely simple. I want you to know that you are supported in your views on Vietnam—and I urge you to continue—and congratulate you on your courage.

JANET DUTHELM PECK.
Mrs. WILLIAM PECK.

WALDPORTE, OREG.,
March 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Salem, Oreg.

For a long time, I have been going to drop you a line to tell you and let you know that I am behind you in your views about our involvement in Asia. I admire your courage and spunk to speak out for something you and I know to be only right and honest. It must not be an easy job. I just want you to know that you have my support all the way. My prayers for the innocent, best of luck to you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MYRTLE BRADFORD.

MOORESTOWN, N.J., May 14, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We wish to commend you again most sincerely for your great and determined work concerning this stupid, insane, and evil war in Vietnam.

We are with you and working to awaken more people to see and understand what an insane stupid course this administration is taking.

Most sincerely yours,

FRANK N. MORSE.

KENELWORTH, N.J.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been watching you on T.V. today on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

May I state that I just burst into applause after you stated your position regarding Vietnam to Secretary of Defense McNamara.

This is one person who admires your "idealism" immensely. I totally support your view that we indeed have an obligation to do all we can to negotiate peace in southeast Asia.

It is too bad that today we are so severely criticized when we uphold ideals and principles—therefore I just wanted you to know that I heartily agree with your views.

Sincerely yours,

MADLINE SAVULICH.

DOWNY, CALIF.,
May 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your continued efforts as a "dove" are strongly commended!

We plan to cast our votes for "doves" wherever possible.

What can be done to outlaw napalm? Of all the horrors of war, this seems one of the most horrible.

Keep up your efforts, and never doubt that you have strong support.

Sincerely yours,

NETTIE R. VAN RAAPHORST.
JOHN N. VAN RAAPHORST.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 11, 1966.

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

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Thank you so much for your forthright and courageous stand against the illegal dirty war in which our country is engaged. Your voice is the voice of the conscience of our country.

There are many of us who are 100 percent behind you. Keep up the good work.

Respectfully,

MARGARET GINSBURG.

CHEHALIS, WASH.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have listened carefully—and I believe—understandingly—

May 16, 1966

to your ideas as regards our bloody war in Vietnam. Every word you said made sense as I understand it. You know—as do I—if once we took profit from war—war would cease. What can we common citizens do?

Yours truly,

Mrs. Roy La Due.

MADISON, WIS.,
May 13, 1966.

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

DEAR WAYNE MORSE: I am 100 percent in favor of your stand for a peaceful and moral solution to the crisis in southeast Asia as well as your hope that our country might return to a closer following of the principles of the Constitution. A stronger voice for Congress in determining foreign policy and more control over the CIA also seem to be very important aims.

Your talk here in Madison in February was inspiring. Especially impressive is your belief which you stated as something like, "The only truly practical course of action is one determined by strict application of principle. Expedience defeats the aims it seeks to further."

I hope that more and more Members of the Senate and House will join you in the bold stand you have taken. If I possessed the aptitudes to be a politician, I would hope to be one of your caliber.

For a better world,

CHARLES T. DEITZEL.

May 9, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: As I watched the Committee hearings on T.V. today I wished to thank you. Thank you for having them and for saying what I would say if I could speak to Dean Rusk or to the President. I truly admire your courage.

Sincerely,

SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.

KATHRYN INCROCCI.

PEORIA, ILL.,
May 12, 1966.

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

SENATOR: I am writing to let you know that I support you on the stand you are taking about this terrible war in Viet Nam.

I was very pleased to watch you on TV on Monday when you backed Secretary Rusk down on the absence of a formal vote in SEATO.

You men who are opposing this war are doing a real service for this country and I for one want to thank you.

I believe, like you, that if we could just bring the Congress around to refusing to vote the money to support this immoral war then they would have to stop it.

In my opinion the best way to support our boys in Viet Nam is to bring them home.

I am almost ashamed any more to say I am American—I shudder to think what the rest of the thinking world thinks of us.

It is a shame that our country has reached such a low.

Thank you again, Senator MORSE, for what you have already done and please continue the good work.

I, too, love my country.

IRVINGTON, N.J.,
May 15, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am in "your" corner re Viet Nam.

It is with regret that I am unable to attend the meeting tonight at Bloomfield College.

I recall that old, old saying "One on God's side is a majority." "We" have five in the Senate who speak out. Here's hoping that we can increase that "majority"—and some day, make it for real.

More power to your elbow—and uncommon sense.

Sincerely,

ELMER BRASHEAR.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,
May 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courageous stand on Viet Nam—We are indeed living in perilous times and I agree with Senator FULBRIGHT that we are following in the foot-steps of ancient Rome and only honest, courageous men, such as you and Senator FULBRIGHT, can save us—

May God strengthen and protect you in your endeavors—

Sincerely

Miss MARY C. CALLAWAY.

May 11, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you sincerely for your recent letter. I admire the things that you say concerning our being in Viet Nam.

I just wanted you to know that our only son will be going to Okinawa and both you and I know the destination from there. What can a mother do? How can the truth be told to his devoted little sister, only seven years old?

May God forgive those in Washington who are responsible for this entire mess. How can they sleep at night? And why is there not immediate action, instead of drawing the debate out for so long while our boys are dying or being maimed for the rest of their life?

A cease-fire must be instituted at once with no more killing. Please, please make those others see that.

Thank you very sincerely.

A very worried and heartbroken mother,
Mrs. GENE GASSMAN.

PEARL CITY, ILL.

Thank you again, Mr. MORSE for your sincere concern, and may God Bless you for your efforts.

SAN MATEO, CALIF.,
May 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I say your T.V. arguments really touched us?

You were great.

Truly yours,

ALICE and AL REYNOLDS.

VINTON, IOWA,
May 14, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: This is the first time I have ever written a government official but I have been watching you on TV and only wish we had more men like you working for us.

I have lived beyond my three score and ten and have always been a republican but that party around here have only praise for you and the work you are doing.

I sometimes wonder if this is only rotten politics or the fulfillment of the scriptures. Please keep up the good work.

Very sincerely,

Mrs. MARY FLOYD.

MONTEREY, CALIF.,
May 10, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a line to tell you my gratitude for your courageous stands in the senate against the horrible genocide in Vietnam. I am very discouraged, disillusioned, and ashamed of this country's actions there.

Thank you for helping me believe there is some sanity remaining. When critical letters to the president get turned over to the F.B.I., when protesting students get reclassified, and our answer to increasing criticism at home and abroad is escalation of the slaughter it is easy to lose faith in the democratic process.

Thank you for helping me maintain my faith in America.

Respectfully,

B. L. JONES.

UPLAND, CALIF.,
May 11, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE: I have adopted you as my Senator, even though I am a resident of the State of California. The purpose of this letter is another vote of confidence for the courage you are showing in trying to open the doors of truth, that have been closed by this administration.

The good Lord Himself is not on our side in this modern tragedy we are responsible for in Vietnam. We are not fighting the Vietcong. We are fighting the people of Vietnam itself. How else could they be so very successful at resisting great, big, powerful, Uncle Sam? Future history books will give credit to the great fight these people have put up against overwhelming odds.

Yes, let's save face in Vietnam. Not the face of our image, but the real faces of thousands of men and women who will die in the coming months. People who do not want to fight or die for any cause.

Let's get on the Lord's side—we all need Him badly. Let's get out, where we are not wanted.

Respectfully,

WALLACE SMITH.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
May 15, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thought you would be interested in reading my opinion about our undeclared war in South Vietnam and the Great Society.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM WAGNER.

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 15, 1966]
ONE-MAN GOVERNMENT?

CHICAGO, May 11.—I fully agree with those Senators who charged President Johnson with mismanagement of our undeclared war in South Vietnam. In my opinion this has resulted from his failure to heed the suggestions of our outstanding and experienced military men.

Unfortunately, we elected a shrewd politician as President, and not a man of wide executive qualifications. The Great Society's major aim is to achieve one-man government and, in my opinion, it appears to be making great progress.

WILLIAM WAGNER.

SUMMIT, N.J.,
May 16, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for sending "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam" which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 25.

You are a true representative of the people and the hope of America and the world. As a citizen I am proud of you as a Senator.

The first consideration of every concerned person should be the establishment of world government and the prevention of a nuclear war which would be a disastrous disgrace.

Thank you again for all your efforts toward a world of progress and peace.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM A. FAZAKAS.

May 16, 1966

10189

NEW YORK, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I must thank you so much and pray that you continue to fight against the frightening foreign policy currently practiced by that weird axis—White House, Pentagon, State Department.

We believe that the military expeditions under the guise of foreign aid is unconstitutional and that such decisions must never be left to them again. Perhaps only the people—by vote—should render such decisions. Washington's executive branch has followed a criminal course. Our political idiom imposes itself as much as communism—it does not have to.

The White House is endangering the civilization we created.

Regards,

JAY EADY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

May 10, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I appreciate your efforts to end the war in Vietnam and wish you all success.

In connection with this it is fundamental that we end our present policies toward Asia and recognize that the Chinese are an important factor which must be considered in any Asian settlement.

Our present policy, if continued, will lead to nuclear war.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS AMMENS.

CHICAGO, ILL.,

May 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: I am fully in accord with the views you expressed today on television as opposed to Secretary McNamara.

I thank God that we have a Senator who has the courage and convictions to stand up and voice his opinion.

Sincerely,

Mrs. S. DAVIDSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

May 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to express my appreciation for the courageous and enlightened leadership you are giving to the American people.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MIRIAM CAMP.

SOUTHAMPTON, MASS.,

May 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: With regard to your stand on the Vietnam situation, I have only a few things to say: You are being heard, you are right, and may God bless you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOYCE M. CARNEY.

MAY 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the excellent work you are doing.

I have been watching you and Senator FULBRIGHT with tremendous interest and appreciation. I trust you will continue until the forces for peace in this country become militant.

Sincerely,

FRANCES RANSOM LANE.

NEW ALBANY, IND., May 13, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: Thank you for expressing my views on Vietnam so eloquently.

Bringing the committee hearings to the public through television was a marvelous idea and who ever is responsible is certainly to be commended.

I understand that Mr. Raborn of the CIA is to be replaced. I would like to see Lieutenant General Gavin head that organization while I am not usually in favor of the military running anything but the military. I do not consider Lieutenant General Gavin just another military man. He appears to be a very intelligent, thoughtful man with a wonderful grasp of world affairs and the role of the United States in them.

If you feel this suggestion has merit perhaps you can give it some impetus.

Thank you for having the strength of your convictions and the courage to speak out. It is very reassuring to me to know that we do have people like you in our Government.

Yours truly,

Mrs. LEO V. CORBETT.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,

May 13, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We admire your honesty and courage in the recent statements you have made in the Foreign Relations Committee Hearings. We depend upon you and others of like thinking to continue to represent the American people, who voted against this impossible war, and have been hurt and disillusioned by the escalation.

Before it is too late—we must stop it. More and more, the people are aware, and as they become so, they are against this war.

With great Respect,

ILSE SHANK.

BRILLIANT, OHIO,

May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I just listened to the hearings on TV also the ones before that and think we should have more of the same. I agree with you and Senator FULBRIGHT on everything you say and hope you will keep on showing the American people how wrong our government has been in this war and the foreign aid we have been so free with to nations who couldn't care less if we win or lose.

I am ashamed of our leaders who try to tell other nations how to run their countries when we have such a mess here at home.

You take heart and keep on fighting because you are right and there are more people for you than the rest of the Congress wants you to think.

I am a Democrat but I will never vote for one again till I am sure they are worth my vote.

The people I talk to here are all very upset over this war and are going to show it at the polls.

Thank you again for being a truly great American with courage and conviction.

Mrs. A. W. HATHAWAY.

I am not a parent, just a good American citizen.

P.S.—I also saw the film you referred to on educational TV and I cried when I thought of the position our country is taking to create such hate and destruction. And why can't the press and regular TV carry films such as these so more people can really see this? I will tell you, they are afraid to really inform the people, but people are smarter than they think and are learning more and more about the true facts which you are helping to bring out.

MAY 13, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: At a time when you are being attacked from many quarters because of your stand on our policy in southeast Asia, I am writing to say I support you in your constant questioning and criticism of our ill-formed foreign policy in Vietnam—a policy that is becoming increasingly dominated by military expediency rather than any consideration of human rights.

Our President speaks much about human rights but his words sound hopelessly unrealistic in this present situation. I write this as a concerned and committed Catholic and also as a graduate student in social work at the University of Chicago, two areas in my life in which my commitment to others makes me regard our Nation's current self-seeking foreign policy with great dismay and profound regret and sorrow. I am praying daily for you and for all our leaders, most especially for our President, that God may help us see our way out of this mess.

A supporter,

CHICAGO, ILL.

AL MURDACH,

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Good for you, Morse. I hope you never die—God bless you and your conscience.

ELSE FIRSCHEIN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

May 14, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope you don't get disheartened by the recent attacks the President has made against you and your policy concerning the Vietnam war.

Believe me, the majority of the people think as you and as a mother I pray that you don't give up the fight.

The Vietnam war is stupid, senseless, and immoral.

Sincerely yours,

BARBARA HANSEN.

NEW BRITAIN, CONN.,

May 13, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God for men of your caliber.

The stand you have taken with regard to Vietnam shows you have the interest of our country and precious boys at heart.

Keep up the good work, and may your endeavors soon bear fruit.

Sincerely,

(Mrs. Albert) CHARLOTTE B. HOFFMANN.

SEATTLE, WASH.,

May 12, 1966.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to express my gratitude and appreciation for your efforts with regards the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

1. I am a 24-year-old college senior, an ex-GI, hopefully a future doctor.

2. I am not a great respecter of many of the ideas which you have championed in the past. On the Vietnam issue, however, I believe that you have been most honest, forthright, and I sincerely say, "courageous."

3. I encourage you in your efforts to bring the truth to the American people.

4. Much of what you have publicly stated has been either poorly reported, or not reported at all in the local Seattle papers. Most importantly, anything that you have advocated as an alternative to present U.S. policy has not come through.

5. I suggest that you attempt in the future to more explicitly state, and singly put forth what you suggest the United States do about our involvement in southeast Asia. I mean that you should make your suggestions on occasions separate from your criticisms, since the papers seem to print the criticisms and not the alternatives.

6. Please continue in your efforts as I am in mind on a much smaller scale. I sincerely believe that the tide is turning, though I am most apprehensive that it may be too late.

Sincerely,

ANDREW M. FEGAN.

GLENBROOK, CONN.,

May 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my hand in support of your stand that we, the

May 16, 1966

American people will show by our ballots that we violently oppose 'our' war in Vietnam.

I devoted my time to the entire Senate Foreign Relations proceedings over N.B.C. T.V. on Monday, May 9th and, to say the least, remembering our American heritage, felt discouraged and mortified at the ruthless attitude toward the tiny country of Vietnam ruled by a 'Hitler' oriented Premier Cao Ky whom we support! I know now that elections in this torn, demoralized land will be to no avail unless Cao Ky is removed from his stand of absolute power.

As you repeat, and I agree, that our boys are being slaughtered in this undeclared war with no end in sight—except in world conflagration, that we make moves to end it and follow the Geneva agreement of '54 which we honored.

Thank you for your unstinting efforts on behalf of humanity. May you be given good health and strength to keep reminding the administration their responsibility to the people of our land and the world.

These public hearings are a healthy and necessary service and we homemakers approve and listen!

Most respectfull yours,

Mrs. A. EPSTEIN.

RINDGE, N.H., May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR FRIEND: This is just to express to you my appreciation for your words and your clear understanding of what is really the true situation in southeast Asia—and Vietnam in particular. It is so discouraging for some of us to see this mistake of 1954 compounded daily until we are deeply depressed—for surely if our (U.S.) "powers that be" do not soon see it is up to them to call an honest-to-goodness halt—before we can ever expect Hanoi to feel we are sincere about negotiations—we are sure it is getting too late fast.

Keep up talking.

Sincerely,

HELEN L. BLISS.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,

May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I just heard your remarks regarding the legality of our being in Vietnam. I want to congratulate you and thank you for having the courage to carry on the fight for sanity in this chaotic world.

As a Democrat, a voter, a taxpayer, and a mother, you have my wholehearted support.

My only regret is I don't live in your district—keep up the good work—we will support you all the way.

Sincerely,

Mrs. S. EIDINOFF.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,

May 9, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to say that I am one of the many Americans who admires you very much, and who supports your views regarding Vietnam (among other things).

It seems as if you are one of the few remaining bright lights of intellect and commonsense left burning in Washington, and I wish you the best of luck in your fight.

Respectfully,

MISS CAROL CAMPBELL.

NEWTON CENTRE, MASS.,

May 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Killing is killing, and it is a good idea to remind Secretary McNamara of the human consequences of his successful military operations, although it

appears that he is not to be reached by anything but statistics.

Please do not let up your battering of U.S. policy in Vietnam. Unless some fundamental changes are made in the direction of peaceful settlement the outlook for the world is terrifying.

Sincerely,

EMILY V. WOLF.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

May 13, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with your views on Vietnam. You deserve more support from the other Senators that you are getting. I intend writing to Senators JAVITS and KENNEDY on this subject.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. L. CHERNICK.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR SENATOR: One hundred percent approval of your stand.

Keep it up. You are gaining more supporters every day, even though they may be reluctant to speak out.

Help me to continue to be proud to be an American.

MISS LILLIAN MEISTER.

EDMONDS, WASH.,

May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note of appreciation and to thank you for just now speaking out on TV. I hope and pray your words will be heeded. God love you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GRANT E. RILEY.

ALDON, OHIO,

May 13, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I am glad you have the courage to question our being in Vietnam. I wish I could vote for you.

I think it is time for a change, we should have a new draft law, draft everybody and everything, for the duration of any war declared or not, pay all according to their rank and service, and I am sure we would be able to get a way to get out.

Yours truly,

Mrs. A. BAILEY.

DARIEN, CONN.,

May 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: History's tragic error is our "charge of the Light Brigade," in Vietnam.

You are so right.

MARGARET KOSTENBADER and FAMILY,
ROBERT A. SHERWOOD.

CHICAGO, ILL.,

May 11, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard your remarks today on television during the Senate investigation of the war in Vietnam, and I can't express too strongly my admiration for your position and for your course of action in general.

You are absolutely right: Our whole psychological orientation toward war, toward military power, and toward international political situations has got to be changed. I am a native of Arkansas, a resident of Illinois, and a voter; and you may count on my support in whatever way it can be expressed.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET DUGGAR.

SAN LEANDRO, CALIF.,

May 10, 1966.

My DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I fully support the policy which you advocate for Vietnam. And for everyone who writes, I am sure there are thousands of others who are supporting you but never let you know.

Sincerely,

Mrs. WILMA WEBB.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,

May 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We congratulate you upon your courage and vigor in prosecuting your case against an unwanted war in Vietnam.

My wife and I want you to know how proud we are of you and your forthright stand against a most disastrous adventure.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM WANAMAKER, M.D.

SEATTLE, WASH.,

May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just to reaffirm my complete support of your stand in regard to the war in Vietnam. This as well as your opposition to our interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

You are, in my opinion, one of the few who place the welfare of our country ahead of their own ambitions for reelection to office. You have my most sincere admiration.

Cordially,

HOWARD L. SEAVEY.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK.,

May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It is most gratifying to hear your concise and bold remarks challenging policies we feel are not for the benefit of the United States or humanity in general. I'm sure that you stick your neck out often, and that you take grave political risks in so doing; but we want you to know that we are grateful for it.

Our Government is in an awkward and difficult position, and I'm sure there is no really easy way out; but your statement that our present course of action just is not working seems so obviously apparent that we wonder why there is not more opposition to it (Government policy—not your statement.) by other members of the Senate.

Please keep up the good work—and tell us what to do to help.

Very sincerely,

JERRY AND KAY MCSPADDEN.

TOPEKA, KANS.,

May 13, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please continue your unbiased analysis of the Vietnam problem. Knowledge of the history of southeast Asia makes our presence there illogical, the centuries of exploitation. These peoples thinking cannot be changed by force, or by money.

Sincerely,

LEO A. SMITH, M.D.

DOYON, N. DAK.,

May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You would be surprised at how many Americans think like you do about the war in Vietnam. The trouble is we do not have the facts to back our thoughts and we do love our country.

Just from the facts we can glean from the news media, we were about 20 years too late in stopping the spread of communism in

May 16, 1966

10191

Asia. It is there and has been for a long time. Supposing we did bring North Vietnam to her knees, would that end the war? Wouldn't we have to go on killing and killing like the fast gun of the Old West? We are told that we want nothing in South Vietnam; that all we want is to stop the killing and intimidation. And we do this by killing and destruction. It just doesn't make sense.

Is it a trait handed down from our founders that we think we can stop a thing merely by killing the person who does it? Can't we learn that the way to stop a bad idea is to make a better one work? It makes one wonder if democracy and freedom can be attained without a loaded gun to back us up.

Thank God for people like you and Senator Fulbright. You speak for those of us who want to be free to live a Christian type of life but do not want to have to carry a gun to do it. You are most courageous. A great many people would like to help you but we can't even find out why we are fighting a war in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. LORETTA EVANS.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations. I have been listening to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee TV program with great interest and congratulate you, dear sir, on speaking as I feel many, many of us would voice our opinion if given the opportunity.

This Vietnam situation is in such confusion and escalation it certainly has people scared as to where or how it may end. Two wrongs do not make a right and this escalation on both sides is only making things worse and the price of our best young men giving up their lives in such great numbers, in addition to dollars spent, is too high a price to pay and for what? I do not feel we are closer to peace—in fact, I think conditions are worse with the Chinese, etc. Also, we are creating a hate from most nations and—instead of a warm feeling, we are creating one of fear and antagonism.

This is my first letter ever to Washington as I feel there are so many problems to be settled by men much more brilliant than most of us American citizens but this is so serious that I am very grateful to you and your committee for trying to get a settlement of this very horrible, gruesome situation. I feel so badly seeing pictures of these very young boys—17, 18, 19, 20, dying and severely wounded—please it is very late and getting worse—if not too late already.

Thanks again, dear Senator MORSE.

Sincerely,

BERTHA GUCKENBERGER.

STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
New Paltz, N.Y., May 11, 1966.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I say once again that were it not for men like you, I should despair for the future of our country and for the integrity of our political institutions.

Your defense of the life of principle is nothing less than courageous, and you almost persuade me that politics can be an honorable profession.

My hope is that you prosper in health and success and that the cause for which you have labored so hard and so long will prevail in the end. I speak not only for myself but for all enlightened men, I hope, when I say that I am truly grateful that you are in a position to defend those of us who love truth, human decency, and the democratic way of life.

No. 80—21

Sentaor, you were positively Burkean in your denunciation of this unjust, illegal, and immoral war, which is corroding the moral fiber of our country.

Your sincerely,

STANLEY C. RUSSELL,
Associate Professor.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N.Y., May 13, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to inform you that you have my wholehearted support in your continuing efforts to bring sanity to our Viet Nam policy. My concern grows daily, and I fear that time is running short, as I see, in the wake of senseless death and destruction on both sides, our encroachments creep closer to Hanoi, Halphong, and China.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES K. SINCLAIR.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
March 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: It is impossible to express my gratitude for all that you are doing to draw the country's attention to the insanity of the war in Vietnam.

Please continue in your efforts to bring about a negotiated peace.

Again, my many thanks for your tireless efforts.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ABBIE KIASNE.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,
May 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I had only a few minutes' time to observe the Foreign Affairs hearing on Monday morning, especially that part dealing with Vietnam.

I certainly want to compliment you on your good efforts and hope you will continue to do everything you can to stop the murder of our fine young men in a war where we have no business being.

We can win nothing by continuing to fight.

We can lose nothing if we abandon our war efforts in Vietnam but we can save the lives of our good American boys.

Sincerely,

R. W. ROBBERTSON.

VENTURA, CALIF.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have been listening to the Senate Foreign Relations hearings today on NBC. We certainly admire your stand and only wish there were more men like you in the Senate.

We are Republicans but Americans first.

Sincerely,

LAURA and ARTHUR ENDELL.

WICHITA FALLS, TEX.,
May 9, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We appreciate you and your statesmanship. Thanks for all your hard work.

HARL MANSUR, Jr., M.D.

FLUSHING, N. Y.,
May 9, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept our thanks and gratitude for your courageous stand in questioning the morality and legality of our presence in southeast Asia. With

tonight's announcement that 7,200 pounds of nausea-inducing gas has been released in an area in South Vietnam, how can we hold our heads up as members of the human race?

We're sorry we cannot show our appreciation by voting for you.

Very truly yours,

MARIE HAUSMAN.

LANCASTER, OHIO,
May 9, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: I am always pleased to know America has such a brilliant man as yourself, in our Government.

The rank and file of people I talk to are opposed to our men fighting in Vietnam. They say MORSE is a smart man. So don't think you stand alone. You have lots of friends.

Mrs. GLENN E. LANE.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
May 9, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your television appearance today. I hope thousands saw you and will carefully consider your bold stand against sending our finest young men to be killed thousands of miles away from home in an action which is, as you state, entirely illegal according to the fundamental principles of this Nation.

Never before in our history of wars has there been so much opposition by so many of our people.

The voters of the Nation are against what the President is doing to disturb other nations by our superior attitude, and if President Johnson ever tries again for the White House he will fall by a large majority. If Stevenson could have been in the White House, we would not now be in this unfortunate situation before the world.

More power to you. I think I do not remember when you were ever wrong as a public official.

Sincerely,

Mrs. L. V. TABLER.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
May 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: It makes my heart turn over to watch you courageously maintain your position with regard to our involvement in the Vietnamese war—always reasonable, never deflected by the barrage of doubletalk thrown at you. My faith in American statesmanship is restored when I watch you and Senator Fulbright at work in these hearings.

Yours sincerely,

MALVINA REYNOLDS.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your remarks to Secretary McNamara and the Foreign Relations Committee this morning, especially your suggestion that the President should go to the U.N. and press for the full use of its help in a negotiated settlement in Vietnam.

You are not alone in your sentiments. I am sure there are many women like me who feel the tragic bitterness of this war. I was a Red Cross hospitals worker in American field hospitals in Europe in World War II, and saw considerable suffering there. Now I have a 12-year-old son and a 16-year-old daughter whose lives will be deeply affected by decisions made in your committee room. I think the televised hearings are good education for the public.

May 16, 1966

If you and your like-minded colleagues asked groups such as the social action section of the National Council of Churches, the League of Women Voters (who support the U.N. actively) and the American Association of University Women to urge the President to go to the United Nations as you suggested, he just might do it. Who knows?

God bless you for your courage and concern.

MARY A. GASTON.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
May 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: Never fear, Senator, there are those of us in the American scene who not only appreciate your efforts in the current debate regarding the tragedy and debacle which is Vietnam, but also take every opportunity to at least make known our dissent concerning present U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Your good efforts on the national scene, along with those of your colleague Senator FULBRIGHT, are of the utmost urgency as they are the key to returning sanity and good sense to the halls of our government.

Thank you and best wishes for gaining the support sanity and good judgment deserve.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. BATEMAN.

BELLE, W. VA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to advise you that we are in full support of your stand on the Vietnam situation. You and Senator FULBRIGHT seem to be standing alone against heavy odds, and we want you to know that the people that we have talked with stand ten to one in your favor.

Most people seem horrified at the administration's stand and fear escalation to an even greater degree. We are relying on men like you and Senator FULBRIGHT to keep up the good work, for we and many, many others support you wholeheartedly.

Mr. and Mrs. D. B. RUNYON.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
May 10, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: "Yes," on your position on the war in Vietnam.

DOWNING N. MANN.

BELLE, W. VA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to advise you that we are in full support of your stand on the Vietnam situation. You and Senator FULBRIGHT seem to be standing alone against heavy odds, and we want you to know that the people that we have talked with stand ten to one in your favor. If only all our leaders were so wise and brave.

Keep up the good work, for we and many others support you wholeheartedly.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN R. HOFFMAN.

LINDEN, MICH.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your efforts in enlightening us (the American people) on the legal aspects of the Vietnam situation. Your discussion on TV today was very important. Again thanks.

Yours truly,

ETHEL R. WELLS.

HILLSDALE, MICH.,
May 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is not often that I write a letter of this kind. But I am so grateful to you for expressing my very own feelings about this tragic mess in Vietnam, that I am eager to say, "Thanks, and God Bless You."

For if there is any real excuse for us being over there—inflicting all that suffering and destruction on a helpless people—to say

nothing of our sinful sacrifice of our own youth—then I am yet to hear it.

And we—supposedly—a Christian nation.

Sincerely

EDITH W. LACKEY.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to let you know of another American who supports your position as you stated it today at the hearings.

There are many who agree with your views and earnestly desire diminution rather than escalation.

Sincerely yours,

ANNE S. CARROTHERS.

MAY 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The courage you display in speaking the truth in the Senate hearings makes me proud that we have such a man as yourself in the Federal Government.

Our boys are being slaughtered because of the unwarranted intervention of our country in Vietnam's internal problems, and I thank God that you are raising your voice so that this terrible bloodbath will come to an end.

Those of us who stand up for the truth are being persecuted. I am a true American, an active Roman Catholic, and not in favor of communism at all; but I say that if these people want and vote in this kind of government we should allow them to have it, and stop killing these Vietnamese people. It is a crime that the cream of our young manhood is being maimed and killed in an Oriental war which was provoked by our intervention with a promise made to these people that they would have free elections in 1954.

Please keep up the fight for truth. God bless you. You are wonderful.

In gratitude,

JUNE DEGENHART.

BUFFALO, N.Y.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 9, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my expression of appreciation for your courage in vigorously questioning our Government policy in Vietnam.

I definitely am in favor of preventing the growth of communism throughout the world, but it seems to me that our current actions in southeast Asia are further alienating the very people whom we wish to protect.

I have written to President Johnson advising him that as a member of the Democratic Party I will use my vote to protest the escalation of the Vietnam war by either voting for the Republican candidate or refraining from casting my ballot in the next election.

Please continue to use your influence to persuade our Government leaders to employ methods other than the slaughter of innocent peasants and the sacrifice of American servicemen in bringing self-determination to the people of Vietnam.

Respectfully,

ADRIENNE THIELE.

RED BANK, N.J.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I have been watching the Senate hearings on our foreign aid and why

we are sending our beautiful young men into the Asian war.

It seems to me that you stand out as the real statesman—a true American—a sincere representative for your people and Americans all over this land. Congratulations.

Thank God we have at least one American who cares about the Constitution laid down by the Founding Fathers. Return to it.

The Congress doesn't seem to control affairs any more—what had happened?

No one questioned why the greatest general of the Korean war was fired. Why?

There are many questions the American people would like answered. Speak out.

Usurp the power that was taken away from you. Perhaps it's easier for most of our Congressmen this way.

They should get to work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MILDRED BROWN.

P.S.—I was watching you, I clapped real loud, hurrah Senator.

SUDBURY, MASS.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

I trust that your suggested session with international lawyers will be held. I fear that the testimony would overwhelming condemn our actions and thus they will never be held.

Thank you, thank you for representing my views

Mrs. C. STRAND.

ALLIANCE, OHIO,
May 11, 1966.

DEAR SIR: We are behind you in your stand 100 percent. Keep up the good fight—you are in the right.

Sincerely,

ELEANOR FULLMER
Mrs. Howard FULLMER.

P.S.—I am a citizen and a taxpayer.

BELLEFONTAINE, OHIO,
May 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: Character will out, high office brings the pressures that reveal it. Your stand is just and highly commendable.

A heartfelt thank you for your efforts.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR E. KNACK.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
May 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I wonder how many of the so-called hawks, put out on a scouting mission in Viet Cong territory, would turn out to be chickens.

Thank God for your independent thought and action. There is hope yet.

Yours very truly,

NORMAN SUPOVE.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to say that I am in full agreement with your sound, knowledgeable, and reasonable views on Vietnam. The more I listen and watch the public discussions of your committee on TV the more thankful I am that we have at least a few courageous, broadminded, honest, brilliant, eloquent men such as you left in our government. I am sure there must be many others in Congress who share your views which are so realistic, so understanding, so reasonable and so right, but for some reason or another they seem to lack the courage to speak up.

May 16, 1966

Approved For Release 2005/06/29 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000400070010-0

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10193

I would urge you to continue to do as you are now doing—hammer away again and again and yet again at your views until the American people become firmly convinced of the truth of the situation in Vietnam.

Thank you for standing up for the right and the truth against almost overwhelming odds, but please continue to preach the truth again and again and again. Also, be wary of any further bid for power by the administration by anymore such emergencies as the "Tonkin Gulf affair."

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

EVELYN REED.

MAY 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The ill wind of current colds which prevented me from going to work this week blew me the good of being at home this morning for the TV Senate hearings with our Secretary of Defense.

I cannot adequately express the gratitude I feel (along with so many other Americans) that in you we have a distinguished and articulate spokesman. You said all the things that are put up in our hearts and thoughts concerning the intolerable situation in Vietnam.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Miss ELLA ZIMMERMAN.

NEW YORK.

MAY 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I want to congratulate you on your stand regarding the Vietnam war. We wholly agree with you in regard to halting the slaughter of American boys.

If our Government is suppose to be "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," why don't they ask us if we want to send our sons, brothers, and fathers to Viet Nam to be killed? Why are we not consulted first before we become involved in such a situation? After all, it is our sons who have to fight and be killed. This decision should be made by the people and not any government official. It doesn't seem fair that we have no recourse in this matter, none whatsoever, except to turn over our sons without a word.

We certainly would appreciate anything you can do to terminate this horrible situation.

Sincerely,

Mrs. WALTER E. KOTTAS.

BUFFALO, N.Y.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been watching with great interest the television coverage of the meetings of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I think the suggestion you made yesterday that our President insist that the United Nations take over and do something about the Vietnam situation. I think this is the best plan that has been offered and wish to tell you that there are many of us who believe you are one of the few clear-thinking people in Congress who is honest with the American people.

I am glad, too, that you said with so much feeling that it is not easy for you to be against the administration. I feel there are many people who have been told that you take a stand against the administration because you enjoy being controversial. I feel that John F. Kennedy would have been glad to include you in his "Profiles."

I am writing my Senators and Congressman asking that they get strongly behind you in insisting that the United Nations do something about this miserable war now.

All my good wishes go to you, Senator MORSE.

Sincerely,

MABEL E. LEARY.

THE MOUNT SINAI HOSPITAL,
New York, N.Y., May 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I write a short letter of praise to you and your colleagues for the fine job the Foreign Relations Committee is doing in providing the American people with detailed insight into the unfortunate conflict in Vietnam.

Examples of sincere and well-founded dissent are becoming harder to find in the present political scene. Therefore, I commend your motives and the sincere, direct manner of the presentation of information.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. APRIL, M.D.,
Laboratories of Clinical
Neurophysiology.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., May 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I address you with a great deal of regret—regret that I am not an Oregonian and therefore cannot support you by ballot. Nevertheless, I write to thank you for your persistent stand of incisive questioning and for your intelligent, brave critiques of our government's Viet-nam policies.

My appreciation and respect are yours not only for those policy changes you advocate. As importantly, I thank you for having thrust your doubts toward the public forum. By having done so, you have helped greatly to re-create an atmosphere in which honest statements of dissent, questioning, and disapproval are once more tolerated, if not yet welcomed with respect. As little as one or two years ago—sadly—my family felt constrained from discussing publicly such issues as our Viet-nam policy. You have done much to assure the public that anti-Viet-nam involvement does not equal anti-patriotism. Perhaps from the freer questioning you have helped foster, more enlightened and less rigid approaches to foreign situations may begin to emerge.

Respectfully,

JAMES LEVINSON.

TUCSON, ARIZ.,
May 10, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for the stand you are taking in regard to Vietnam. I believe history will prove you right. I pray we will not get into an atomic war. So keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. G. A. HORACK.

AUSTIN, TEX.,
May 9, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have hardly written at all to any Congressmen. But I do so now to express my support of your position on Vietnam. If I may help to support your views let me know how.

Respectfully yours,

MEREDITH D. TURNER.

ESCANABA, MICH.,
May 11, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Member of the Senate Foreign Relations
Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: On May 10, 1966, I wrote a letter to Senator J. WM. FULBRIGHT, Chair-

man of the Foreign Relations Committee, thanking him for his efforts in promoting peace in the world and specifically his attempt to stop the useless slaughter in Viet Nam. As I mentioned to him, I am a long time student of political science and government, going back more than forty years. I want to thank you for your sincerity and efforts in promoting world peace. I have watched and listened to many of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings, publicly televised in recent weeks. I specifically want to commend you on your effort at the public hearing, which was televised today, May 11, which I watched. Your extemporaneous comments to Secretary McNamara, trying to get necessary this whole Asian and world problem to the United Nations, are necessary for world peace, in my opinion and seemingly in yours, and probably in the opinion of the great majority of the people of United States and the world. It was the greatest unprepared speech for peace I have heard in a long time.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE ERDMAN.

MAY 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We watched you on live T.V. yesterday, and are behind you 100% in every thing you said.

It is too bad we don't have more wonderful men like you who speak out, and work for the good of the U.S.!

Best wishes for success.

Sincerely,

LEWIS AND EVELYN GRAY.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

FREEPORT, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been watching the Senate hearings on TV and felt I had to somehow let you know how very deeply I, and many many others, appreciate your stand. Yours is the sanest word put forth. Please do not become discouraged. Your followers and supporters are legion.

Sincerely yours,

MARJORIE P. LUYCKX.

BRISTOLVILLE, OHIO,
May 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In my opinion, there are very few men who have the courage and fortitude, as you have, to stand up for their convictions even though they may find themselves in the minority. Certainly these men are the foundation of a strong democracy, and I think these men should be commended.

Recently, you and your colleague, Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, have probably been the most criticized Senators in the Senate, due, primarily, to your opinions regarding the Vietnam conflict. I share your deep concern in our involvement there. I certainly admire your questioning of the legality and actual basis of our concern there, and I, also, admire your great respect for the lives of American men fighting and dying in Vietnam.

I wanted to let you know that there are many Americans who are very proud to have a man of your stature in their Government, and I hope we will continue to have men in our Government like you, who will question and not just accept.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD COOPER.

KANSAS CITY, MO.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God we have at least one man in our government who has the courage to speak out and hold to your convictions. I agree completely with your views on our situation in Vietnam. May God bless & keep you.

Most sincerely,

GERTRUDE WELTON.

May 16, 1966

MADISON, WIS.,
May 11, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your clear lucid arguments involving the legalities of our position in Viet Nam in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings. Your sanity in a time of reckless abandon and temptation of fate and the steps leading to global war are much appreciated. We are in complete accord with your views on Viet Nam and are grateful to you for speaking out. Thank you also for your fine talk here in Madison in February.

Yours truly,

Mrs. HUGH ILTIS.

MAY 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: Just a note to express our appreciation for your courageous statements in recent weeks.

We realize that certain forces seem to be leading us towards a military dictatorship. And we thank you for challenging those who would lead us down the road to the destruction of true Democracy.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. DANIEL DEATON.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY,
May 11, 1966.Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to take this opportunity to express my full support for your position with respect to our military involvement in Vietnam. I greatly admire your courage and hope you will be successful in bringing about a change in administrative policy on this crucial matter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. STEBBINS,
Professor of Zoology.MONTEREY, CALIF.,
May 9, 1966.Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The opportunity to view the televised hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this morning prompts me to write this letter. You have earned the gratitude of every American citizen by your persistent and relentless questioning of the present administration's foreign policy. Your outspoken refusal to accept the fiction that our military action in Vietnam is in any way justified, and your reference to our violation of the United Nations Charter, give new hope to those of us who earnestly desire a sane and sensitive foreign policy for our nation.

Perhaps we may yet come to base our relations with other countries on an understanding of the genuine desires of the people of un-developed nations, rather than on a sterile and self-defeating anti-communism. Thank you for your continuing efforts in that direction.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. B. L. JONES.

MAY 9, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is an expression of admiration from a resident of California for your courageous and honest stand against the conflict in Viet Nam.

It was a most distressing experience to watch a television program from Viet Nam and listen to the pilot speaking of his bombing attack as if he were killing a few pests.

He said that he enjoyed using the napalm and strafing the human beings as they ran in search of safety. It was a horrifying experience to witness the torture and death of a prisoner, the evident terror of a young lad of fourteen or fifteen years of age, who was thought to be a member of the Viet Cong, as he was marched down the road and other parts of the film. Have we reared our boys to have no respect for life and no feeling for the pain inflicted upon other human beings?

Even if I were convinced that our involvement in Viet Nam were justified, I could not condone such bestiality. I have failed, thus far, to be convinced that this war in Viet Nam is our affair and I deplore our involvement.

Thank you for your forthright stand and sane approach to this distressing war.

With sincere admiration and gratefulness,
SIMON R. STEIN,
NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I am in full agreement with you in your stand on the Vietnam war. I don't see how Rusk, McNamara, etc., can utter the flimsy excuses which they do. All these bombings, right in Saigon show that we are not wanted there.

Yours truly,

JANET HARDING.

MAY 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I felt I must sit down and write to you and express my thanks for your stand against the horrible war my Government is involved in.

I realize the ridicule and harassments you are put to for your stand, as an ordinary citizen. I see a very small sample of this by simply stating that I am against our policy.

I am a young adult who has voted for only one President and has never written to any public official before, but after closely following you and Senator FULBRIGHT on television I felt compelled to write you and thank you for your courage. I am frightened to think that my husband and brothers may have to die for a war I feel is senseless and which I believe in time will be proven unnecessary.

Sir, to close, let me say I support you and am heartily grateful that there are men like you, however few in number, who rise above politics to raise their voice when they feel an issue is wrong. You belong in President Kennedy's "Profiles in Courage."

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOANNE SARVER.

CUYAHOGA FALLS, OHIO.

MAY 13, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: I wish to add my small voice to the many who thank you for your rational and courageous position with regard to the immoral war being waged by the United States in Vietnam.

Unfortunately, we are still living in a time when to be rational demands courage.

For the good fight you are waging, I know you will be remembered when others, presently more influential, will either be forgotten or remembered with shame.

Please continue the good fight. My only regret regarding you, sir, is that as a resident of New Jersey, I am unable to vote for you in Oregon.

Very truly yours,

JACOB ELDMAN.

TOMS RIVER, N.J.

BELLEVILLE, ILL.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been viewing the foreign relation hearings and just want to let you know how much I admire your

courage on the stand you are taking concerning the war in Vietnam, and the effort you are making in trying to get at the truth of the matter.

Too many of our young men are taken into the service as soon as they graduate from high school age 18 to 19 years many of whom have already been killed and are being killed every day according to the reports in the local newspapers, which is a very shocking thing to anybody's mind.

Thank you for the good work you are doing in the interest of our Government and peace. I thank God for men like you who have the wisdom and courage to fight for the right of the people and work toward peace and good will among the nations.

God bless you.

Mrs. H. BECKMAN.

NARBERTH, PA.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept my thanks for your efforts to bring some sanity into the Vietnam situation. There are many of us on the sidelines who applaud you.

Respectfully,

FRANCES P. BRODIE
Mrs. GEORGE R. BRODIE.

MAY 13, 1966.

CHICAGO, ILL.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You have always had my general appreciation in your political career—and your stand on Vietnam has done nothing but magnify this. I sincerely hope that you can prevail among your colleagues and bring some sense to our country's actions.

Sincerely,

MARTHA KAY.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,
May 11, 1966.Senator WAYNE B. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You are absolutely right in your viewpoint on Vietnam. A misadventure by the United States of America. We interposed in a civil war, backgrounded by a religious strife, and corrupt political influences. The precedent we set there—could be duplicated in Indonesia, Colombia, Rhodesia, and Pakistan. The American people are sick and tired of warmongering and war. Keep strong, and solvent and charitable—but no more. Cut the foreign aid by 50 percent.

GEORGE T. MEYERS.

BETHESDA, MD.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I cannot let another day go by without telling you how greatly I admire your stand, bravery, and integrity. Keep up the magnificent work.

Gratefully,

MARJORIE H. LASHER.

FREEPORT, N.Y.,
May 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As you can see I don't live in the State you represent. I am writing to you because I feel sure that you will ask and try to get an answer to the question I have on my mind.

Why are more Americans dying than Vietnamese? This week three times as many American boys died than Vietnamese.

Are these people going to sit down and let my son and other Americans fight and die for their freedom? I thought we went there to help them, not to do the whole job while they sit around and wait for a promised election.

Why can't the Americans sit and wait, too? Maybe that way, the war would go away. I don't know how we can end it unless this country is ready to fight an all-out war.

May 16, 1966

10195

I object to my son fighting and maybe dying while the Army of South Vietnam is on vacation. If they want to be free, let them fight; no fight, no freedom.

Bring our boys home so that they can enjoy the freedom their fathers and grandfathers fought for.

Respectfully,

ROSE C. STONE.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
May 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your presentation of your views on the conflict in southeast Asia at today's Foreign Affairs Committee hearings, was most impressive. At last we had a clear idea of the alternatives that could be followed. We appreciate your thoughtful comments and hope that you will keep up with your efforts and eloquence for the things that you and many other people think right, the smears and attacks on you notwithstanding.

Very truly yours,

Dr. and Mrs. WALTER STRICKS.

DOUSMAN, WIS.,
May 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The plan you expressed today while the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was questioning Mr. McNamara was the most hopeful plan I've heard. It had seemed to me that the U.N. is failing in its duty to work for peace and, since they've done nothing in response to President Johnson's request for help, I had decided that the U.N. was about dead. Could you not write out the plans you gave today at the meeting and send copies to whomever could do something about it? Just maybe the United States can be got "off the hook." I really believe that if the President demanded such action as you suggested we might get results.

Always I have this fear: Since so many countries for so long had urged us to get out of Vietnam and we paid them no attention. Maybe now those countries think we are getting what we deserve and no one will help us. I do hope we still have enough friends who will go to bat for us by following the U.N. plan you suggested. It seemed to hold hope in what has looked like a hopeless situation.

God bless you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. EVA M. BARRY.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
May 11, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and myself have been very attentive in recent months to the hearings in Washington relative to the merits of the war in Vietnam.

We have taken notice of the fact that at all times you have put the welfare of the Nation and the people ahead of any political considerations even at the risk of splitting party unity.

We are convinced that you have acted at all times in accord with your conscience and that you are one of the few people in Washington with the courage to speak the truth.

We have a son of military age who has discharged his responsibility to the State and Nation by completing training in the National Guard and stands ready to defend his State and his country in any emergency, but we would feel frustrated indeed if he were called to fight in an Asian jungle for a cause he does not believe to exist.

In conclusion, we can only say that we think the billions of tax dollars that are being expended to prolong the war in Viet-

nam could be much better utilized to further the needs of our own people.

We are indeed grateful that there are still those in Washington who put the National interest ahead of other selfish considerations. Very sincerely,

JAMES H. PAIST.
ELLEN M. PAIST.

SCHENECTADY, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: I should like to have my name added to the list of millions of Americans who applaud your efforts in the Vietnam dilemma. Out of every agonizing crisis in America's history, there have come great men, men of great vision. You, Senator MORSE, are one of the great men to emerge in this crisis. May the good Lord continue to give you the courage to carry on your work.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST R. BLAKE, JR.

MAY 12, 1966.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

SIR: Since you said yesterday that it was hard to be in your position and misunderstood by many, I feel that I owe you a letter of support and appreciation for your courageous stand on Viet Nam.

Thanks for expressing my own views so eloquently; it was thrilling to watch you on T.V.

Congratulations on your passionate plea for peace through the United Nations; I hope and pray that your suggestions will be followed.

I trust that this note of approval will be encouraging to you, sir.

Respectfully,

MARGUERITE PAULEY.

BOYNTON BEACH, FLA.

MAY 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I have been seeing the telecasting of the Senate hearing on the Viet Nam affair or war. I will say, this that I sure agree with you.

And I will only vote for the candidate that is for peace. You know the news programs show some of the fighting in Viet Nam but to see the old women and children routed by the American troops, 6 ft. boy and those little and women crying just makes me sick.

We our supposed to be Christians so let's act like one. We brag about killing 400 or 500 Viet Congs a day with bombing and gun fire these bombs must be killing a lot of women and children. We see them crying on television. I sure don't like it. To me it looks like a giant picking on a baby. For God sake there must be a better way to have peace without killing all the people in Viet Nam.

I agree with you, Mr. MORSE, that they should have had elections in 1952 or 1954 as you say.

So Senator, keep on with your good work.

I am sure for you and I tell everybody that I talk to that I am for you would be surprised how many agree with you. So God bless you, Senator.

EDWARD G. TEAL.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Since I am a resident of the state of Wisconsin I am sorry I shall be unable to support you directly with my vote, but you most certainly have my moral support. The only reason I have now to be proud to be a democrat is that you are a member of the party. Please keep up

your good work. It is most refreshing to hear your comments on the Vietnam war.

Sincerely

NORMAN C. RUSSELL.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

SOMERSET, MASS.,
May 11, 1966.

DEAR SIR: I agree with you that the President should go to the United Nations and ask assistance in this conflict. You are doing a good job, please keep it up.

Sincerely

Mrs. JOHN RUSSELL.

CRYSTAL LAKE, ILL.,
May 10, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I have been encouraged by your position on a number of national and international issues during your tenure in the Senate. Particularly, we now join in supporting you in your stand related to our activities in Vietnam.

We feel that your efforts have contributed enormously to grassroots participation in this discussion. It is our strong conviction that public participation is the key to a just solution of this problem. We find that the subject of Vietnam is no longer forbidden at lunch with associates or during dinner with friends.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

CHESTER and BETTY KEENEY.

WHEATON, ILL.,
May 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to tell you, as I have Senator FULBRIGHT, how grateful

I am, as an American citizen, to have the unprecedented privilege of participating in the Senate Foreign Relations hearings at this crucial time in our history.

I am writing you particularly, because I feel you have done such an outstanding service to the American people in fighting so hard and so intelligently to keep us from going over the brink.

Yesterday, on May 11, in your exchange with Secretary McNamara, there was a moment when it could be felt, by the viewers that you and he were stripped of all pretense and protocol, and he honestly had no defense against your passionate and lucid honesty and logic.

What really takes courage and patriotism is to think and study and agonize over our infinitely complex problems, and then have the intestinal fortitude to stand up against the establishment and fight for reason and light. God bless you.

Sincerely,

REVELLE DUX.

BUFFALO, N.Y.,
May 11, 1966.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you in appreciation of your work on the Foreign Investigation Committee. I can't tell you how much I agree with yours and Senator FULBRIGHT's views on this matter. In fact, if either of you gentlemen were to run for President I should work endlessly for your victory.

I believe that either you or Senator FULBRIGHT would have if you were the President today found a solution to this war. I don't believe that either of you would have gotten us into such a state of affairs. Judging by your convictions you are both solid American citizens who love America and the American people. With this sincere love you could never lead us into a dangerous situation.

So I shall pray that both you tremendous men can bring peace to our country. I have a son in the Army who I fear will never return to me if soon this war does not end. I have always worked, my husband and I

May 16, 1966

10196

always paid our taxes. We were honored to pay them because we're proud to be Americans.

I would even give my sons and my own life if anyone threatened our country. Yet I feel that for this war is my son's life necessary. Please end this war even if the people who want it and seem to benefit from it should be impeached. I admire you and Senator FULBRIGHT. So with God's speed shall your mission be successful.

Always,

Mrs. ANNA AQUALINA.

HOLLYWOOD, FLA.,

May 11, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I thank you, even though I do not live in your State, for your magnificent stand against the war in Vietnam, and the policy of this administration in that area. I have listened to most of the broadcasts of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings. I have found that your brilliant and courageous exposition of the issues at stake there represent my own views and feelings almost exactly. I am aghast at the danger of our present course, and have welcomed your repeated reference to legal concepts, which are so lacking in the justifications put forward by the members of this administration. Thank you once again.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPHINE BARCLAY.

ORANGE, TEX.,

May 11, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE,
Member of Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I thoroughly endorse your views on the Vietnam war. Stop this war, as you say. We are not doing any good, only killing great numbers of our innocent young boys and men.

I have listened to all of the public TV Foreign Relations discussions and I appreciate them very much. The public is entitled to know what is going on. We pay taxes to help kill our boys. Why?

Senator, please keep expressing your candid views and know that a great many, I would say the great majority of people, endorse your views.

It seems to me the majority of these people we have tried to help detest us, as they are displaying every day, so what is the motive of our leaders to keep it going?

I am wondering how many of those Senators share your views as they do not express their views as candidly you do although I can see there are doubts in their minds as to the validity of our course in Vietnam.

I hope I am not out of place in expressing my views to you, as, of course, I am only a citizen and not cognizant of all the facts. I am so interested in your meetings that I just can't keep from expressing my views.

Thank you Senators for allowing us to see and listen to your discussions.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BIRDIE BALL.

UTICA, N.Y.,

May 11, 1966.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have been thoughtful listeners to the Senate hearings on television. Thank you for the energy and commitment that you have put into these investigations.

Today when you spoke out so explicitly I felt compelled to write to you. You have put your finger on our dilemma. When we as a nation proclaim that war is immoral, inhuman, contrary to our conviction on the dignity and worth of all men, then and only then will the world believe in the alternatives that will evolve in such a climate. Many people will need to change their thinking but

it can happen because we are human beings with a human relationship to all people on this planet and it must happen if we are to survive.

Twenty-five years ago I lifted my hand in proud farewell to a husband off to war. Now it may soon be necessary for our sons to go. It will not be a proud occasion. My thinking has changed. This has in no way changed my loyalty or love of my country. Our sons were taught to respect the right of all, to turn the other cheek when necessary. They know there are better ways of resolving conflict because they have practiced them.

We as a nation can find better ways. The world will believe us when we erase our war-like image. True humility and agony for all is something not expressed in words but in actions. But first we must be and believe. Thank God that you and Senator FULBRIGHT are in Washington right now.

Sincerely yours,

WINFRED S. ROBERTS
Mrs. Wilbert T. Roberts.

MAY 7, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Eugene, Oreg.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your active participation in the Foreign Relations Committee hearings is a real delight to me. We need more men like you to speak up and express their views. Too many Government officials worry too much about their own political and social gains and too few have the interest of the people at heart.

The hearings that are televised for the public are a wonderful example of America's right for freedom of speech and freedom to question our policies.

Keep up the good work; the people want the truth, and they want action.

Sincerely,

GREELEY, COLO.

DARLENE SALL.

DALLAS, TEX.,

May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God we have a Senator MORSE in this beloved country of ours. "Stick to your guns," Senator MORSE. If we fail to have good, sensible, level headed men like you speaking up (I've got to knowing you through the Foreign Relations Committee hearings). I think we will be in grave danger. I know it's a lonely position. I feel almost as lonely here in this largely conservative town (though there are thousands of good people here who are prone toward creative, broad thinking).

My sincere thanks to you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. OPAL LOVING CHRISTOPLE.

PENDLETON, IND., May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I am in accordance with your every comment on the situation we are in, and I honor you for every thing I heard you say on TV.

I have a son who served 51 months in World War II, now his 19 year old son, (our only grandson) leaves May 18 for Training. I thank God my son came home safely and my prayers are for our precious grandson. Our older son had four severe heart attacks last summer, Doctor has not dismissed him as yet, I thank God his life has been spared.

I pray they will call our boys back before things get worse.

If France and Russia, and smaller countries will not help us, why are we sacrificing our boys.

I wish everyone would write you a letter, telling what they think of it all.

Thanking you again for all you have said, I remain your sincere friend.

Mrs. CHARLES E. COOPER.

KIRKWOOD, Mo., May 13, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to express my appreciation of the work the Foreign Policy Committee is doing in behalf of enlightening public opinion regarding the war in Asia.

You and the chairman of this committee stand 10 feet tall morally and judgmentwise in this insane venture in Vietnam.

Sincerely,

DAISY D. WINGFIELD.

ROCKPORT, MASS.,

May 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: Please accept my heartiest congratulations on the way you have called the bluff on the administration's policies in South Vietnam during the recent Senate hearings. Your exposure of the bankruptcy of American foreign policy is a true service to your country.

As a recently elected Democrat (planning board) in a Republican town I feel I am one of a growing number of disillusioned Democrats.

Again sir, my congratulations, and please keep at it.

Sincerely,

ROGER MARTIN.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,

May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Today I heard you speak, while Senator McNamara was being interviewed. May I tell you that you spoke so well. If only the powers to be would listen. You are so right. We must end this war. And we must, as you suggest take this to the U.N. demand a vote on this.

Just as you worry about our becoming involved in a larger war, so do many of us Americans. Please Mr. Morse keep up your good work. We, the people of this large country are grateful to you. And I firmly believe history will prove you right. I wish with all my heart we could wake up tomorrow morning, and learn that the Vietnam war was over. It must somehow be stopped, we are losing too many men, and if they persist it, we will lose many more.

Please do all in your power to convince our government that this is; the wrong war at the wrong time. I believe most of America hopes we never never fight a war again.

Gratefully,

Mrs. HALLWARD.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,

May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: God bless you, sir. I know that millions of mothers support your brilliant and courageous crusade for peace.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH GIBSON.

KIRKWOOD, Mo.,

May 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You and Senators FULBRIGHT and GORE are to be commended on your stand with regard to our position in southeast Asia. The philosophies which you upheld in yesterday's televised session of the Senate caucus indicate a concern for present actions both with regard to the historical context of U.S. policy and purpose and to the light in which the future will view the present decisions.

May 16, 1966

10197

Your suggestion for the use of intervention by the United Nations offers a constructive and logical mode of action toward resolution of the Vietnam conflict. I hope it will be acted upon.

Sincerely,

MISS MARY P. McCUE.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am at this moment listening to the televised account of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I am in complete accord with what you and Senator FULBRIGHT are trying to do. I believe you are realistic men attempting to do a very difficult job.

Frankly, everyone (almost without exception) that I talk to about the war in Vietnam is against it.

Your idea of going before the United Nations—particularly, the Security Council—sound logical, sensible and certainly worth a try.

Remember many, many people are behind you. Don't lose heart.

Yours truly,

LOIS M. GARDNER.

P.S.—I am a housewife, middle-aged, mother of three.

FENTON, MO.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: Have just finished watching your interview with McNamara. I want you to know there are thousands of people backing you. If there's anything the people can do to help, besides write letters, be sure and let us know.

We have sons, one in service. We've had friends that lost sons in Vietnam. It is all so useless for these young men to give their lives for what? It seems like there are people that think money can pay for these young lives. But they don't seem to have sons over there.

Keep the good work up. And I'm sure that most of use will have to be Republicans next election.

Mr. and Mrs. ROBERT C. McDOWELL.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We always delight in hearing your views on Vietnam. You somehow reestablish reason as a possible tool in ending this tragic war. We are sick of outright lies and admire your gumption for speaking out against them.

Yours for Peace,

CAROL DE'AK and WILLIAM DE'AK.

ST. JOSEPH, MO., May 12, 1966.

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

DEAR SIR: Since I am an admirer of you and your policies on our situation in Vietnam I think I can write you and get an honest answer. First, what law of our land gives authority to our Armed Forces to take one's son, who is a draftee, and send him to a combat zone which is an undeclared war in a foreign country?

He is my only son, and I think Vietnam is a civil war we have no business sticking our nose in.

Because someone made a promise there, some time ago is no sign they could not remember the Biblical saying "A wise man changes his mind, but a fool never does."

It seems our country is going more to a dictatorship, ruled by a very few and Congress has not much say, at least that is the way it looks now, or is the challenge too great—and politics gets in the eyes of too many of our chosen senators and representatives?

Sir, I'm writing you, because I believe you will give me a true answer to my questions which I doubt I could receive from my own representative.

Sincerely,

H. C. RUHNKE.

MASSACHUSETTS.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Stay with it. There are more Americans secretly behind you than one can count. They do not quite dare say so. What you say about "tyranny" and the "slaughter of our American boys" hits truth and maybe hurts in some spots!

Mrs. LUKE LEONARD.

GHEENT, N.Y., May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,

DEAR SIR: As a long time Democrat I take my hat off to you and want you to know I appreciate your voice in this wilderness of deceit, lies, and confusion of today.

You spoke clearly, sincerely, and overwhelmingly with truth and I am sorry everyone in the country could not hear you. Do not be discouraged as I am one of the little people and so hear what little people think and feel and they are with you.

To one who carries the Holy Grail of Peace my best wishes for your health and success.

Sincerely,

Mrs. DOROTHEA CONNACHER.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, 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. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HISTORY WARNS THAT PROSPERITY PRECEDES A STORM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the March 27 issue of the Cedar Rapids Gazette appears an article by the distinguished economist, J. A. Livingston, entitled "History Warns That Prosperity Precedes a Storm."

In view of the events which have occurred in the stock market subsequent to the publication of this article, which points up the accuracy of the statements which were made, I ask unanimous consent that the article be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE GREAT SOCIETY AND THE STOCK MARKET—
HISTORY WARNS THAT PROSPERITY PRECEDES
A STORM

(By J. A. Livingston)

Surely, it is no accident that literature, history, and philosophy are laden with warnings against prosperity.

"Everything in the world may be endured," said Goethe, "except a succession of prosperous days." A proverb says, "Prosperity lets go the bridle." Tacitus asserted, "We are corrupted by prosperity," and Washington Irving counseled that in a "time of unexampled prosperity" businessmen should "prepare for the impending storm."

"Prosperity sows the seeds of its own destruction" has become a cliché. Why? Because prosperity fashions its own pathology: The prospects of ever-rising profits develop a Frankenstein dynamism toward over-expansion.

President Johnson is aware of the danger.

In January 1965, he said in his economic message to Congress: "A time of prosperity with no recession in sight is the time to plan our defenses against future dips in business activity."

But he is caught up in his own propulsive commitments. The Vietnam war keeps enlarging. The Great Society program expands. The President competes for men, materials, machinery, and credit with the City of New York, the State of California, and such corporate giants as Ford, United States Steel, General Electric, in a congested marketplace. Result: Upward pressure on prices.

NOT EMBARRASSED

This doesn't embarrass the President. He is committed to full employment—to unemployment of 3.5 percent or less. The poor and underprivileged must find work. But job opportunities will open only if manufacturing and service industries need workers. Then, industry will be willing to provide on-the-job training.

So this is the Washington trade-off, the calculated risk: A little price inflation in exchange for big, broad social gains—for full employment.

In the algebra of nice, round assumptions, in inflation markup of \$18-to-\$23 billion on total output of \$710 billion is a small price for social progress.

True, people who have savings accounts will have less real purchasing power stored away. True, also, persons who live on pensions or other fixed incomes will be somewhat less well off. However, if those who have little are lifted far, far up, while those who have enough lose only a little, the swap is justified. It's for the greatest good of the greatest number. But . . .

Anticipation—the velocity of the marketplace—is the algebraic unknown. Will the 2 percent-to-3 percent-a-year creep change into a gallop?

The labor leader who expects prices to rise, wants protection against increased living costs. That's why George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, rejects the President's 3.2 percent guideline. He doesn't want workers shortchanged in advance.

EVERYONE JOINS

The businessman wants to increase prices so as to obtain adequate profit margins after paying higher wages and higher prices for raw materials. Everyone joins in the game of buying ahead to beat the price rise and/or possible shortages.

A plant bought today will be worth more tomorrow. Ditto a housing project or shopping center. Real estate developers pick up land—by option or down payment. Business men add to inventories. Corporate and other borrowers make loans ahead, fearing congestion in the money market. Fear of inflation lurks in every commitment, contract and purchase. It even pokes into the shopper's cart in the super market.

Price indexes do not measure the inflation fully. Firms drop discounts, discontinue services, scant quality or treat as extras what has been standard. Deliveries are often delayed, which adds to costs. Companies have to increase inventories against slower replacement of stock.

Investors prefer stocks—capital gains—to fixed income from bonds, in spite of the current large discrepancy in yields—3 percent against 5 percent.

Why not? The economy has been expanding at a 4 percent to 5 percent annual rate. A bumper crop of young men and women will be going to the altar this year, next and the year after—the legacy of the baby boom, just before and after the war. This will bolster demands of all kinds—for homes, for furniture, for pots, pans and appliances. Dynamic: He who buys something today will be richer tomorrow. In a seller's market, ownership is the first rule of profit.

May 16, 1966

The President has intervened in the marketplace to stay the process. He has rolled back prices of aluminum, copper, steel and cigarettes. But, he hasn't stopped dozens of other prices from advancing—chemicals, plastics, TV tubes, gasoline, newsprint, copper tubing, aluminum light-poles, rubber tires.

HITS SYMPTOMS

The President is tilting with symptoms. The cause is overconsumption. The economy lacks room at the top. Though production rises, demand is rising even faster.

The father of the New Economics, John Maynard Keynes, dissected the process in his "General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money". Even before full employment is reached, he wrote, "money wages have to rise in response to an increasing effective demand" but the rise in wages will not be "fully in proportion to the rise in the price level." This is true today, despite cost-of-living clauses in wage contracts.

Keynes went on to describe the state we, in the United States, may be entering: "When a further increase in the quantity of effective demand produces no further increase in output . . . we have reached a condition which might be appropriately designated as one of true inflation."

In World War II, congress moderated inflation with wage-price-and-profits controls. But that was an all-out war. This is only a 2 percent war. And controls would require a no-strike pledge. Labor is unlikely to give up its chief bargaining weapon—the right to strike—for Vietnam. It didn't during Korea.

So the President has these rather-not alternatives: To cut government spending or to ask congress to increase taxes.

In either case, demand would be lowered. Fewer jobs would be created. And economic expectations would slip into a lower trajectory. The up-spiral would become a down-spiral. Negotiations for property would be halted, corporate blueprints for expansion shelved, inventory policies shifted downward.

CHANGE INEVITABLE

Sooner or later, such change is inevitable. The Vietnam war isn't endless. The escalation in requirements—for men and materials—will slow down. And peace, itself, will eventually come.

A wise professor, I. L. Sharfman, of Michigan, where Gardner Ackley got his PhD in economics, told me again and again: "In times of prosperity, it is the function of the business analyst to point out the danger of excesses. And in times of depression, it is his responsibility to point out the bright spots. Thus he can temper over-exuberance at the top and despair at the bottom."

The United States today is in the boom phase—the capital-goods phase—of prosperity. President Johnson and Ackley hope that higher Social Security and other taxes will slow up demand and "tame down" expectations.

The President doesn't want to apply the brakes and chance a recession. This is understandable—particularly in an election year.

The President and his advisers hope to "slight" Great Society projects into the Vietnam gap. The backlog of social under-maintenance is unlimited—potholed and cramped streets and highways; crowded airports, polluted rivers and streams; contaminated air; shortage of educational facilities; slums; inadequate water supplies; congested hospitals; too much crime and too little police protection.

Ideally, prosperity would flatten out and forward into a plateau. But this happy hope is not promised by history, as noted in the second article.

Even if post-Vietnam projects are prepared in advance, revival won't be instant. It takes time for public expenditures to course through the economy, revive anticipatory

purchases of inventories and reinstate postponed corporate expenditures on plant and equipment. Capital-goods booms evaporate fast and reconstitute slowly.

Nor will Federal Reserve Board action be immediately useful. Easy credit and lower interest rates are only an invitation to borrow. The incentive comes from the prospect of profit.

URGENT TO PLAN

Further, the nation's balance of payments deficit does not allow full freedom of choice. If interest rates come down too fast, gold might flow out of the country. Indeed, a recession might cause loss of confidence in the dollar. So it is all the more urgent to "plan our defenses against future dips in business activity."

And fiscal activism will be possible then. The President undoubtedly will urge, and congress undoubtedly will pass, a bill reducing taxes. This will lift the purchasing power of consumers, elevate the profit potential of corporations and renew confidence in common stocks as long-term investments.

We—all of us—need to layer prosperity at the top—to peel off projects not immediately necessary—whether plans to build steel or chemical plants, shopping centers, apartment houses, public works, or to buy homes. What isn't bought today will be deferred demand for tomorrow.

The decline so far in the stock market has been salubrious. It is a warning: All is not up, up and up.

The drop in the bond market, similarly, is salubrious. It has forced some states, some local governments and some corporations to review expansion plans.

Mortgage rates have risen. Home-building is falling. This may be salubrious, but it could be a signal . . .

Yet, the view from the top of prosperity is always upward. It takes periscope vision to see a downturn.

The national mood is impatience, not moderation. The President nurses the Great Society. He drives toward full employment and Vietnam drives him on. Corporations, speculators and householders fear higher costs and shortages. So they buy now and order ahead.

Only a letdown in effective demand—to use Keynes' term—will suppress inflation. Prosperity is bruising itself against a ceiling of manpower and capacity. It is bloodied by the war in Vietnam. But it's still very much unbowed.

It is still progressing. It still possesses a propulsive dynamism. And that's its trouble.

And if, by pointing out this, these articles cool off some exuberance and level down expectations, they will have served their purpose. To temper a boom is to diminish the velocity, depth and duration of its aftermath.

THE VIETNAM WAR: A COST ACCOUNTING

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the April issue of Fortune magazine appears a very knowledgeable article entitled, "The Vietnam War: A Cost Accounting."

There is much concern nowadays about the cost of the commitments we have in Vietnam. Various estimates have been made, running in excess of \$15 billion a year.

This article points out that much more is involved than merely adding up items. Commitments against future appropriations must be taken into account, and when that is done the estimated costs run to over \$23 billion a year.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be placed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE VIETNAM WAR: A COST ACCOUNTING

(By William Bowen)

(NOTE.—The cost analysis for this article was carried out by a team consisting of, in addition to Mr. Bowen: Alan Greenspan, president of Townsend-Greenspan & Co., consultants; P. Bernard Nortman, independent economic consultant; Sanford S. Parker, chief of Fortune's economic staff; and research associate Karin Cocuzzi.)

The Vietnam war is peculiarly expensive, far more so than is generally thought. Costs are running above \$13 billion a year, and are headed up. Fortune's figures suggest that we're in for bigger defense budgets—and new economic strains.

What happens in the U.S. economy over the next year or two, what happens to demand and production and prices and taxes, will to a large extent depend upon the cost of the Vietnam war. If anyone inside the Pentagon knows the current cost, he is not telling, nor, of course, is anyone there telling about costs associated with future operations. Accordingly, Fortune has undertaken on its own to figure out the cost—present and prospective—of the Vietnam war. It is already costing a lot more than almost anybody outside the Pentagon imagines.

At present, with about 235,000 U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam, the U.S. costs are running at a yearly rate of more than \$13 billion. Costs, it should be observed at once, cannot be translated mechanically into expenditures; a drawdown on inventories involves a cost, but may not involve an expenditure for quite some time. Still, if the war continues at only the present rate through fiscal 1967 (the year beginning next July 1), the resulting Defense Department expenditures will probably exceed the \$10 billion or so that the hefty 1967 defense budget officially allows for the Vietnam war.

But the war, it appears, will get bigger. U.S. Senators who know what Defense Department witnesses say in closed congressional hearings have predicted a U.S. buildup to 400,000 men, or more. General William C. Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam, has reportedly requested a buildup to 400,000 by the end of December. With that many U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam, the cost of the war would run to \$21 billion a year—even more if bombing and tactical air support increased in proportion to the buildup on the ground. At any such level the Vietnam war would bring on economic strains beyond what most economists appear to foresee, and beyond what makers of public policy appear to be anticipating. The strains would surely add to the pressure for higher taxes.

In its Vietnam cost accounting, Fortune had considerable help from outside economists, but no access to classified data. The basic sources were public documents—federal budgets, Defense Department publications, transcripts of congressional hearings. Defense Department officials interviewed were persistently wary of discussing the costs of the war, although the department proved willing to provide some missing bits of factual information that would otherwise have been unobtainable. It turned out that some costs—of ammunition, for example—could be easily calculated from published Defense Department figures. But getting at some other costs required elaborate calculations, and still others could only be estimated. Estimates and assumptions were in all cases conservative. The results, set forth by category below, represent what is probably the first serious effort outside the Defense Department to analyze the costs of the war.

The purpose of the undertaking was not to make a case against (or for) the fiscal 1967 defense budget, but to provide a basis for looking beyond the budget and assessing the potential economic effects of the war.

May 16, 1966

In wartime no defense budget can sensibly be viewed as a hard forecast of defense spending. Actual expenditures during the fiscal year will be determined by unfolding events that no budgeter can foresee months in advance. So far as the economy is concerned, then, what counts is not budget projections but Defense Department orders and expenditures.

The costs and expenditures resulting from a war do not match up in the short run. They rise and decline in different trajectories. In the early phases of any war, the Defense Department can hold down expenditures by drawing upon existing forces and supplies, just as a business firm can temporarily reduce cash outlays by letting inventories dwindle, or a family can cut next month's grocery bill by eating up the contents of the pantry. Later on in the war, expenditures catch up with costs. It must be kept in mind that "expenditures," as used here means *incremental* expenditures—those that would not be required if it were not for the war.

An idea of the movements of costs and expenditures and defense orders, and their changing economic effects, can be gathered from the following budgetary-economic scenario of a medium-sized war—i.e., a war not very different from the one in Vietnam.

A WAR IN FIVE ACTS

Act I: It looks like a small war, and it requires only smallish incremental expenditures. The forces sent overseas are members of the existing defense establishment, and the Defense Department would have had to pay, feed, and otherwise provide for them if they were doing peacetime duties in Georgia instead of fighting guerrillas in a tropical republic. The weapons, ammunition, and equipment come from existing stocks. The extra expenses (hostile-fire pay, transportation) can be temporarily absorbed in the immensity of the defense budget, and the Administration does not have to ask Congress for supplemental appropriations to finance the war. It is being financed, in effect, through "reduced readiness"—that is, the U.S. has fewer trained men and smaller stocks of war materiel to deploy or use in any other contingencies.

Act II: The struggle has expanded, and the armed forces need extra inflows of men and materiel to compensate for the unexpectedly large outflows to the war zone. The Pentagon places contracts for additional arms, ammunition, equipment; it expands draft calls and recruitment efforts. The Administration asks Congress for supplemental appropriations. War expenditures are still only moderate, but with defense orders increasing and inflationary expectations beginning to stir, the war is already having noticeable effects upon the economy.

Act III: The U.S. buildup in the war zone has continued. The Administration has asked Congress for large supplemental appropriations. Spending still lags behind costs, but it is rising fast—the recruits in training have to be paid, and so do the additional civilians hired. The war's economic effects, moreover, are expansionary out of all proportion to the actual increases in defense spending: the surge in defense orders has increased demand for skilled workers, materials, components, and credit in advance of deliveries and payments. To some extent, the Defense Department's materiel buildup is being temporarily financed by the funds that contractors and subcontractors borrow from banks against future payments from the U.S. Treasury.

Act IV: The U.S. military buildup in the war zone tops out. Defense production continues to rise, but the rate of rise is much less rapid than in Act III, and the expansionary economic force exerted by the war

begins to wane. Deliveries of arms, ammunition, and equipment rolling into military depots more than match the chew-up of materiel in the war, and so some replenishment of inventories takes place. Men are moving out of training and into operating units faster than forces are being sent overseas, and so there is a net buildup of trained deployable military forces in the U.S. Expenditures catch up with costs.

Act V. The war ends. The drop-off in contract awards and the collapse of inflationary expectations reverberate throughout the economy. Far from falling steeply, expenditures continue to rise a bit before entering into a gradual decline: the incoming deliveries must be paid for, and the men brought into the armed forces must be provided for until they are mustered out. With deliveries no longer partly offset by wartime chew-up, inventories fill rapidly, and begin to overflow. During the period of readjustment, military manpower and military inventories exceed normal peacetime requirements. Expenditures for this excess readiness largely make up for the expenditures deferred through reduced readiness in the early phases of the war.

In January, 1965, the Vietnam war was still in Act I, and to all appearances nobody in the Administration expected an Act II. The President's budget message declared that, with the "gains already scheduled," U.S. military forces would "be adequate to their tasks for years to come." The new budget projected a *decrease* in defense spending in fiscal 1966, and a *decline* in total uniformed personnel. Major General D. L. Crow, then controller of the Air Force, subsequently testified at a congressional hearing that "the guidelines for the preparation of the budget as they pertain to Vietnam were actually a carry-forward of the guidelines that were used in the preparation of the 1965 budget, and they did not anticipate increased activity, per se, in Vietnam."

IT'S NOW ACT III

Not until last May was it entirely evident that Act II had begun, but there were intimations earlier. In January, 1965, after declining for four consecutive quarters, the Federal Reserve Board index of "defense equipment" production turned upward, beginning the precipitous climb depicted at the bottom of the page opposite. In February the U.S. began bombing targets in North Vietnam. In March the decline in Army uniformed personnel came to a halt, though the downtrend continued for a while in the other services. In April the U.S. buildup in Vietnam accelerated. In May the Administration asked for, and Congress quickly voted, a supplemental fiscal 1965 appropriation of \$700 million. In June the decline in total uniformed military personnel turned into a steep rise.

The Vietnam war is now well along in Act III of the budgetary-economic scenario. Since that \$700-million request in May, 1965, the Administration has asked for \$14 billion in supplemental war appropriations. Soaring orders for ammunition and uniforms have contributed to shortages of copper and textiles for civilian use. So far, however, the costs of the war have been largely channeled into reduced readiness. The war reserve of "combat consumables" has been drawn down. New equipment and spare parts that otherwise would have gone to units elsewhere have been diverted to Vietnam—Iroquois helicopters, for example, that would have gone to the Seventh Army in Germany. Fixed-wing aircraft to replace losses in Vietnam have been ordered, but not yet fully delivered and paid for. The war has required only moderate incremental expenditures (that must be understood, however, to mean "moderate" as war expendi-

tures go—a few billion dollars). But as deliveries roll in and the armed forces expand, expenditures will begin to catch up with the war's far from moderate costs.

In numbers of U.S. servicemen deployed, the Vietnam war is not as big as the Korean war at its peak. But costs per man run much higher than they did in the Korean war. The pay that servicemen get has gone up more than 40 percent since then. Some materiel costs have risen very steeply since Korea. The F-86D fighters in Korea cost about \$340,000 each; the F-4C's in South Vietnam cost nearly six times as much. Ammunition use per combat soldier is very much higher than in the Korean war. The M-14 rifle fires up to 150 rounds per minute, and ten rounds per minute at a sustained rate. The M-16, carried by some Special Forces troops, can use up ammunition at a full-automatic rate of 750 rounds per minute. The M-79 grenade launcher fires grenades as if they were bullets.

The nature of the war contributes to making it peculiarly expensive for its size. Technologically sophisticated military forces, magnificently equipped to kill and destroy, are inefficiently employed against meager or elusive targets. In Korea, there were visible masses of enemy forces to shoot at, and the U.S. superiority in weapons could be exerted efficiently; in Vietnam the enemy hits and runs, moves under cover of darkness or foliage. With their abundant firepower, the superb U.S. fighting men in South Vietnam clobber the Vietcong in shooting encounters, but the U.S. forces run up huge costs—in troop supplies, fuel, helicopter maintenance—just trying to find some guerrillas that they can shoot at.

FIRING INTO A CONTINENT

There is an almost profligate disparity between the huge quantities of U.S. bullets and bombs poured from the air upon targets in Vietnam and the military and economic damage the bullets and bombs do, in the aggregate. In North Vietnam the U.S. has debarred itself from attacking economically valuable targets such as port facilities and manufacturing plants. From bases in Thailand, F-105's fly over North Vietnam and drop their mighty payloads on or near roads, rail lines, ferry facilities, bridges. The costs to the enemy of repairing the damage are picaresque compared to the costs to the U.S. of doing the damage. In South Vietnam the guerrillas seldom present concentrated targets. Machine guns mounted on helicopters and on A-47's (elderly C-47's, modified and fitted with three guns) fire streams of bullets into expanses of jungle and brush that are believed to conceal Vietcong guerrillas. The thought of an A-47 firing up to 18,000 rounds per minute into treetops brings to mind that bizarre image in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, of the French warship off the African coast: "There wasn't even a shed there, and she was shelling the bush . . . firing into a continent."

B-52's, operating at a cost of more than \$1,300 per hour per plane, fly a ten-hour round trip from Guam to South Vietnam to strike at an enemy that has no large installations or encampments visible from the air. The B-52's have been fitted with extra racks that increase their payloads to more than sixty 750-pound bombs, about \$30,000 worth of bombs per plane. "The bomb tonnage that is resulting is literally unbelievable," said Secretary McNamara at a Senate hearing last January. Several weeks later, at a press conference, he said: "Our consumption in February . . . of air-delivered munitions alone in South Vietnam was two and a half times the average monthly rate in the three years of the Korean war." But much of that "literally unbelievable" bomb tonnage

May 16, 1966

merely smashes trees and blasts craters in the earth.

Only a rich nation can afford to wage war at ratios so very adverse. But the U.S. is a rich nation. If there is a great disparity between the bomb power dropped and the economic value of the targets, there is also a great disparity between the wealth and power of the U.S. and of the enemy. The cost of the bombs is small in relation to the G.N.P. of the U.S., and the damage they do is sometimes substantial in relation to the G.N.P. of North Vietnam, or to the resources available to the Vietcong. But the costs of winning are going to be unpleasantly large.

The official position of the Defense Department is that it does not know what the costs of the war are, and that it does not even try to compute them. As a Pentagon official put it: "We have no intention of cost-accounting the war in Vietnam. Our business is to support the conflict there. Our business is not cost accounting. We have no estimates of costs. It's not practical to say the war has cost x dollars to date."

The Defense Department argues that the war costs are commingled with those of a military establishment that existed before the U.S. troop buildup in South Vietnam began. And that, of course, is true. Still, a meaningful total can be arrived at by analyzing and adding up the various war costs, regardless of whether they translate immediately into added expenditures. One way or another, we may assume, all costs will result in either added expenditures or reduced readiness, and in the reckoning of the costs it does not matter which, or when, or how.

Fortune's first objective was to arrive at an approximation of annual costs at the early-1966 level of 200,000 U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam. The results of that analysis can serve, in turn, as a basis for calculating costs at higher levels of buildup. In what follows, costs are divided into standard categories—military personnel, operation and maintenance, and procurement—that the Defense Department uses in its budgeting. To outsiders, the department's assignment of expenses to these categories sometimes seems at bit arbitrary. Some clothing is funded under personnel and some under operation and maintenance; ordinary repair parts are funded under O. and M., aircraft "spares" under procurement.

INSIDE AND OUTSIDE THE THEATRE

Military personnel. As noted, the fiscal 1966 defense budget, submitted in January, 1965, projected a moderate decline in total uniformed military personnel ("active forces"), from about 2,663,000 at that time to 2,640,000 as of June 30, 1966. Actually, the decline proceeded so briskly that the total got down to 2,641,000 in May, 1965. Since then the Defense Department has announced plans to increase military personnel to 2,987,000 by next June 30, and to add on another 106,000 by June 30, 1967; by the latter date, the total would be 452,000 above the May, 1965, low point. In addition the department is expanding the civilian payroll by about 100,000 during fiscal 1966, and many of these civilians will take over work previously done by servicemen, freeing them for other duties.

It might appear that these figures could serve as a basis for calculating the personnel costs attributable to the Vietnam war. But it is impossible, without knowing the Defense Department's classified plans and assumptions, to relate the announced personnel increases to any particular force level in South Vietnam. And to have any meaning, statements about the cost of the Vietnam war must be related to specified force levels. Here we are trying to get the cost of the war at a particular level—200,000 U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam. For this reckoning, the war personnel costs may be taken as the combined personnel costs of

(1) the 200,000 men in Vietnam, (2) the peripheral supporting forces in Southeast Asia, and (3) the required backup forces. The Defense Department defines personnel costs as pay and allowances, subsistence (chow), personal clothing (the "clothing bag" issued to each recruit), plus certain other expenses. Average personnel costs in the armed forces run to \$5,100 per man per year, but the men in South Vietnam get "hostile-fire pay" of \$65 a month, and other war costs boost the average to about \$6,200. So, 200,000 men at \$6,200, or \$1,240,000,000.

The peripheral supporting forces—mainly aboard Seventh Fleet ships and at bases in Thailand—numbered at least 50,000 last winter, when the U.S. force level in South Vietnam reached 200,000. That's 50,000 men at \$6,200 a year, or \$310 million.

Each thousand U.S. servicemen stationed overseas under non-war conditions have on the average about 600 other servicemen backing them up: trainees, transients, men serving in supply units or performing various auxiliary functions. But it takes far more than 600 men to back up a thousand men deployed in South Vietnam. Additional supply men are required to keep the huge quantities of arms, ammunition, equipment, and supplies moving into the theatre of war. The men serving there are rotated home after a one-year tour (a three-year tour is normal for U.S. forces in Western Europe), and additional trainees are needed to support the rotation. Extra backup men are needed, also, to make up for the erosion resulting from deaths, severe injuries, and tropical ailments. In the course of a month, large numbers of men spend some days or weeks in transit to or from South Vietnam. And additional men in training require additional men to train them. With all the additions, it works out that there is a ratio of one to one, or 1,000 to 1,000, between servicemen in the theatre of war and servicemen outside the theatre but assignable to the war as elements of cost.

For the 250,000 men in Vietnam and vicinity, then, there will be 250,000 others elsewhere. Since some of these are new recruits, the average personnel cost is taken to be only \$4,700. That makes another \$1,175,000,000, bringing total personnel costs to \$2,275,000,000.

KEEPING THEM FLYING

Operation and maintenance. This category is even more capacious than its name suggests. It includes everything that does not fall into other categories—recruitment, training, medical care, repairs, operation of supply depots, transport of goods, and, in the official expression, "care of the dead." A great many of those additional civilians hired by the Defense Department in the last several months are working in O. and M.

In fiscal 1965, O. and M. for the entire armed forces averaged out to \$4,630 per man. For 500,000 men that would come to \$2,315,000,000. But the Vietnam war entails extraordinary O. and M. expenses. Planes there fly a lot more hours per month than they normally do, and the extra O. and M. involved in keeping them flying runs at a rate of more than \$200 million a year. Extra repair and maintenance are required to keep vehicles moving and equipment working. An enormous logistic flow must be coped with—more than 700,000 tons a month. The shipping costs to Vietnam amount to \$225 million at a yearly rate. Combat clothing gets ripped up in the bush, deteriorates rapidly in the moist tropical heat. And, of course, extra medical care per man is needed in a tropical war. When all the extra O. and M. costs involved are added together, the total, by a conservative reckoning, comes to \$1 billion. That brings the over-all O. and M. costs \$3,315,000,000.

Procurement, i.e., matériel costs. As reckoned here, these are taken to be the chew-up in the war zone rather than the additional

procurement resulting from the war. Ammunition and aircraft losses together account for more than 75 percent of matériel costs, and for both categories the costs can be calculated with some statistical precision.

McNamara reported last January that U.S. ground forces in South Vietnam, including Army and Marine helicopter units, were "consuming ammunition at the rate of about \$100 million per month," and that U.S. air forces were using up "air munitions" (mostly bombs) at a rate of about \$110 million per month. That works out to a combined rate of \$2.5 billion a year. At that time there were about 190,000 U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam, so for the calculation of costs at the 200,000-man level, the figure has to be adjusted upward a bit, to \$2,650,000,000.

In testifying at congressional hearings, McNamara and other Defense Department witnesses furnished numerous bits of information about U.S. aircraft operations in the Vietnam war, including losses in 1965 and numbers of sorties over various periods (one flight by one plane counts as one sortie). Sorties per month increased dramatically during 1965, and despite low loss rates per 1,000 sorties, losses added up to large numbers over the course of the year: 275 fixed-wing aircraft lost as a result of "hostile action" alone, and 177 helicopters lost, 76 as a result of "hostile action," 101 in accidental crashes and other mishaps. Assuming continuation of 1965 ratios between sorties and losses, estimated annual attrition at a 200,000-man force level works out, in rounded figures, like this:

475 fixed-wing tactical planes	
@ \$1,800,000-----	\$855,000,000
165 other fixed-wing planes	
(transport, observation)	
@ \$200,000-----	33,000,000
320 helicopters @ \$250,000-----	80,000,000
	<hr/> \$968,000,000

A figure for aircraft spares was arrived at by first calculating total flying costs of the aircraft operations (information on average flying costs per hour for various types of military aircraft is available). That came to \$800 million a year. Spares represent, on average, 20 percent of flying costs, which comes to \$160 million. With the addition of a minimal \$25 million to allow for spares required to repair planes hit by enemy fire, the total for aircraft spares comes to \$185 million.

Little information is available about matériel chew-up, apart from ammunition and aircraft. In the absence of direct evidence, however, Defense Department procurement orders provide a basis for rough estimates. It is assumed—and this is a bit of a leap—that the annual attrition of weapons, vehicles, and equipment is equivalent to one-third of the increase in procurement orders in those categories (as measured by the increase in prime contract awards from the second half of 1964 to the second half of 1965). From that procedure emerges a round figure of \$600 million for attrition of hard goods other than aircraft, ammunition, and ships (in effect, ship losses are assumed to be zero). That brings total procurement to \$4.4 billion.

The three categories together—military personnel, O. and M., procurement—add up to \$10,440,000,000. That is the approximate annual cost of the U.S. operations in the Vietnam war at the 200,000-man level reached early this year. To that figure must be added support for South Vietnamese military forces. (For fiscal 1967, military assistance to South Vietnam will be included in the defense budget.) Counting supplemental requests, total military aid to South Vietnam comes to more than \$1 billion in the current fiscal year. In the early 1960's military aid to South Vietnam ran to something like \$100

million a year; the \$900-million difference can be considered a Vietnam war cost. In addition, the U.S. pays \$50 million to help support South Korean forces in South Vietnam.

Much of the \$1.4 billion that Congress has appropriated in fiscal 1966 for military construction in Southeast Asia has to be counted as part of the Vietnam war cost. According to Secretary McNamara's testimony at a Senate hearing, all of the contemplated construction "is associated with the operations in South Vietnam." Some of the facilities may have military value to the U.S. after the war is over, but it seems reasonable to suppose that at least \$1 billion of the planned construction would not have been undertaken had it not been for the war. If that is spread over two years, construction adds \$500 million a year to the cost of the war.

That brings the grand total to \$11.9 billion a year. This figure does not allow for an important deferred cost, depreciation of equipment. Since the Defense Department does not pay taxes or operate in terms of profit and loss, the business-accounting concept of depreciation is hard to apply, but the wearing out of equipment is a reality whether it is cost-accounted or not. This wear-out is a separate cost from the additional maintenance and repair required to keep planes and ground equipment operating in the Vietnam war. Tactical planes and Military Airlift Command planes involved in the war are flying 60 percent more hours per month than they normally do in peacetime, and even with extra maintenance their useful lives are being shortened. The consequences will show up in future defense budgets.

In addition, the war imposes substantial nonmilitary costs that are not included in the \$11.9 billion (or in the other war-cost figures that follow). U.S. economic aid to South Vietnam, for example, leaped from \$269 million in fiscal 1965 to \$621 million in the current year.

MORE MEN FOR PATROL, SEARCH, PURSUIT, ATTACK

The \$11.9 billion may be taken as the annual military cost of sustaining the war with 200,000 U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam—the level reached around February 1. Given that yardstick, it is a relatively simple matter to cost out the present level (about 235,000 in South Vietnam). It can be assumed that costs have increased since February in direct proportion to the buildup, except that construction costs and military aid to South Vietnam remain unchanged. So calculated, the current cost works out, at an annual rate, to \$13.7 billion—the "more than \$13 billion" mentioned at the beginning of this article.

Efforts to project costs at very much higher levels of buildup run into some uncertainties. Costs at the 400,000-man level—the level General Westmoreland is reportedly aiming for by the end of this year—would not be double those at 200,000. For one thing, the expansion of U.S. forces will itself tend to alter the character of the war. Indeed, it has already. The widening U.S. superiority in firepower forced the enemy to cut down on direct assaults by battalions and regiments and revert pretty much to guerrilla warfare. As the number of G.I.'s in South Vietnam increases, the forces needed to guard the coastal enclaves will not have to increase proportionately, so a larger percentage of the total combat-battalion strength will be available for patrol, search, pursuit, and attack operations. Some costs, as a result, will increase faster than the number of U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam—e.g., Fortune has assumed a 5 percent increase in the rates of ground and helicopter ammunition use per 100,000 men.

But in some respects costs would not nearly double as we built up to 400,000. The existing construction plans, for example, provide for port facilities, roads and installations beyond current requirements. Costs of supporting South Vietnamese forces would not double either—South Vietnam's military and

paramilitary forces already number about 600,000 men, and an increase of even 50 percent could not be squeezed out of a total population of 16 million. (An increase to 670,000 has been announced, however, and some upgrading of the military equipment and supplies furnished by the U.S. will undoubtedly occur.) Bombing and tactical air support operations would probably not double either: lack of runways would prevent that large an expansion.

In Fortune's calculation it was assumed that the 100 percent increase in U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam, from 200,000 to 400,000, would be accompanied by these less than proportionate increases: 50 percent in bombing and tactical air-support operations; 10 percent a year in construction costs; 15 percent in military aid to South Vietnam.

On these exceedingly conservative assumptions, the costs at 400,000 come to the resounding total of \$21 billion a year.

To calculate Vietnam war costs during fiscal 1967 it is necessary to make some assumptions about the pace of the buildup. Fortune assumed that U.S. forces in South Vietnam would increase to 250,000 men by this June 30, expand steadily to reach 400,000 as of December 31, and then remain at that level. On this basis the prospective Vietnam war costs during fiscal 1967 work out to \$19.3 billion.

USED-UP OPTIONS

The \$58.3 billion defense budget for fiscal 1967 includes, by official reckoning, \$10.3 billion in expenditures resulting from the Vietnam war. With a buildup to 400,000 in fiscal 1967, war expenditures during the year would greatly exceed this figure, but would not necessarily boost total defense spending as much as \$9 billion. For one thing, Secretary McNamara can cut somewhat further than he already has into programs not directly connected with the war.

But not very far; McNamara's options for deferring expenditures in fiscal 1967 have been pretty well used up. The 1967 defense budget shows a total of \$1.5 billion in cutbacks in military construction, strategic-missile procurement, and other non-Vietnam programs. In view of McNamara's economizing in recent years, there cannot be much leeway left for deferrals. The Secretary himself said not long ago that in shaping the 1967 budget he had deferred "whatever can be safely deferred," which suggests that there is no leeway any more.

He has also largely used up the options for restraining expenditures by drawing down inventories and reducing trained forces outside the war theatre. McNamara has vigorously insisted that "we have a great reservoir of resources," and he is undoubtedly right about that, especially if "a great reservoir" is interpreted to include the potential capacity of the U.S. economy to produce military goods. But he has overstated his case by arguing, in effect, that the Vietnam war has not reduced readiness at all ("... far from overextending ourselves, we have actually strengthened our military position"). Counting peripheral supporting forces, the U.S. now has about 300,000 men deployed in the Vietnam war theatre, and (in keeping with this one-to-one ratio) another 300,000 men are committed to beefing them up. That makes 600,000 men unavailable for other contingencies. Since the low point in May, 1965, U.S. military manpower has increased by approximately 400,000 (this figure allows for substitution of civilians for uniformed personnel), and a lot of those 400,000 are men still in training. It would be remarkable indeed if all this had somehow "strengthened our military position."

Nor is there much left to draw down in military inventories. As shown in the middle row of charts on page 121, Defense Department expenditures for procurement declined sharply in fiscal 1965—by \$3.5 billion, in fact. This decline in procurement apparently con-

tributed to the Army shortages (of repair parts, communication equipment, helicopters, and trucks, among other things) discovered early last year by investigators of the U.S. Senate's Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, headed by Mississippi's Senator JOHN STENNIS. Pentagon witnesses tried to explain that the "shortages" were mere routine gaps between reality and ideal tables of equipment. But at one point South Carolina's Senator STROM THURMOND pinned down two Pentagon generals in this exchange:

Senator THURMOND. You have not denied those shortages, have you, General Abrams?

General ABRAMS. No.

Senator THURMOND. And you have not, General.

General CHESAREK. No.

Senator THURMOND. You do admit the shortages?

General CHESAREK. Yes, sir.

The combination of rising Vietnam requirements and thin, declining inventories led last year to surges in military production and orders far beyond what can be inferred from the official estimates of expenditures attributable to the Vietnam war. In the second half of calendar 1965, Defense Department prime contract awards ran \$3.3 billion ahead of the corresponding period of 1964—\$6.6 billion at an annual rate. In contrast, the Defense Department estimates fiscal 1966 expenditures for the Vietnam war at only \$4.6 billion. Anyone trying to catch an intimation of things to come might do well to keep an eye on orders, rather than expenditure estimates. Orders are for real: if you want the stuff delivered in time, you've got to order it in time. But expenditure estimates are not binding upon anybody.

TRYING TO AVOID THE PILE-UP AT THE END

Since they are not for real, budgetary expenditure estimates are an exceedingly unreliable guide to the future. A better guide can be found in requests for appropriations. For the fiscal years 1966 and 1967 combined, the Defense Department has estimated Vietnam war expenditures at \$15 billion, but for the same two fiscal years the department has already requested approximately \$23 billion in Vietnam war appropriations.

Big as they look, however, these requests for war appropriations will almost certainly be added to long before the end of fiscal 1967. That probability can be inferred from on-the-record statements by Secretary McNamara and other Defense Department witnesses at congressional hearings.

The Defense Department has based its requests for war appropriations not upon a forecast of what will actually happen in the Vietnam war, but upon what a Pentagon official calls "calculated requirements." In calculating the "requirements" for any procurement item, the department considered the lead time—how far ahead you have to order the item to have it when you need it. For complex or precisely tooled military hardware, lead times may run to a year or more, and for such items—particularly aircraft and aircraft spares—the department allowed fully for expected losses and use-up to the end of fiscal 1967. But for items with shorter lead times, requirements were calculated tightly, on the assumption that later on they could be revised and McNamara could ask for supplemental appropriations.

Supplemental appropriations have come to be viewed as natural in wartime. And McNamara's policy of asking for funds "at the last possible moments," as he puts it, has its merits. By following that policy he hopes to avoid "overbuying" and any pile-up of surplus matériel at the end of the war. (When the Korean war ended, the military establishment had billions of dollars worth of excess goods in stock or on order.) But the policy implies that the Defense Department will have to ask for more funds before the end of fiscal 1967 unless there is some unexpected abatement in the war.

May 16, 1966

Of necessity, the 1967 defense budget was constructed upon working assumptions about how big the war will get and how long it will last, and given all the uncertainties, these cannot be expected to coincide with the realities. In estimating expenditures and appropriations for fiscal 1967, the Defense Department assumed that U.S. "combat operations" in Vietnam will not continue beyond June 30, 1967. In keeping with that assumption, the 1967 budget does not provide funds for orders of aircraft or other military goods to replace combat losses after that date. Here again the assumption implies that the Defense Department will need supplemental appropriations in fiscal 1967 if the war continues at even the present rate.

McNamara has not said in public what U.S. force level in South Vietnam is allowed for in the 1967 budget, and the explanations he has offered at congressional hearings have been deleted by Pentagon censors. But at a Senate hearing in January, General John P. McConnell, the Air Force chief of staff, indicated that, for the Air Force at least, the appropriations requested so far allow for little or no expansion of the war beyond the 200,000-man level. Said McConnell in reply to a question concerning the adequacy of the funds requested: "We don't have any problem if the war continues at about the same rate as now, Mr. Chairman."

These budgeting assumptions expressed and implied by McNamara and other Pentagon witnesses lead to a strong inference: by next January, if the war continues unabated until then at even the present rate, the Defense Department will have to ask for supplemental appropriations for long-lead-time items required in fiscal 1968 and shorter-lead-time items required in the last months of fiscal 1967. Some months before next January, indeed, perhaps this summer, the department will have to begin ordering very-long-lead-time items in anticipation of fiscal 1968 combat losses.

MOUNTING ASTONISHMENT AT THE BAD NEWS

It follows that if the U.S. buildup in South Vietnam proceeds to a much higher level, the supplemental requests will run into many billions before the end of fiscal 1967. And since the military establishment will have to procure a lot of additional equipment and supplies and bring in a lot of additional men, defense expenditures will rise billions of dollars above the estimate submitted last January.

So the 1967 budget barely begins to suggest the level of Vietnam war spending that probably lies ahead. The budget is not misleading once its rather sophisticated underlying assumptions are understood; but the assumptions are not widely understood, and the Administration has not made much of an effort to see that they are. There is likely to be mounting astonishment this year and next as the bad news about the war's costs and the implied message about taxes and inflation sink in. It's a good bet that Americans will still consider the war worth winning. There is no reason for them not to know its cost.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1966

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11487) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1966".

TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

SEC. 101. Clauses (4) and (5) of subsection (a) of section 23 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (D.C. Code, supp. V, 1966, sec. 25-124), are each amended by striking out "\$1.50" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1.75".

SEC. 102. Subsection (a) of section 40 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (D.C. Code, 1961, sec. 25-138), is amended by striking out "\$1.50" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$3.50".

SEC. 103. The increase in tax upon spirits, alcohol, and beer as provided by sections 101 and 102 of this title shall be applicable to all such beverages in the possession on the effective date of this title of the holder of a retailer's license under said District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

SEC. 104. Within twenty days after the effective date of this title, every holder on said effective date of a retailer's license under said District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act shall file with the Commissioners a sworn statement on a form to be prescribed by the Commissioners showing the quantities of spirits, alcohol and beer held or possessed by such licensee or anyone for him as of the beginning of the day on which this title becomes effective, or as of the beginning of the following day if the effective day be a Sunday, and shall, within twenty days after the effective date of this title, pay to the Commissioners the difference between the amount of tax imposed by the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act prior to the effective date of this title and the amount of tax imposed by sections 101 and 102 of this title.

SEC. 105. Every holder of a retailer's license under said District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act shall keep and preserve for a period of twelve months after the effective date of this title, the inventories and other records made which form the basis for the information furnished on the sworn statement required to be filed under this title.

SEC. 106. Any violation of the provisions of this title shall constitute a violation under the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto.

SEC. 107. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT, 1925

SEC. 201. Subsection (j) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (43 Stat. 1119), as amended (D.C. Code 1961, sec. 40-603(j)), is further amended by striking out the figure and words "2 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure and word "3 per centum".

SEC. 202. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES TAX ACT

SEC. 301. Subsection (c) of section 127 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act, as amended (D.C. Code, supp. V, 1966, sec. 47-2604(c)), is amended by striking out the figure "4" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "5".

SEC. 302. Paragraph (q) of section 128 of said Act, as amended (D.C. Code 1961, sec. 47-2605(q)), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 303. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIGARETTE TAX ACT

SEC. 401. Subsection (a) of section 603 of the District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act (63 Stat. 136, ch. 146, title VI), as amended (D.C. Code 1961, sec. 47-2802(a)), is amended by striking out the figure and word "2 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure and word "5 cents".

SEC. 402. The increase in tax upon cigarettes, as provided by section 401 of this title, shall be applicable to all packages of cigarettes bearing District of Columbia tax stamps, and to all stamps in the possession, on the effective date of this title, of the holder of a wholesaler's, retailer's, or vending machine operator's license under said District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act.

SEC. 403. Within twenty days after the effective date of this title every holder on said effective date of a wholesaler's, retailer's, or vending machine operator's license under said District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act shall file with the Commissioners a sworn statement on a form to be prescribed by the Commissioners, showing, as of the beginning of the day on which this title becomes effective, or as of the beginning of the following day, if the effective date be a Sunday, the number of each kind of stamps denoting payment of District of Columbia cigarette taxes, held or possessed by such licensee or by anyone for him, including stamps affixed to packages of cigarettes.

The licensee, within twenty days after the effective date of this title, shall pay to the Commissioners the difference between the amount of tax represented by such stamps at the time of purchase and the amount of tax imposed by the District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act, as amended by section 401 of this title.

SEC. 404. Every holder of a wholesaler's, retailer's, or vending machine operator's license under said District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act shall keep and preserve for a period of twelve months after the effective date of this title, the inventories and other records made which form the basis for the information furnished on the sworn statement required to be filed under this title.

SEC. 405. Any violation of the provisions of this title shall constitute a violation under the District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto.

SEC. 406. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—FEDERAL PAYMENT

SEC. 501. In recognition of the unique character of the District of Columbia as the Nation's Capital City, regular annual payments are hereby authorized to be appropriated from revenues of the United States to cover the proper Federal share of the expenses of the government of the District, and such annual payments, when appropriated, shall be paid into the general fund of the District. The annual payment authorized shall be an amount equal to 25 per centum of the sum of all tax revenues, including that portion of the motor vehicle registration fees but excluding fees from licenses and other charges, which the Commissioners estimate will be credited during each fiscal year to the general fund of the District of Columbia, including, by way of illustration and not as a limitation, revenues estimated to be derived from those categories of taxes (including penalties and interest thereon) of which the following are representative: Property taxes, both realty and personal tangible; sales and gross receipts taxes; income taxes—individual, corporation franchise, and unincorporated business franchise; the real estate deed recordation tax; in-

years from enactment. There may be occasions when, upon special findings, the Secretary should be authorized to act earlier. For example, elimination of radiator and other ornaments which are hazardous to pedestrians. If an industry standard is not available, the Secretary should be authorized to act in six months or less if he is ready to do so.

TITLE II, H.R. 13228

This title authorizes Federal facilities to conduct research and testing. The Council endorses this proposal.

We desperately need more research information on traffic safety problems, and the research role is an especially fitting one for the Federal government.

The size of the effort as projected in Title II would appear to be in scale with the size of the problem. In fact, it appears to be the first time the Federal government has projected a research expenditure appropriate to the size of the accident problem. As we have repeatedly said before Congressional committees the amounts appropriated for Federal safety research should have the decimal point moved one or two places to the right.

Under the present form of Title II, it would appear wise to amend Section 202 to authorize the Secretary to use appropriated funds for the initial steps in site acquisition because decision on site or sites will be necessary parts of the final stages of planning.

Comprehensive Program

Having now addressed myself to Titles I and II of H.R. 13228, I return to my original point that it is necessary to assess them and place them in the context of a comprehensive, balanced program. For this purpose, I should like to make two major observations:

1. Title III of H.R. 13228

The NSC supports Title III of H.R. 13228 as being indispensable to a comprehensive and balanced program to cope with traffic accidents. However, we urge some amendments which will strengthen and improve Title III's effectiveness.

Yesterday we presented our views to these ends on H.R. 13290 (which is, except in one respect, identical with Title III of H.R. 13228) before the House Committee on Public Works. For this Committee's attention, I furnish a copy of that statement.

2. Additional 10-Point Program

The NSC recommends an additional 10-point program, each of which recommendations is explained more fully in Appendix No. 3.

- (1) *Action Program for Highway Safety:* The Congress should by *Joint Resolution* adopt recommendations embodied in the *Action Program for Highway Safety* as an interim, non-exclusive guide to national policy.
- (2) *Congressional Review of National Policy*
- (3) *Coordination among Federal Agencies*
- (4) *Increased Federal Support for Accident Research*
- (5) *Federal Accident Costs and Prevention Budgets*
- (6) *Use of Seat Belts*
- (7) *Federal Driver Improvement*
- (8) *Federal Off-the-Job Safety*
- (9) *Drinking Drivers*
- (10) *Strengthening Voluntary Safety Organizations*

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me again say that the National Safety Council is gratified that traffic safety is now so high on the national action agenda. If Congress enacts an effective traffic safety bill—and we have indicated what the NSC believes such a bill would be—the nation will be taking an enormous step forward toward

copied with highway accidents. With the President and Congress taking this initiative, and with industry, the American driving public, the voluntary safety community and the States and local governments each being thus activated to do their utmost as part of a comprehensive action program, the NSC believes we can save 25,000 lives a year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. MORRISON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

ESCALATION AND ELECTIONS IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam continues to be escalated to new levels by both sides.

In the last weeks new doubts have been cast on the possibility of holding early elections and on whether certain outcomes of these elections would, in fact, be honored.

Both of these developments, Mr. Speaker, disturb me greatly.

ESCALATION QUESTIONED

I strongly question the wisdom of escalating the war. I question whether such action will not lead to a larger and much more costly conflict, or to at least a new stalemate at a higher and more dangerous level. I question, too, whether it brings us any closer to the conference table and a verified cease-fire.

The United States is in Vietnam so that the people of that war-torn country may have an opportunity to determine their own future, free from the outside interference of those who would determine it for them. This purpose remains valid so long as we honor that choice, whatever it may be, and so long as we encourage, in every way we know how to, the day when free elections may be held.

But preceding degrees of escalation have not induced the other side to desist, and I fail to see how an even higher level of military effort can advance the day when any meaningful form of self-determination may be possible. I suspect it may make its achievement that much more difficult.

I also fail to see how any action that would delay popular elections can be condoned, or how any action which would jeopardize their result could be tolerated.

OUR POLICY ON ELECTIONS IN DOUBT

Yet, the respected columnist, Joseph Kraft, writing from Saigon, has confirmed what I felt on my own inspection trip to Vietnam, and that is:

The American mission here has yet to develop a coherent program for dealing with the elections and their predictable problems.

He has noted that:

Rightly or wrongly there is a widespread impression among both Americans and Vietnamese in Saigon that the United States is opposed to free elections.

He has gone on to report that:

There is also a widespread impression that if the United States does accept elections it is only to provide a figleaf of legitimacy to the present military regime.

There can be little question, Mr. Speaker, that the majority, if not all, of governments we have supported to date in Saigon have been supported for the simple expedients that they could function and that they were the most stable that could then be achieved.

COMMITMENT TO ELECTIONS URGED

The time is past, however, when these can be our standards. There is a ground swell in South Vietnam that is properly demanding a popularly elected government, and we should be encouraging and supporting its creation, if for no other reason than that it is consistent with our own national tradition.

What steps, then, can we properly take? What actions can we pursue which might hasten the time when negotiations may be held, peace restored and elections made possible?

First, I believe it is absolutely essential that this country make clear, by word and deed, its irrevocable commitment to free elections. There must be no room or reason for anyone to challenge our sincerity.

Second, we should assist the government in power in Saigon to move as rapidly as possible toward the day when these elections can and will be held. We should plainly resist, with all of the appropriate tools at our command, any unnecessary or unreasonable delays in this process.

Third, we should insist, and insist now, that the results of free elections be respected. Our continued support should be conditioned on an acceptance of the voters' will. And this includes immediate withdrawal on our part, if we should be so asked by any government that comes to power.

NEW EFFORTS TO END THE WAR

At the same time, we must make new efforts to end a war which is destroying the resources and devastating the people of Vietnam. We must be unceasing in our endeavors to bring this conflict to the conference table and to achieve an effective cease-fire.

There are, of course, no ready or easy solutions to this task. But one or more of the following initiatives on our part might be considered as practical means of further opening the door to negotiations:

A call for a truce during the period of the South Vietnamese elections.

A further pause, however limited, in the bombing of North Vietnam, accompanied by aggressive diplomatic efforts to substitute discussions for further destruction.

A proposal for a mutual and supervised reduction of force levels, such as the verified withdrawal of equal numbers of North Vietnamese and American troops.

A call for a peace conference at a specified time and place, to be open to all parties, including the Vietcong.

A recommendation that the United Nations, or a strengthened International Control Commission, be called upon to supervise elections open to all the people, and to verify their results.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that no efforts on our part will induce the other side to discuss a peaceful settlement. But with the terrible loss of lives, with the danger of an even larger and more costly war, and the tremendous drain on otherwise needed resources which this war has caused, it is imperative that we make every reasonable attempt.

The cause of peace must be pursued with diligence, perseverance and urgency.

It must be pursued with an awareness that the people of Vietnam have known little else than war for 2 dozen years.

And it must be pursued with the knowledge that we still have wars to complete at home against poverty, discrimination and the other common enemies of man. In winning those wars we have no time to lose.

Mr. Speaker, these remarks were prepared before the seizure of Da Nang by the Ky government. If anything, I believe this action underscores the necessity of pressing forward firmly and without hesitation toward the day when free elections are held.

I believe it also means that we must be alert to the purposes for which our own military forces are used. It may even mean that we should withhold our military support until assurances are given that no delay will be imposed in the election of a constituent assembly this fall or in the orderly transition to a popularly based civilian government.

As the New York Times states so correctly this morning:

The alternative to elections is chaos. Premier Ky must realize this. So must Washington. Whatever happens now, the final goal still has to be elections.

Mr. Speaker, I include this timely editorial from the New York Times and also the perceptive article by Joseph Kraft which I referred to earlier in my remarks, and which appeared in the Washington Post on May 11:

[From the New York Times, May 16, 1966]

THE DANANG COUP

The seizure of Danang by the Ky Government means a determination to fight it out with the dissident political elements of the Unified Buddhist Church. Unless the struggle is quickly stopped, this would mean an end to the hopes, expectations and promises of an election by Sept. 15 for a constituent assembly and later an elected government.

The gravity of the situation is obvious. Civil war is one possibility. The South Vietnamese struggle against the Vietcong is bound to be seriously hampered. Worst of all would be the embarrassing and perhaps critical position of the American forces in Vietnam and the handicap to the war they are waging.

Once again, Washington has been caught by surprise—even to the extent of Ambassa-

dor Lodge being in the United States instead of in Saigon. When Marshal Ky calmly announced a few days ago that he intended to keep his government in power for at least another year, Secretary Rusk declared that the Premier had been misunderstood and really did not mean what he seemed to be saying. He meant it all right, and this development becomes another in the long series of misunderstandings and miscalculations of the Vietnamese by the United States Government.

As always when a sudden and unexpected event of this sort explodes in Vietnam, it is necessary to let the storm blow over. When it does, every effort must be made to bring the electoral position back to where it was, if that is going to be possible.

The desirability and, indeed, necessity to hold elections that would permit a broad-based civilian government in South Vietnam is as clear as ever. Washington's orders to the American advisers in Saigon to urge a peaceful settlement can only be a stopgap move. The military may prove strong enough to prevent the militant Buddhists from creating a chaotic situation in Danang, Hue and Saigon. The damage is by no means beyond repair. In South Vietnam the pessimists as well as the optimists are often confounded.

But the coup emphasizes once again that it has never been possible to interpret Vietnamese events in terms of American ideas or Western logic. Premier Ky obviously feels strong enough to assert Saigon's authority over the virtually rebellious northern provinces. If, having done so, he then turns back to the concept of constitutional and legislative elections, the harm can be held to a minimum.

Once the situation has stabilized it is more important than ever that the election be demonstrably fair. The very nature of the American involvement in South Vietnam makes it impossible for the United States to operate with total detachment in this respect. As Senator RIBICOFF has suggested, the United Nations would be the best possible choice to exercise a supervisory function to guarantee the fairness of a vote in a country with no democratic tradition.

The alternative to elections is chaos. Premier Ky must realize this. So must Washington. Whatever happens now, the final goal still has to be elections.

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1966]

THE VIETNAMESE CRISIS—IV

SAIGON.—Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge's return to the United States is happily timed. For the central theme of his consultations will have to be the coming elections in Vietnam. And on that score Washington has a huge contribution to make to American thinking here in Saigon.

Without outside help, indeed, the American mission here is almost incompetent to frame a broad approach to the elections. For one thing, the mission is preoccupied with the day-to-day, not to say minute-to-minute, business of supporting the war effort.

The emphasis is on moving goods and people, arranging appointments, making telephone calls and other tedious administrative tasks. That emphasis leaves little, if any, scope for thinking big. In consequence, the American mission here has yet to develop a coherent program for dealing with the elections and their predictable problems.

Precisely because the mission is so much geared to doing business, it tends to favor people in power who can get the job done. That is how such diverse figures as the late President Ngo Dinh Diem, former Premier Nguyen Khanh, and, now, Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky all acquired virtually unconditional American support.

By the same token, the focus on getting things done puts a discount on uncertainty. But a free election is uncertainty writ large—

a leap in the dark. It is thus precisely the kind of thing the American mission in Saigon does not like to think about.

Already the unease of the mission here in the presence of an election prospect has yielded two exceedingly damaging impressions.

And in large measure, Washington's work during the consultations with Ambassador Lodge should develop a means for dissipating these bad impressions.

First, there is, rightly or wrongly, a widespread impression among both Americans and Vietnamese in Saigon that the United States is opposed to free elections. This feeling at this time is exceedingly dangerous. For insofar as they believe that the United States has misgivings about elections, by so much the Vietnamese military leaders in office will be tempted to stage a coup or phony coup designed to head off the elections.

There is also a widespread impression that if the United States does accept elections, it is only in order to provide a fig-leaf of legitimacy to the present military regime. This impression is reinforced by rumors of covert American efforts to set up some political notable from Saigon or the delta region as a front for the present military leaders. It is further reinforced by rumors of American efforts to line up a majority of refugee Catholics, nationalist parties and members of the Hao Hao and Cao Dai religious sects to support the government against the Buddhist militants under Bonze Tich Tri Quang.

The mere prevalence of these rumors, whether they are true or not, works against the American interest. For the rumors lend color to the suspicion that the United States is not in favor of a free choice in South Vietnam, that, instead, the United States only wants a regime that will continue to sponsor the war.

Even if the schemes attributed to the Americans here could be brought off, they could not yield lasting results. For the present government plus a politicalized front would fence out not only the Buddhists but the whole central region of South Vietnam. And the center, which has been the source of the present trouble, would react by making even more trouble.

The true American interest, in fact, lies in the one thing the American mission here finds it most difficult to contemplate. It lies in making a leap in the dark—in fostering a process that will give free play to local political forces. And the starting point for that process can be the coming elections.

But that means unrigger elections.

It means elections which hold out the possibility of a passage of power to a new government based on an alliance of the moderate Catholics of the South and the militant Buddhists of the Center.

It means elections from which there could at least develop a meaningful political opposition.

The consultations with Ambassador Lodge can be a success only if they advance the prospect for honest elections, only if they make clear beyond any doubt the American commitment to free choice in South Vietnam.

HEROIC ACTION BY AMY LA FRANIERE, MEMBER OF SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KREBS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 13, 1966, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY awarded the AAA Life-saver Medal for heroic action to Amy La



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 16, 1966

No. 80

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Rev. John W. Pressly, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Sacramento, Calif., offered the following prayer:

God of our lives, Thou who art our highest thought and our noblest aspiration, we ask that Thou will free us from a stubborn trust in ourselves. Enable us to trust in Thy guiding providence. May the mists of doubt be dispelled in the light of a vigorous and confident faith.

Here today in this distinguished Chamber of national deliberation, where history has been made, where tradition bespeaks integrity, freedom, and justice for all men, help these Representatives of the people that they may not merely represent their constituents, important as this is in our system of government, but that they may truly seek the welfare and security of all and be true to their own ideals, integrity, and faith in Thee.

Bless each legislator in his unselfish commitment and grant to each one so committed the full measure of personal satisfaction in their individual and public life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 12, 1966, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14215. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14215) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr.

BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 108. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and to authorize appropriations therefor.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington D.C., May 11, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the duty to inform you that I have transmitted to the Honorable George Romney, Governor of Michigan, my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Ninth District of Michigan, effective at the close of business, May 10, 1966.

I leave the House of Representatives to assume the office of U.S. Senator from Michigan.

With kind personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington D.C., May 11, 1966.

Hon. GEORGE ROMNEY,
Governor of Michigan,
Lansing, Mich.

DEAR GOVERNOR ROMNEY: I hereby resign my office as Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Ninth District of Michigan, effective at the close of business, May 10, 1966.

With kind personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. DENTON, Mr. KIRWAN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Messrs. MARSH, MAHON, REIFEL, McDADE, and now.

KY STATEMENT FRAUGHT WITH INHERENT DANGERS

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last week I warned of the dangers in the leadership of South Vietnam by Premier Ky. I was alarmed by statements which cast doubt about whether free elections in that country could ever be held while Ky remains in power.

Yesterday my fears were realized as Ky took over Da Nang by force.

Through tactics similar to those employed by the Vietcong, Ky accomplished by force that which he was unable to accomplish by the democratic process.

The people of South Vietnam rely upon the United States to guarantee their freedom from attacks from both within and without. Premier Ky has abused our protective assistance and is indeed coming to exemplify that which we are fighting against in Vietnam—a dictatorship of force.

With Ky's seizure of Da Nang, an overt act of violence, how can we hope for free elections?

I have supported Ky's government in the past, not the man nor his intemperate acts, but a caretaker government which I hoped would provide some stability during the emergency brought about by Communist aggression. But Ky's action endangers the faith of the entire free

10031

world in the rightness of our cause in Vietnam.

I call upon the ruling junta in Saigon to remove Premier Ky from power.

The United States is paying an increasingly steep price in the lives of our young men that the South Vietnamese people might have a chance to live in freedom.

It is intolerable that our Government continues to support a man who more and more is coming to represent what we are fighting against—rule by force in defiance of the will of the people.

THE MINIMUM WAGE BILL

(Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include a proposed amendment to the minimum wage bill.)

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow and Wednesday the House will be considering H.R. 13712, the bill to raise the minimum wage. I support this bill and intend to vote in favor of it. I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

I am concerned, however, not with the level at which the minimum will be set, but with the speed with which we proceed to that level. I think we would do the cause of full employment and decent living standards a great disservice if we move to the \$1.60 level too rapidly. I intend, therefore, to offer an amendment which will bring the \$1.60 minimum wage into effect at a more reasonable time.

For the information of the House, I insert in the Record at this point the text of my amendment. I intend to make a more complete statement later when the debate actually begins:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 13712, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. MORRIS

Page 46, beginning in line 24, strike out "during the first year" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "during the first three years".

SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include a letter.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, during the period of May 15 to 22 local churches throughout the United States are observing Soil Stewardship Week. This annual observance is sponsored by the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts and the 3,000 local soil and water conservation districts which blanket the Nation.

The subject of this year's observance is "Crisis in the Countryside." Ministers of all faiths are carrying vital messages to their followers to further God's purpose.

I salute the thousands of clergy of all faiths who use this observance to remind us that soil stewardship is everyone's responsibility. It is a responsibility of people who live in the towns and cities as well as those who work the land.

The President of the United States has recognized Soil Stewardship Week with a special statement issued from the White House. President Johnson stated:

It is our responsibility to make certain that our stewardship of the soil ensures progress and prosperity for the generations of the future.

Under unanimous consent, I insert into the Record the full text of President Johnson's statement:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 2, 1966.

It is appropriate that we set aside a Soil Stewardship Week each year to rededicate our commitment to the preservation of our precious natural heritage.

This observance reminds all responsible Americans of our duty to protect our threatened land and water resources, to restore those which have been ill-used, and to develop their rich potential for the benefit of all of our people.

Much of the future of the country lies in the wise and proper use of its rural lands. It is our responsibility to make certain that our stewardship of the soil ensures progress and prosperity for the generations of the future.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

TIME FOR LESS EMOTIONAL LOOK AT AUTO SAFETY

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the stock market closed last week in a tailspin and amid reports of a decline in automobile sales and production widely attributed to the impact upon the public of the congressional investigation of car safety.

This disturbing chain of events, underscoring again the bellwether position of the automobile industry in our economy, while not a cause for panic, is certainly a cause for concern. At a time when the economy is experiencing high employment and prosperity, it is incredible that right here under the Capitol dome we can talk ourselves into a decline such as this merely by the sensational play given a few people who have been acting like safety had just been discovered.

While I feel very strongly that every purchaser should have a safe automobile, I do not believe that even the most vehement critic intended that concern over safety should trigger a setback throughout the entire economy. But whatever the intentions, it is obviously time that we start to look at the problem a lot less emotionally and a lot more realistically.

The problem of safety on our highways is hardly a new one. People have been working on it for years. If anyone doubts this they should talk with the automobile workers themselves to see just how much safety is stressed within the plants. I know from personal experience the pride that our craftsmen take in what they are making.

Certainly cars can have more safety features, but it is a fact, recognized by the tests given for operators' licenses, that it is the driver's attitude that is the first cause of the overwhelming majority of accidents. It matters little what part of the automobile the driver or his victim comes into contact with as far as the real cause of the accident is concerned.

It is a cruel deception to lead the American people to believe that Congress can guarantee auto safety simply by legislating.

Before we go about trying to write any such Federal legislation, especially in an election year, I believe, we should heed the suggestion of Governor Romney, of Michigan, and first take a long hard look to see what could be realistically achieved through the existing State and local agencies which have the experience and facilities to get closer to this problem.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

AUTHORIZING ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO CONTRACT WITH MEDICAL SCHOOLS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 197) to amend chapter 73 of title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration to enter into contracts with medical schools and clinics for scarce technical services.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 197

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 4116. Contracts for scarce technical services.

"The Chief Medical Director may enter into contracts with medical schools and clinics to provide scarce technical services at Veterans' Administration facilities (including, but not limited to, services of radiologists, pathologists, and psychiatrists)."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 73 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"4116. Contracts for scarce technical services."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "§ 4116." and insert in lieu thereof "§ 4117."

On page 1, line 7, strike out "Chief Medical Director" and insert "Administrator" and strike out "technical" and insert "medical specialist".

On page 1, line 9, strike out "technical" and insert "medical specialist".

On page 2, after line 4, strike out "4116" and insert in lieu thereof "4117" and strike out "technical" and insert "medical specialist".

On page 2, beginning on line 5 insert the following:

"Sec. 2. That section 610 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) While any veteran is receiving hospital care in any Veterans' Administration facility, the Administrator may, within the limits of Veterans' Administration facilities, furnish medical services to correct or treat any nonservice-connected disability of such veteran, in addition to treatment incident to the disability for which he is hospitalized, if the veteran is willing, and the Administrator determines that the furnishing of such medical services (1) would be in the interest of the veteran, (2) would not prolong the hos-

spike fastened to an endless chain. The charred skins were then removed by sprinkler washers and brushes, with the final cleaning done by hand.

Finding the new roaster satisfactory, the Riegels continued their research on canning pimientos in a small shed on a farm near Pomona, Ga., a few miles from Griffin. During the summer of 1914 they put up a small pack of pimientos in this little plant, and the H. V. Kell Wholesale Grocery Co. of Griffin marketed the entire pack.

Frank Patterson, who was associated with the H. V. Kell Wholesale Grocery Co. in Griffin, became interested in the new pimiento cannery after his success in selling the first canned pimientos. He offered to provide financing for two additional roasters and a plant, to be built on his farm. Plans were made, and Mark Riegel, Frank and Bob Patterson, and Frank Cook, Sr., built and equipped the Pomona Products Co. This plant was an extremely large food processing facility according to the standards of that day and probably the largest in Georgia. It was located 3 miles west of Pomona and about 6 miles north of Griffin.

Pimientos were first canned in the new plant in 1916 and sold under the Sunshine brand name. The total crop that year came from 75 acres, all located in Spalding County, of which Griffin is the county seat. Frank Patterson served as president of the young organization. By 1918 the plant was processing the pimiento crop from 100 acres in the area.

It was in 1920 that Pomona Products Co. began to assume the character and the personality that have made it an outstanding member of the American food industry. In that year Walter L. Graefe purchased a controlling interest in the business and became president of the pioneering company. He served as president until 1955, when he became chairman of the board and was succeeded in the presidency by W. Ennis Parker.

Walter L. Graefe was a native of Maryland and attended school at Western Maryland College and Johns Hopkins University. After serving as first lieutenant in the Army during World War I, he was discharged on March 4, 1919, at Camp Gordon near Atlanta. Liking Georgia, he looked for a business connection in that area. One night at a party a prominent Atlanta business man suggested to Graefe that the young Pomona operation near Griffin might offer an opportunity. Mr. Graefe visited the company and was offered a job which he accepted.

During 1920 he decided that the business offered a substantial future, so he purchased control of the business and became its president. His first major action was to move the plant to Griffin where gas was available to provide fuel for the huge roasting ovens which charred the skins so that they could be removed from the pimientos.

In spite of the problems faced by a new company processing a new product, Pomona Products Co. grew and prospered. There were bleak years—when all the pimientos on contract could not be processed because of lack of labor and facilities, but they still had to be paid for.

There were years when the pimiento crop was too short to produce a profitable pack. But the bad years were outnumbered by the good years and pimiento volume climbed steadily. Pomona's success led to the entry of other canners into the Pimiento field and over the years as many as eighteen or twenty firms were in the business at one time. Growing of pimientos by farmers, once limited entirely to Georgia, now extends into several adjoining States and California.

Pimiento growing added a new crop to Georgia and southern agriculture. It provided millions of dollars for farmers and off-farm workers, but perhaps its greatest economic contribution was the growth it sparked for food processing in Georgia and other Southern States. Plants built and expanded to process pimientos found themselves with sufficient facilities to handle many other products, thus providing further employment for southern workers and additional income for the areas in which they were located.

During the period of peak production Pomona employs more than 1,000 workers. About 20 different fruits and vegetables are processed and canned. All of these are distributed and sold in the Southeastern States and some carry the Sunshine label throughout the United States and parts of Canada.

The past 50 years have been full years for Pomona Products Co. A new American-grown food was introduced to the Nation, the complexities of processing it and packing it were solved. Its growth in acceptance and sales over the years has been consistent. The future is not ours to foretell, but Pomona will always seek new products and constantly research methods to improve them—to the benefit of the American food industry and America's grocers.

Mr. W. Ennis Parker, of Griffin, Ga., is now president of Pomona Products Co., and is currently serving as president of the National Canners Association.

Ky in Translation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as is clear to anyone who reads the daily dispatches from Saigon, Premier Ky needs a new press officer. Either he should not say what he thinks, or he should not think what he says.

Now Clayton Fritchey, whose credentials as a journalist and principal aid to Ambassador Stevenson give him considerable insight into such questions, has suggested that Premier Ky at last has found an interpreter. His name, says Fritchey, is Dean Rusk.

Fritchey's witty, pungent column in the New York Post of Friday, May 13, follows:

KY IN TRANSLATION
(By Clayton Fritchey)

WASHINGTON.—Dr. Johnson certainly owes much to Boswell, as does John F. Kennedy to Schlesinger. And where would Omar Khayyam and Proust be in the English world without the translations of FitzGerald and Scott-Moncrieff? Actually, many heroes of the Anglo-Saxon domain would hardly exist were it not for their eloquent and often unsung interpreters and translators.

But their debt is small indeed compared to what Premier Ky of South Viet Nam owes Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Few diplomats in history have been able to make so much out of so little, or, when necessary, vice versa.

On the basis of deeds and words, the world might think Premier Ky was: (1) a Hitlerite; (2) a militarist; (3) opposed to peaceful settlement of the Viet Nam war; (4) determined to stay in office, constitutionally or not; and (5) willing to accept the results of an election only if his side wins.

Fortunately, with the aid of the State Dept.'s special earphones and the Secretary's instant translation and interpretation of all that Ky says and does, we know that the Premier at heart (1) hates Nazism; (2) is civilian minded; (3) is dedicated to peace; (4) is eager for elections; and (5) will cheerfully abide by the results no matter what his own fate may be.

Houdini himself would be spellbound by this feat of magic, but, as is often the case in this perverse world, the beneficiary shows little evidence of any gratitude. In fact, he gives the impression of being rather annoyed at having his forthright, if untactful, statements constantly sterilized by Rusk.

According to dispatches from Saigon, "Vietnamese in general appeared to be appalled at the bluntness of Ky's remarks, and insulted by what seemed to them a 'clarification' by Secretary Rusk." One Viet Nam official was quoted as saying, "Why should the American Secretary of State have to clarify the remarks of the Vietnamese Prime Minister?"

It's a good question: why indeed? In Saigon, no clarification was needed because the military junta ordered the local press to censor Ky's statements. But in Washington, Rusk simply had to clean them up because they are not acceptable to the American public.

The Administration is in the painful position of either liquidating Ky or whitewashing him. After embracing him so enthusiastically at the Honolulu meeting in February, it now shrinks from disowning him, so the alternative is to try to persuade the U.S. public that he is misunderstood.

It is a thankless and losing task. Poor Rusk has been at it almost since Ky took office last year. The first shock came when Ky in a famous interview suddenly made known his admiration for Hitler. When the State Dept. recovered from its shock, we learned that Ky really meant he only admired Hitler's efficiency.

In November came another shock when Ky contradicted Rusk's repeated statement that peace negotiations were being blocked solely by North Viet Nam's intransigence. Ky said his government would never enter into negotiations with Hanoi. The official spokesman for the State Dept., however, denied any knowledge of this position, and said there was no disagreement between Washington and Saigon over peace talks. Also, within 24 hours the South Viet foreign minister, Tran Van doc, publicly said the Ky government was flatly opposed either to a cease-fire or peace negotiations.

And so it has gone. The embarrassing statements of the last few days are nothing new. When the pro-election demonstrations broke out in Da Nang, Ky said they were Communist inspired, but later retracted this

May 16, 1966

A2637

quest of western civilization and the enslavement of free peoples.

This hospital is dedicated, in gratitude, to those who were maimed and injured in the cause of freedom, and who suffer from disease. It is dedicated to the veterans of our country and it is a manifestation of the deep gratitude of the American people.

Old Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a resolution passed by the Lyon County Barracks of the Veterans of World War I.

It is with some concern that I have noted the growing disrespect toward the flag that has been demonstrated by certain segments of our population. In addition to disrespect there seems to be mounting apathy toward the flag and the traditions which it represents by many unconcerned citizens.

The Veterans of World War I, the schools and patriotic groups who are working hard to teach the proper respect for the flag deserve our wholehearted support. On the other hand, those who manifest their disrespect for our Nation by desecrating the flag should be punished to the fullest extent of the law. I support legislation designed to improve respect for the flag and increase penalties for improper treatment of this symbol of our Nation.

In this connection Barracks No. 1111 of Emporia, Kans., has passed a notable resolution which I hope will be read by many of my colleagues. It deserves your attention and support.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I,
LYON COUNTY BARRACKS NO. 1111

Whereas there is a growing display of disrespect for our Flag, especially on the College Campus of our Nation, and when the Flag is carried in Parades, and by dissident groups and individuals;

Whereas this is both repugnant and disheartening to us as Veterans who have fought under that Flag;

Whereas the memory of our Buddies who fell on the field of honor in defense of that flag has remained undimmed through the years;

Whereas we believe this disrespect is motivated in many instances by those who seek to destroy our system of Government.

Whereas we believe that this cannot be allowed to continue without jeopardizing our National Honor.

Therefore we, the Veterans of World War One, working with the American Legion, the VFW, and other patriotic organizations urge our Government to institute a program of education in our schools and that Congress pass appropriate legislation, as ably stated in H.R. 13492, for punishment of those who would desecrate "Old Glory."

SETH HUMPHREYS,
Commander.
LLOYD D. MILLARD,
Adjutant.

The Wrong Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have supported, from the very beginning, efforts to rescind the Supreme Court's decision so that voluntary prayers can be permitted in our schools, and I will continue to do all that I can to see that this is brought about.

Last week an editorial in the Kingsport Times commented on recent actions taken by some schools to comply with the ruling by the Supreme Court, and I am inserting this article for the benefit of all:

[From the Kingsport (Tenn.) Times, May 3, 1966]

THE WRONG ANSWER

The public school system of an eastern city thinks it has the answer to the prayer in school problem that has resulted from the decision of the Supreme Court.

The answer is that instead of opening each day's classes with a reading of verses from the Bible as was done formerly, the teacher now reads selections and quotations from the writings of historical personages and well known names, calculated to impress the young. These readings are inspirational, and as one person put it "may prove meaningful to the children."

The superintendent of schools of the city, who it may be assumed found this "answer" is quoted as saying, "When all is said and done, our opening exercises are concerned with values. We can teach the brotherhood of man without actual use of the Scriptures; and teach integrity without ritual."

If this plan is quite satisfactory to the people whose children attend public school in that city—and they are the only ones concerned—no one can object.

But we wonder how many people in this country will take the reading of secular statements as a satisfactory substitute for Bible reading and prayer?

We have a feeling that many will be quick to say that teaching the Fatherhood of God is of more importance than teaching the brotherhood of man, valuable as the latter undoubtedly is.

Indeed it seems that the two statements "the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man are indivisible in the Judaic-Christian philosophy by which most of the American people live.

Surely no one will question the value of readings from great words of the sages. Such readings are helpful to children. They do emphasize the real values in life. Yet how many normal Americans regard this as the be-all and end-all of spiritual education?

To think that this is a complete substitute for prayer and Bible reading is to miss the heart of the problem. One has to understand that to the average Christian who adheres to a church, the fine ethical statements in the Bible are good because they are in the Bible; the Bible is not merely good because it contains these statements.

To most Christians the Bible is the unique method of communication between each individual and God Almighty. This spiritual religious relationship is more important to understand than teaching moral conduct, in the view of most Christians.

Therefore, there is a vast difference between reading the Bible and reading Ralph Waldo Emerson or Epictetus or any other philosopher.

We know that many people will agree with the school superintendent that moral standards can be taught and the brotherhood of man can be inculcated without the Scriptures and without ritual; but we must doubt if many of those who have been loud in their outcry against the Supreme Court decision will agree with this idea.

To them that decision meant "taking God out of the schools" and they would say there is no substitute for God.

That is why we have to say that this answer to the problem is not likely to be a satisfactory answer to many people in this country.

The 50th Anniversary of Pomona Products Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, 1966 marks the 50th anniversary of the Pomona Products Co. of Griffin, Ga., famous for pioneering the cultivation packing and marketing pimientos in America. Pimiento growing and processing is of considerable importance to southern agriculture.

The story of pimientos in Georgia, and probably in America, begins in 1911, when a young man, George Riegel, saw a can of Spanish pimientos on a grocery shelf in Griffin. He and his brother and father were commercial vegetable growers on a farm near Griffin and together they had worked on improving the quality of vegetable crops, particularly peppers. Through the American consul in Spain the Riegels secured 6 ounces of pimiento seed and in 1912 grew enough plants to set out 1½ acres of pimiento plants on the Riegel farm. From this planting a single plant was selected which bore fruit so perfect in shape, size, and color that it was given the name "Perfection." Subsequent plantings were made from the seeds of this plant.

Attempts to sell pimientos on the fresh market met with no success because of the extreme toughness of the pimiento skins. George Riegel recalled that his interest in pimientos had stemmed from the canned Spanish product, so he decided to attempt canning himself. Skins were removed by immersing the pimientos in a lye solution. After cleaning they were canned with salt and vinegar.

The use of lye proved so tedious that the help of the Spanish consul was again sought, and he reported that the skins in Spain were removed by roasting the pimientos for several minutes in a hot oven and wiping off the charred skins with clean cloths.

The roasting operation proved far more satisfactory, and by 1913 Mark Riegel perfected a mechanical roaster. It consisted of a coke-burning tunnel of fire brick, through which the cored pimientos passed, each placed over a steel

May 16, 1966

A2639

charge, which the U.S. embassy could not support. Then he said he was going to execute the mayor of Da Nang, but he had to back down on this, too.

Since then, the U.S. has pledged itself to abide by the proposed elections no matter what the outcome, but Ky upset the apple cart by frankly speaking his own mind. If the elections result in a neutralist or Communist government, he says, "I and my friends will fight it."

Moreover, he made it equally plain that he intended to prolong the electoral process as long as possible. "I expect," he bluntly told the press, "to stay in power for at least another year."

That is what brought Rusk so swiftly to the microphones to explain that Ky was once more being misunderstood. But in Saigon, Ky was not being very helpful; as of this writing, he had not yet joined Rusk in the Orwellian job of purifying his own remarks.

The fact is that Ky, personally a gay and likely air force officer, is more candid than his U.S. sponsors. He apparently has no taste for dissembling, and simply blurts out what is on his mind. This is a terrible failing in a puppet, but where is the U.S. to get a better one?

Cheers for U.S.S. "George Washington Carver"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 3, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

U.S.S. GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER
(SSBN-656)

At Sea, North Atlantic, May 8, 1966.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FULTON: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of our 37th Polaris nuclear submarine. The U.S.S. *George Washington Carver* was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company, Newport News, Virginia. We also have in operation 22 attack type nuclear submarines, making a total of 59.

This ship is named for George W. Carver, a botanist and chemurgist renowned in the annals of American scientific agriculture. The child of slaves, he did not know the day of his birth. Even the year is not certain, but he thought it was 1860. Where he was born, however, is not in doubt. In 1943, shortly after he died at Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, both houses of Congress passed, without a dissenting vote, a bill authorizing erection of a national monument at his birthplace in Diamond Grove, Missouri. In fourscore years, George W. Carver had come a long way and accomplished a great deal.

None of it had come easy. His start in life was most inauspicious. A sickly infant, orphaned before he was a year old, it seemed unlikely he would survive. He lost his father in an accident and was soon after kidnapped, together with his mother and sister, by marauding nightriders. Those were lawless times. Stealing slaves for sale to plantations in the Deep South was not uncommon. But George Carver was such a puny baby that the kidnapers had no use for him, and so his master was able to get him released in

return for a race horse valued at \$300. Of mother and sister nothing was ever heard.

Hard as it was to be a slave child without kith or kin, by great good fortune his master Moses Carver (from whom he took his surname) was not a typical planter but a plain farmer, one of the so-called "Black Republican abolitionist Germans," or "lop-eared Dutch," as they were contemptuously called, who had migrated to Missouri in the 1830's. He was opposed to slavery, but he and his wife were childless and middle-aged; they needed help and servants were not to be had. So Moses bought a slave girl from a neighbor for \$700. After she had been abducted, he took it upon himself to raise her small son. Slavery ended when the boy was four years old but he remained with the Carvers and was treated much as any other farm boy. There was a lot of work to be done and George was expected to do his share. He was an especially apt pupil in all the domestic chores around the house and showed early that he had a way with growing things. People called him "plant doctor" for he could cure any ailing plant; he seemed to know instinctively what it needed in order to grow.

The boy was born with a keen mind, fantastically clever hands and so great a thirst for knowledge that no obstacle could bar him from obtaining an education. Of rebuffs he suffered many, but he was also often given a helping hand. The free school nearby was barred to him, whereupon Mrs. Carver gave him an old blue-back Speller and with her help he taught himself to read and write. Thereafter he was hardly ever without a book in his hand. He would prop it up while he washed and ironed, these being some of the chores that earned him a living while he gradually accumulated school credits.

At 10 he decided he must find a school and so he left the Carvers, all his possessions in a small bundle over his shoulder. Thus began an Odyssey that was to take him in short stages northward geographically and upward educationally. At several critical times during his 30-year quest for an education, luck or his pleasing personality, or perhaps a combination of both, brought him into contact with warmhearted childless couples who gave him the concern and care usually found only in one's own family. With a few he stayed but he was never a burden. He earned his keep for he was a prodigious worker, determined never to accept charity.

George Carver literally inched himself up the educational ladder, working his way not just through college but through grade and high school as well, working all the time to support himself. He was 20 before he got to high school, 25 when he graduated. Highland University accepted his credentials but when he presented himself, he was told negroes were not admitted. He was 30 when he finally entered Simpson College in Iowa. A year later, he entered Iowa State University, graduating with a Bachelor of Science degree in 1894. Invited to become a member of the staff in charge of systematic botany, the bacteriological laboratories and the greenhouse, he continued his studies and received a Master of Science degree in 1896. That year, he was invited by Booker T. Washington to organize and direct a new agriculture department at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama. There he remained the rest of his life.

From earliest childhood, Carver had the habit of rising at four and walking about the countryside for an hour or two. Soil, plants and trees interested him intensely; he wanted to know how they were put together, what made them fruitful. Nature was both a consolation and a challenge. In Tuskegee, he found the land exhausted from one-crop cotton culture, robbed of its mineral content, eroded from lack of plant cover, treeless and sun parched. The campus was

bare earth, dusty in dry weather, a sea of mud when it rained. He went about looking for ways to restore the overworked earth and found it in green manure and the growing of nitrogen-producing legumes—pod bearers such as vetch, peas, clover, peanuts—plants which enriched the soil. Crop rotation which European peasants had practiced for a thousand years had to be relearned by Southern tenant farmers who knew no other crop but cotton. Carver went among them preaching diversification. He urged them to grow peanuts and sweet potatoes; those who heeded his advice rode out the disastrous invasion of the boll weevil.

On the experimental farm he developed at Tuskegee, he evolved a cross between the short-stalk and tall-stalk cotton known as "Carver Hybrid," besides three other new strains. With green manuring, he grew enormous potatoes, cabbages, onions, watermelons and cantaloupes. He instituted a visiting day each month for neighboring farmers to show what could be grown with scientific methods. They were most impressed with his new cotton strain which carried 275 huge bolls on a single bush, and yielded nearly a bale and a quarter per acre, in contrast to the usual one third of a bale most tenant farmers produced.

To bring the message of scientific agriculture to those who could not come to Tuskegee, Carver loaded a wagon with tools, boxes, jars and packages of seed and set out every Friday evening after class to give demonstrations to meetings of farmers. In 1906, with money donated by Morris K. Jesup, a member of the Slater Foundation, he designed the so-called Jesup Wagon which served as a movable farmers school and was adopted in other countries.

Carver's skill as soil scientist and plant breeder was to him but a means to help raise the standards of the Southern farmer, not just in productivity, but in his whole way of life. It was obvious to Carver that the prevalent diet of pork, meal and molasses lacked the vitamins and minerals necessary for good health and stamina. So he urged the farmers to grow more vegetables and fruits, showed them that many common weeds, properly cooked, were edible and nutritious, taught their women how to prepare them. His own boyhood had been spent on a multi-purpose farm where everything the family needed was grown and processed, only sugar and coffee being bought. He called this "living at home" and preached it throughout the land. By avoiding store purchases, a little could be saved each week and eventually a piece of land bought. This, he said, was the way out of poverty. Tenant farmers lived in drab cabins. Noticing the beautifully colored clay in which Alabama abounded, Carver developed a simple method for making color wash and demonstrated how much even the shabbiest cottage could be improved by a paint that cost not a penny.

Carver is best known as a pioneer "chemurgist"—a word, coined by Dr. William J. Hale in 1934, which means chemistry at work. In his book "Pioneers of Plenty," Christy Borth called Carver "the first and greatest chemurgist." Carver made paper from Southern pine "at least a quarter of a century before Dr. Charles H. Herty tackled the problem," and synthetic marble from wood shavings "years before a rocklike plastic made from wood waste became a chemurgic promise." He saw promise in the peanut when it was still a lowly weed growing along fences and tolerated by farmers only because their children liked its taste. From the peanut and the sweet potato, Carver developed more than a hundred different products, including plastics, lubricants, dyes, medicines, ink, wood stains, face creams, tapioca and molasses. He developed these in his laboratory at Tuskegee which he had put together out of odds and ends salvaged from scrap heaps.

A2640

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 16, 1968

When he first arrived to take up his post, he discovered there was no money to equip a laboratory. In the course of his life, necessity had made him a genius at making do out of nothing. He and his students made the rounds of the rubbish heaps on campus and in town. They collected bottles, cut their necks off evenly and turned them into beakers. A thick, chipped teacup became a mortar, a piece of pipe the pestle. An old ink bottle with a wick made of string stuck through a cork became a Bunsen burner. Pieces of tin were punched and became sifters. Reeds served as tubes to transfer liquids. Carver had brought with him the one indispensable and costly thing not to be found on scrap heaps: a microscope. It was a parting gift from colleagues at Iowa State.

The products of his laboratory made his name known and brought him tempting offers of positions in industry, and checks for advice that had been sought from him. He politely declined the positions and returned the checks. He had no interest whatsoever in money and could not be bothered with the problem of marketing his inventions. His head was too full of ideas for new products. Advice, he thought, should always be free. He hoped it would reflect favorably on people's attitude toward his race, if he helped others with their problems. His own needs were minimal. Indeed, out of a salary of \$1,500 a year at Tuskegee, he saved \$33,000 which he donated to the Carver Foundation for creative research in chemistry.

Many people from all over the world sought out this shy and retiring man, wanting to talk to him and to observe his work. Edison, Henry Ford, Theodore Roosevelt, and other important men became his friends. Honors and honorary degrees came his way. One was the Roosevelt Medal for distinguished service in the field of science (1939). He was introduced to the dinner guests in Theodore Roosevelt's New York home with these words which are a summing up: "I have the honor to present not a man only, but a life, transfused with passion for the enlarging and enriching of the living of his fellowman."

Respectfully,

H. G. R. Jones

United States Should Face Facts About War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following column by Robert Jones:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Dec. 18, 1965]

UNITED STATES SHOULD FACE FACTS ABOUT WAR IN VIETNAM

(By Robert Jones)

NEW YORK.—"What price victory?" was the editorial lament of The New York Times regarding the recent bloody clashes in South Vietnam. In Hanoi, at the same time, a North Vietnamese staff officer confidently predicted eventual American withdrawal.

"I may not live to see the end myself," he told a British newsmen, "but I expect my children will."

The two reactions are directly related. They sum up the fundamental problem in Vietnam—and wherever else we may face this type of aggression: Are we going to be able to out-bleed and out-wait the Communists?

It is already obvious that many Americans are not willing to go the length. Indications are that the Communists will. Militarily, we can hold off the Communists indefinitely in Vietnam. But the Communists are openly banking on the conviction that we will lose the war right here in the United States.

UNITED STATES HAS ROLE OF ROME

This is a war we have to fight. It is not, however, a war we have to win. This is no contradiction. Our war in Vietnam is the type of war waged successfully by the legions of Rome for some four centuries—the Pax Romana during which the legionnaires manned the ramparts of civilization against the constant encroachments of the Barbarians.

Rome decayed, her will weakened, the Barbarians overran the ramparts and a thousand years of darkness descended. Today, we are faced with the same prospect.

For 20 years we have been trying to man the walls against the new barbarians. Until now, we have been protecting civilization at remarkably little cost in human life. Now, as in Korea, we must pay for our values in blood. And loss of this war could be infinitely more disastrous than would have been defeat in Korea.

In Vietnam, there is no final victory remotely in sight. There rarely is in guerrilla warfare. Once a guerrilla movement has eaten to the core of a country it seems almost impossible to eradicate. In our own hemisphere, guerrilla warfare has ravaged the Colombian backlands since 1948, taking some 300,000 lives. Algeria, Malaya, the Philippines, and Vietnam itself are examples of guerrilla insurrections which dragged on year after bloody year.

ONE GUERRILLA VERSUS 10 G'S

Nor is our technological supremacy likely to bring the present struggle to a quick conclusion. Manpower as well as machines is vital in guerrilla warfare. Statistics of a score of such wars show that a ratio of 10 regulars to one guerrilla is needed to smother a guerrilla movement.

North Viet Nam's military strategists say the proportion could have been halved to five regulars to one guerrilla and they would still win. They point out that both sides place Communist strength in South Viet Nam at about 200,000 men—meaning that at least a million regulars would be needed to cope with them effectively.

Here is the great weakness of our present effort. Such a vast army means sending hundreds of thousands of citizen soldiers, the draftees and Reservists. And it is precisely the citizen soldier who is least suitable for anti-guerrilla war. Military professionals are needed—highly trained specialists like the Marines, Special Forces, the paratroops.

There is even a more fundamental weakness to fielding a mass army. For the professional soldier, death is an occupational hazard, but combat is not the chosen occupation of the citizen soldier. Anti-war pressures will inevitably mount with the soaring casualty lists of citizen soldiers until the wall of "what price victory?" becomes deafening.

FUMBLING IN POLICY

Is there a solution to the dilemma? Perhaps not. However, the White House and Pentagon should realize that the real struggle for South Viet Nam is being fought right here in the United States. Public opinion in a democracy is as vitally important as any strategic military consideration. Unfortunately, the present heavy-handed policy of

managed news, manipulated casualty lists and official optimism simply isn't effective in an otherwise open society.

The government should emphasize and re-emphasize that this is going to be a long war. There should be no sudden elation over victories, no clumsy efforts to conceal defeats. Instead government spokesmen should settle down to a calm and even stolid systematic dissemination of the facts.

We should resist the temptation to pour a million men into Viet Nam and seek a quick, decisive solution—which has always been an American characteristic as well as a military tradition. Instead, our manpower commitment there should be held to a bare minimum, mainly professionals. Let them dig in, set up a military meat-grinder to chew up guerrillas for as long as necessary.

This may not bring peace to Viet Nam in our time. But perhaps our children will see it. At least, that should be our attitude.

The Blind Man and the Elephant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 5, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, during my 22 years in the U.S. Congress, I have had the honor and privilege of serving a portion of that time with the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. This term of service gave me a great appreciation for our Nation's merchant marine, its abilities and its potential.

At the present time, the endeavors of our merchant marine to compete with the other nations of the world in their respective maritime efforts is a subject of current discussion. An article entitled "The Blind Men and the Elephant" appears in the May issue of Pilot, the official organ of the National Maritime Union of America, AFL-CIO. This article gives some cogent reasons why we are slipping in our efforts to compete in this international undertaking to provide the free world with proper maritime service.

I am pleased to insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an exposition of what is facing our Nation in meeting the challenges of the future.

THE BLIND MEN AND THE ELEPHANT

"It was six men of Indostan
To learning much inclined
Who went to see the elephant
(Though all of them were blind)
That each by observation
Might satisfy his mind."

That old Hindu tale by John Godfrey Saxe about the blind men and the elephant has a very modern application. It epitomizes the effort of six government agencies to "understand" the American merchant marine, an effort which resulted in the notorious Inter-agency Task Force Report.

The Task Force group had representatives of nine agencies but three of them can be excluded from this fable: the Council of Economic Advisors is not an administrative agency, but purely advisory; the Federal Maritime Commission is solely regulatory; and the Department of Labor made clear it was not a party to the report which the Task Force produced.