

morning stage at Chillicothe was 32.6 feet, about 8 feet above flood stage.

CHECKING NEW RISE

Col. W. G. Kratz, Missouri district engineer for the Army, said his agency was keeping a close watch on the new rise and its effect on water-soaked levees along the stream.

Under close watch, he said, is the new 16-mile levee protecting Elwood and Wathena, Kans., and the Roscreans air field, near St. Joseph. He said additional efforts would be made to bolster the levee protecting Sherman air field at Ft. Leavenworth.

The Big Muddy is expected to crest at 25.5 feet at Rulo, Neb., tomorrow afternoon. This would be only .1 of a foot under the record set in the 1952 flood.

A stage of 25 feet, 7 feet above flood stage, is forecast at St. Joseph next Sunday morning.

Points below the flood crest area are also under close watch. The Army engineers have 47 persons on duty at the mouth of the Gasconade, where three acres of the corps boat yard already is under water.

The annual summer field training exercise of the Kansas, Utah and Wyoming National Guard units at Camp Guernsey, Wyo., was mired down in mud.

The operation was changed from a tactical maneuver because of dangerous conditions caused by heavy rains in the canyon areas around the camp. Guard officials said it would be hazardous to transport heavy equipment, including 155-millimeter howitzers, over the soggy terrain.

A temporary ramp built to support a bridge across the North Platte river was washed out by the high water. It has been raining nearly steadily for two days and two nights.

Rains last night in those sections ranged up to six inches south of Beaver City, Neb., and three inches at Oberlin and Norton in Kansas and Stamford in Nebraska.

TO REACH 1966 LEVEL

The bureau said the flooding south of Beaver City will be about the same as that in June, 1966, on Sappa creek. At Oberlin, where flood stage is 11 feet, a crest of 13.5 to 14 feet was expected.

The creek flows into the Upper Republican river.

The Red Cross set up emergency shelters in Grand Island, Neb., and more than 100 persons spent the night in the high school in the town of Kenesaw, about 30 miles southwest of Grand Island. High waters on the Big Blue followed another night of heavy rains ranging more than 6 inches in Southwestern Nebraska.

In Montana high water severed the east-west main line of the Northern Pacific railroad east of Livingston. Bridges were washed out and Interstate 90 was closed between Big Timber and Columbus, Mont. Possible flooding in Billings, Mont., was expected as the Yellowstone river was gorged with incoming tributary waters.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Times,
June 17, 1967]

MISSOURI LEVEES OUT—SWOLLEN BY REPEATED RAINSTORMS, RIVER CRESTS BREACH MANY BANKS ALONG THE WAY TO ST. LOUIS—ACRES FLOODED—ARMY ENGINEERS REPORT 40 BREAKS ALONG STREAM

The Missouri river, swollen by new rains over the last 24 hours, sent new flood crests racing downstream between Miami, Mo., and St. Louis, breaking or overflowing levees and inundating around 50,000 acres of farmland.

The Army Corps of Engineers office at Glasgow reported about 40 levees breached with over 1,000 persons working on sand-bagging and earth moving operations in an effort to stem existing breaches and prevent new breaks.

GLASGOW CREST TO DROP

At Glasgow, the river maintained a crest of 30.7 feet between 6 o'clock and 10 o'clock last night but corps officials expected this to drop by Monday.

Predictions of a 29.5-foot crest by Monday at Glasgow would still put the river four and a half feet over bankfull with corresponding situations downstream.

The engineers reported no towns were threatened and no farm houses had been ordered evacuated.

The severity was indicated by the size of the break in the David-Noland-Merrill levee south and east of Carrollton. That breach had widened to 70 yards yesterday afternoon. Unofficial sources said the amount of land covered in Carroll County is 10,000 acres. Some 50 families have been evacuated from the lowlands in the county.

BOONVILLE BRACING ITSELF

River forecasters expect further trouble this morning downstream at Boonville where the river is predicted to top at 27.7 feet, almost seven feet over bankfull. The surge is expected to hit Jefferson City with a 26.5 reading tonight.

The heavy line of thunderstorms that moved across Eastern Kansas and Western Missouri yesterday afternoon will not make any appreciable difference to rivers here swollen by recent downpours.

A second flood crest is coming down the Missouri river but the weather bureau reports it will not be as high as forecast previously.

The Missouri here is expected to top off at 21.5 feet at 8 o'clock tomorrow night. Bankful is 22 feet but levees can handle a further 20 feet rise.

Today's forecast calls for a 20 per cent chance of rain and a 10 per cent chance tonight.

ST. JOSEPH CREST TOMORROW

A crest of 21.5 feet is expected at St. Joseph tomorrow afternoon. This is more than 4 feet over flood stage but river forecasters expect no flooding.

The swift current in the Missouri has deepened the channel there by churning up bottom sand which becomes suspended in the water allowing the river to carry the same amount of water at a lower stage.

Yesterday's storm, which dumped .36 of an inch of rain on the Kansas City area, brought the 24-hour rain total to .43.

Windstorms also did some damage in the area.

TRAILER HOME TOPPLED

The five members of the Ernest Brewster family escaped with only superficial injuries yesterday when high winds blew their trailer home over on its top at Lawrence, Kans.

"I had a premonition and was watching the clouds," Brewster said. "The rain had stopped when I saw debris blowing by, and over we went."

Mr. and Mrs. Brewster and their three children—Michele, 4½, Jonathan, 2, and Lorraine, 1—were in the kitchen of the trailer. It was demolished, and they crawled out through a hole in one end. Michele had a cut on one foot, and the others had scratches.

The trailer was parked on the Old Baldwin road about six miles south of Lawrence near the Vinland community.

The winds destroyed a shed and blew down several trees at the home of a neighbor, Darryl Salls.

BIG RAIN AT EMPORIA

Emporia, in East-Central Kansas, recorded 3.11 inches of rain in six hours.

Rains Thursday and Friday halted the Kansas wheat harvest from Great Bend west.

As the rains moved southeast, Loyal Fortmyer, director of the state harvest labor control office in Great Bend, said the harvest undoubtedly will be delayed in south-central counties, too.

Rains of 1 to 3 inches were reported through much of the area where the wheat is ready, and Fortmyer said he does not expect the harvest to be resumed until the first of next week.

In Grand Island, Nebr., thousands of residents, Air Force personnel and national guardsman hauled sandbags and moved furniture as water from the Wood river swirled northward into the city of 25,000.

NEBRASKA HIT HARD

Evacuation centers accommodate several hundred Nebraskans during the night. About 30 per cent of Grand Island was covered by flood water, but there was none in the main business district.

In Eastern Nebraska hundreds of acres of farm land were under water and many highways were flooded or closed by bridge washouts.

Ten tornadoes by official count were sighted in Nebraska Thursday night—the tenth straight day of violent weather in the area.

Serious flooding continued in Central Montana, although the Yellowstone river began to subside. The Northern Pacific railroad's main line was still closed yesterday near Greycliff. Some flooding was reported along the Gallatin river, U.S. 10 between Big Timber and Columbus, Mont., remained closed.

STORMS IN CHICAGO AREA

The Chicago area was raked by a violent thunderstorm. Midway airport reported hailstones three-quarters of an inch thick. The official Midway airport reporting station measured 1.40 inches of rain in 15 minutes—an all-time record for a 15-minute rainfall in the Chicago area.

Before power failure shut off the wind measuring instrument at Midway airport it had recorded winds at 63 miles an hour. Some hangars were partly unroofed, planes were tossed about and damaged and windows were blown out. A Beechcraft Bonanza, which flipped over on its back, was registered to Troy Arnold of Richmond, Va.

Debris from the roofs of hangars was blown into Cicero avenue and traffic was tied up for 45 minutes.

Winds shattered display windows in Chicago Heights.

A funnel cloud was sighted west of Mokena, Ill., and visibility in the Kanakee, Ill., area was reduced to zero by heavy rain and strong winds. Earlier funnel clouds were sighted in Madison, Wis., and Milwaukee. Moline, Ill., was pelted by soft hail and gusty winds.

NE file

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. GRUENING, Mr. President, recent national polls have shown that the overwhelming number of people in the United States who have any opinions on the Arab-Israel conflict believe that the Israelis were right and the Arabs were wrong. This is not surprising in the least. For 19 years Israel has struggled to maintain its independence to develop its economy, to accept without limit refugees from oppression and to foster democratic institutions which advance the dignity of the individual. During this period the Arab countries have maintained a policy of unrelenting hostility to the very concept of the existence of Israel. They have devoted their scant resources not to the betterment of their illiterate and abjectly impoverished peasants but to the acquisition of billions of dollars of weapons with the avowed purpose of using them to destroy Israel. Their people remain mired in a feudal society which barely sustains their existence and

Milford, placed in operation last January near Junction City, has been filling slowly. With rises on the Republican river, it now has jumped up nine feet in the last four days. Perry, northwest of Lawrence, is only 65 percent completed. But the contractor and the Army engineers rigged an emergency power setup and closed the gates on the dam. Now 179,000 acre-feet of Delaware river water is temporarily trapped behind the embankment. This action, needless to say, proved highly popular downstream at Lawrence, where the long-planned levee system still is on paper.

At Topeka, these storms surely would have put tough old Soldier creek out in the streets in the old days. But Soldier creek has a new, manmade bypass channel, a strait jacket of stone and concrete that scooted the high water out of town in a hurry. Again, the public works budget includes the first money for the Pattonsburg dam—but this week the Grand river was way out of its banks from Chillicothe on down.

So far this year, a Vietnam-conscious Congress has been reluctant to invest in river projects at the usual rate. When the full figures are available on the floods that didn't happen in soggy Missouri and Kansas these last few days, they just might change their mind.

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News Press, June 17, 1967]

THE VALUE OF LEVEES

Northwest Missouri's current flood tragedy is demonstrating the value—where they exist—of levees and reservoirs.

In unprotected areas, flood damage is likely to be high. Thousands of acres of farmland have been inundated, and some persons have been forced to flee their homes.

There has been flooding along the Grand, Platte, and Little Platte rivers. Reservoirs authorized for the Little Platte and the Grand could have prevented much of this.

The value of the reservoirs and the levees has been demonstrated in this area. Reservoirs on various rivers in Kansas have helped control the water flow there, keeping the Kaw and the lower Missouri at manageable levels.

In the St. Joseph area, levees have prevented flooding at Rosecrans Field and at Elwood, and have protected much other low land to the south.

Water is among man's greatest blessings, but too much of it can be a curse if steps have not been taken to control it. The reservoirs are a key to proper water management.

The current floods are another reason why Northwest Missourians should continue to push for water resource projects on the Little Platte and the Grand—already authorized—and on the Platte itself. Such reservoirs will in the future help prevent the type of damage which has occurred so often in the past and is happening again right now.

The success of the levee—even though it is only partially completed—is proof of the wisdom of those who planned the structure and are carrying it to completion.

[From the Chillicothe (Mo.) Constitution-Tribune, June 14, 1967]

GRAND REACHES HIGHEST MARK SINCE RECORD FLOOD OF 1947—STAGE IS 32.08 EARLY THIS AFTERNOON HERE BUT IT MAY REACH 33 FEET; SOME FAMILIES FORCED TO EVACUATE

The Grand River south of Chillicothe missed its predicted crest for the second straight night as floodwaters covered approximately 80,000 acres of land in Livingston County today.

Heavy rains north of here Monday night and Tuesday caused the river to continue to rise late yesterday and last night after weather bureau officials had predicted a crest of 31 feet at midnight last night. The Grand

at 1 o'clock this afternoon was 32.08 and holding steady. A crest of 33 feet was expected for Chillicothe later today.

The present 32.08 reading is the fifth highest recorded here, according to records kept on the Grand since 1909. The river today is at its highest stage since the record flood of 1947.

The water moved to the southwest edge of Chillicothe overnight causing one family to evacuate their home on Keith street at 3 a.m. Water also was reported in four rooms of the Bend Motel and an antique shop just south of the city limits.

Furniture and other items were being moved to the east part of the motel by Edwood Allatt this morning. The floodwaters were at the edge of a trailer court west of old highway 65, and across from the Bend.

U.S. 65 near Farmersville was closed to passenger traffic last night and only large trucks were being permitted to travel north from here. The highway department told The Constitution-Tribune shortly before 2 o'clock this afternoon that water was still over the highway but all traffic was now using the road.

For the first time since 1947 water was across old highway 36 south of Chillicothe in the Bear Lake bottoms. Traffic was heavy on highways 65 and 36 last night as hundreds of vehicles traveled the area south and west of here to get a view of the floodwaters.

The Grand topped the 30-foot level yesterday at 1 p.m. and by 8 o'clock last night had climbed another foot to 31.03. By 7 a.m. today it had risen more than another foot and was at 32.05.

The Thompson fork of the Grand at Trenton started falling last night. Hobart Sparks, weather observer, reported the reading at Trenton at 6:30 yesterday was 21.72 and this morning it was down to 19.74. Water was reported to be dropping fast there today.

Trenton police reported heavy rain there again this morning and the showers moved on north. Depending on how much rain was received north of here, the worst seems to be over.

Some families residing in the low areas west and south of here left their homes Monday and yesterday. It is not known for sure how many families have moved out of their homes in Livingston County because of the flooding waters.

Railroad crews have been on duty since Monday at the Burlington railroad bridge just west of U.S. 36 where it crosses the river. The men have attempted to keep heavy drift from piling up against the bridge.

Several large levees protecting bottom land broke late yesterday and last night. Volunteers worked through the night at several locations attempting to keep water off the bottom land between U.S. 36 and old 36 and south of the old highway.

Harold Beetsma and Joe Ruppel started calling for volunteers yesterday afternoon to sand bag levees in those areas. The men and a large number of high school boys worked through the night loading sand bags and carrying them to several locations along the levees and on old 36 near Utica.

Beetsma farms approximately 3,200 acres and Ruppel has about 900 acres. Beetsma said this morning that all of his levees had broken and they were now concentrating their efforts near west edge of old 36. The workers were attempting to protect 400 acres of beans and about 80 acres of corn south of the old highway.

The Corps of Engineers at Glasgow provided 4,000 sand bags and they arrived here yesterday afternoon. Sand was donated by many persons along with trucks and boats. The Five-Watt Wizards, a local CB radio club, was also on duty. They provided radio communications and brought water and coffee to the workers.

The Salvation Army also provided coffee. Most of the efforts were washed aside by

the high waters, but Beetsma told a Constitution-Tribune newsman he just couldn't stand by and watch the water roll over the levees. "We felt like we had to try to hold it back, but it just kept coming," he said.

This was the first serious flood since Sept. 22, 1965 when the Grand reached a crest of 31.70. That flood caused \$1,178,000 in damage to crops alone in Livingston County.

The Grand is higher now, but the loss might not be so great because planting of crops has been restricted because of excessive rainfall during the last two months.

Thousands of acres of cropland are under water in the Sumner and Brunswick areas. The Grand is expected to crest 10 feet over bankfull stage at Sumner Friday. A crest of 36 feet is expected there at 3 a.m. Friday and at Brunswick it is expected to reach a crest of 22.50 by midnight Friday. Flood stage at Brunswick is 12 feet.

The only levels higher than today's 32.08 here were July 7, 1909 (33.60), June 3, 1930 (32.20), June 7, 1947 (33.82) and June 24, 1947 (33.53).

Levees south of Wheeling and near Roach Lake were reported to still be holding back the floodwaters this afternoon, but one large levee south of Sampsel was reported to have broken at midnight last night.

[From Kansas City (Mo.) Times, June 16, 1967]

NEW FLOOD BLOW NEAR—WITH MORE THAN 15,000 ACRES OF LAND UNDER WATER IN RAY AND CARROLL COUNTIES, THE MISSOURI CONTINUES TO RISE—WATCH A LEVEE—ELWOOD AND WATHEENA, KANS., AND ROSECRANS FIELD SAFETY DOUBT

The flooding Missouri river is giving the state of Missouri a one-two punch. The second punch is expected to be worse than the first.

A crest of 30.5 feet is forecast to reach the Glasgow, Mo., area by this morning. This would be 5½ feet above flood stage.

KEEPING CLOSE WATCH

On hand in that area are 52 Army engineer personnel and some 600 workmen watching the rising waters and reinforcing weakened levees.

The second flood, caused by two days of heavy rains in Nebraska and Iowa, is expected to cause heavy rises in the Missouri river from Nebraska City to Jefferson City.

"In many cases," the weather bureau said, "the rises will exceed those of the last week."

Many highways already are closed by high water.

RAIL LINES CLOSED

Several railroads have been forced to suspend operations in some areas. The Chicago, Burlington & Quincy lost a bridge at Rosendale, near St. Joseph. The Rock Island still is closed between Atchison, Kans., and St. Joseph and the Missouri Pacific is closed between Kansas City and Jefferson City.

Estimates indicated that more than 15,000 acres of land were under water in Ray and Carroll counties on the north side of Big Muddy. This includes land between the banks and the levees.

Sheriff Paul Johnson of Carroll County said a break in the Davis-Merrill-Nolan levee on the north bank of the Missouri just above Waverly is so big it can't be repaired until the water recedes.

He said water was pouring through a gap 6 feet deep "and two telephone poles wide." Sixty to 70 families were moving out of their homes.

The river fell about a foot during the night in the Waverly area. Still closed was U.S. 65, which is under 2½ feet of water between Waverly and Carrollton.

Tributaries of the Missouri are gradually falling. The Grand was expected to drop within banks at Pattonsburg and Gallatin last night and at Chillicothe by Sunday. The

which gives them little hope for their future.

The smashing military victory of the Israelis, in which the combined armed forces of the Arab countries were destroyed in 60 hours, has been properly hailed as one of the most successful military campaigns ever waged. The dread of every military leader is the necessity to fight on two fronts. Israel, surrounded by hostile countries on all sides, had to face an enemy on four fronts and to engage the enemy actively on three in order to insure its survival.

The results of that conflict are now a matter of history, but analysts will seek for years to come the reasons which enabled a country of some two and a half million people to defeat countries with a population 50 times greater and occupying an area 100 times as great. One fact, however, is evident. The Arab armies, poorly trained and poorly led, with no stomach for laying down their lives for governments which had given them no reason for devotion, were no match for the Israelis. The latter knew, down to the last soldier and airman, down to the last worker and farmer reservist, that the survival of Israel as a nation and of the Israelis as a people was at stake.

Radio Cairo had for weeks called for a "jiddah," a holy war against Israel. Egypt had mobilized its armies and had poised seven divisions in Sinai at the Israeli borders. Nasser had taken over military command of the Arab Legion of Jordan, had blockaded the Gulf of Aqaba, and had ordered the United Nations Emergency Force to leave, clearing the way for an assault through the Negev. Syrian forces, entrenched on the heights above the Sea of Galilee and assisted, apparently by Russian officers, had poured an unrelenting fire down onto Israel villages.

Under these conditions the Israelis knew that they could not wait to see whether President Johnson would succeed in persuading other maritime nations to test the Gulf of Aqaba blockade, neither could they wait for the Arab armies to cross their borders.

Whether the Israelis struck first is only of academic interest. When an individual points a loaded gun at you and states repeatedly that he is going to kill you, the law provides and commonsense dictates that you do not wait until he shoots you before taking reasonable measures to resist the aggression. The situation in the Middle East on June 5, 1967, was as simple as that.

The Arab nations for 19 years had been waging an aggressive guerrilla war against Israel, had indeed declared a perpetual war on that little nation, and had given plain intention that they were about to launch a formal attack against Israel. What were the Israelis to do? Wait until the Arab air forces in their Russian planes had bombed Tel Aviv and Haifa? Wait until the Arab armies had moved onto Israeli soil? If Israel was to survive, it could not conduct a military campaign within the borders of its country—a tiny land scarcely larger than Connecticut and so poorly demarcated from a military viewpoint that Jordan-

ian troops were already in position to shell Tel Aviv, a bare 15 miles from Jordanian territory.

What a poor joke it is for Russia to bring a charge of aggression against Israel in the United Nations General Assembly. Soviet Russia has further stoked the fires of Arab aggression with massive military aid and has lent support to the Arab dream of driving Israel into the sea. Russia sought to find in the instability of the Arab governments and in the desperation of the masses a fertile ground for the intrusion of its power and influence in that area of the world. It has made the Middle East a pawn in its cold war tactics against the United States.

The record of arms shipments by Russia to Arab countries in the last 10 years makes a mockery of her accusations of aggression against Israel. The Soviet Union, according to data accumulated by the Government of Israel, has supplied the Arab countries with 2,000 tanks, of which 1,000 have gone to Egypt. The Kremlin has delivered 700 modern fighter aircraft and bombers. The Israeli sweep through the Sinai disclosed that the Egyptians had received Russian surface-to-air missiles. Egypt alone had received 540 field guns, 130 medium field guns, 200 120-millimeter mortars, 695 anti-aircraft guns, 175 rocket launchers, 14 submarines and 46 torpedo boats including missile carrying boats. The Egyptian army and air force has been trained by Soviet military experts. Recent reports from American newspaper reporters indicate that some Syrian forces raining artillery fire on Israeli territory were under the direction of Russian military advisers.

Nor has Russia followed a constructive role in the United Nations in the search for peace in the Middle East. Its repeated use of the veto in the Security Council insured that the Arab countries could continue their aggression against Israel by means of guerrilla attacks without fear of censure, while Israel could take action to protect itself only at the risk of incurring a Security Council censure.

I wish I could say that the actions of the United States in the Middle East in the last 10 years were commendable. Unfortunately, the United States is greatly at fault for what has occurred. For years, U.S. policy has been to attempt to maintain a kind of balance in that troubled area, to balance the phenomenal growth of the Israel economy, achieved in large measure through its own efforts, by giving massive economic assistance to the Arab world and attempting to tie Jordan to the United States by supporting its military budget almost in its entirety. This policy has failed.

The United States sought to appease those nations bent on the destruction of Israel.

The policy of appeasement failed.

It did not secure peace and stability in the Middle East. The Arab world has become more unstable, notably Syria, Iraq, Algeria, and Yemen. The economic and military assistance we provided the Arabs became a means of their acquiring the strength to launch an aggressive attack against Israel. I have protested

against this policy of subsidizing Nasser for many years. However, it was not until 1966 that our massive food shipments to Egypt were cut off—shipments which enabled Nasser to conserve his scanty foreign exchange which he used to equip his armies. And even then we continued large-scale aid to the other Arab countries.

Illustrative of some of the difficulties that the prospects for peace in the Middle East face is the performance of Jordan's King Hussein. Coming to this country to appear before the United Nations, he had the gall to warn the General Assembly that if Israel were allowed to keep "even 1 square foot" of the land it had taken, the United Nations would never again be able to make a cease-fire stick anywhere.

The fact is that of the many discredited figures in the Arab fiasco none is more so than King Hussein. The United States has supported his country lavishly, paying a large share of his budget and quite mistakenly supplying him with arms. These arms were presumably to be used again Communist aggression. But typically, as in many other examples, these arms were not used for the purpose for which they were intended but indeed for the opposite purpose, for Russian communism was supporting Arab aggression. Jordan has little justification as an independent state, and its role, as the U.S. policymakers have indicated, was as a kind of peacemaking buffer state which, though Arab, would be less hostile and less aggressive in its purposes and designs against Israel than the other.

Before the outbreak of this 4-day war the Israel Government sent messages to the king urging him not to attack and saying that if he did not there would be no counterattack or action by the Israel troops across the Jordanian border. King Hussein not only rejected this peace offer but rushed to embrace Nasser, joined him in his attack, started the bombing of Israel and brought upon himself the inevitable reprisal.

He has no case whatever in the record of history or in the court of public opinion. He is and should be thoroughly discredited for his double-dealing, for his aggression, and for the folly deliberately embarked on, which not only cost many lives of Jordanians but quite a few Israelis who did everything in their power to obviate action on the Israel-Jordan front. Hussein has no legitimate claim of the kind that he makes. He alone is responsible for the loss of previously Jordanian terrain.

But now the fat is in the fire and we must begin to develop a policy to extinguish the flames of hostility. The prospects are none too bright. The Arab countries, stung by their humiliating defeat, will not be inclined to enter into direct negotiations with Israel much less formally admit to the existence of the State of Israel which for 20 years they have denied. The Soviet Union, likewise deeply humiliated by the fiasco of its Middle East policy seeks to allay the growing suspicions of the value of its support by resuming military aid to Egypt and by fanning the illusions of the Arabs that the situation that existed

S 8940

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 27, 1967

before June 5, 1967, can somehow be restored. Within a few days after the Arab defeat Russian arms were again on their way to Egypt.

Nor can we look to the United Nations to provide the forum out of which meaningful proposals for a long-range solution to the problems of the Middle East can be expected to emerge. Indeed, the failure of the United Nations to carry out any of the assurances given to Israel in 1957 has dealt a staggering blow to the hopes we have held that that organization can be a major force for peace in this troubled world.

It must be recalled that in March 1957, after the Israelis had, for the second time, defeated the Arab armies, the General Assembly assured Israel of free passage through the Suez Canal and the Strait of Tiran. A United Nations Emergency Force was to separate the armies in Sinai and Gaza and terrorist attacks against Israel were to cease. Israel accepted these assurances and withdrew its forces from Gaza and from the entrance to the Strait of Tiran and from Sinai. In effect Israel placed its trust and hopes for security in the international community acting through the United Nations. But these hopes were misplaced. Since 1962 Nasser has been preparing his people for armed attack against Israel and as the tempo of these preparations increased the United Nations stood by unwilling or unable to enforce the 1957 agreements. By 1966 it had become evident that the Arab world was determined to destroy Israel. President Al-Atassi of Syria had declared:

We raise the slogan of the people's liberation war. We want total war with no limits, a war that will destroy the Zionist base.

Egypt had proclaimed that—

The noose around Israel's neck is tightening gradually—Israel is no mightier than the empires which were vanquished in the Arab east and west—the Arab people will take possession of their full rights in their united homeland.

In May 1967, Egyptian forces began to move into the Sinai. At the request of Egypt, the United Nations Emergency Force was removed from its positions between Israel and Egyptian forces. A general mobilization of reservists was conducted by Egypt. And finally the decisive step—Egypt announced the blockade of Israel shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba and the Strait of Tiran.

While the United Nations Security Council endlessly debated the situation, and while the United States unsuccessfully sought to arrange a grouping of maritime nations to test Egypt's blockade in the Gulf of Aqaba, time was running out. Finally Israel did what she had to do as an act of elementary self-defense and to insure her own survival. The Arab forces of aggression were destroyed and Israel occupied such territory in Jordan, Syria, and the Sinai as would assure that such aggression could not occur again. History can record no more brilliant military performance.

The Arab countries, having failed in their plans for the destruction of Israel, are now engaged in a massive effort with the support of the Soviet Union, to turn the clock back to May 1967 and to re-

establish all of the conditions of instability and intransigence in the Middle East.

But this cannot be done.

Israel did not sacrifice its citizen-soldiers—a loss to that small country comparable to the death of 50,000 Americans—to see Arab armies once again poised on its borders, its shipping, so vital to its economy, barred from the Suez Canal and from the Gulf of Aqaba, and the Palestine Liberation Army carrying out its murderous attacks once more on Israeli villages.

Stability and peace can be assured in the Middle East, but not by acceding to the demands that Israel relinquish the territories she now occupies and which the bitter lesson of recent days shows she must retain at least until adequate and trustworthy arrangements for her security are obtained. No pressure from a United Nations General Assembly, which has shown itself incapable and unwilling to establish peace in the Middle East, should be allowed to negate the consequences of defeat for the Arab world. Nasser and his allies have chosen to find an outlet for their implacable hostility to Israel in a test of military strength. The choice was theirs. They are now tasting the bitter fruits of their frustrated ambitions.

Let them gaze out from Cairo and Amman and Damascus on their lands now occupied by Israeli forces and ponder whether the time has not come to admit the utter futility of their rabid hate.

It is being said that the humiliation of defeat is so bitter to the Arabs that they can ever agree to meeting with Israel to work out a solution to the manifold problems of the Middle East. But, the only cure for this state of paranoia, is a constant confrontation with reality. Their armies are smashed, their economies are near ruin, and some of what was once their soil is occupied by a hostile force.

The Arab leaders must get over the idea that they cannot even with Russian assistance undo the consequences of their aggression and their defeat. When this is realized the possibility for direct negotiations between the Arab countries and Israel will become real and the first step in achieving a permanent solution in the Middle East will have been taken.

For the moment, the United Nations and the great powers need do no more than address themselves to the two most urgent tasks: providing relief for the refugees who have fled before the Israel armies and those who now find themselves in Israel-occupied territory. Therefore, it is encouraging that the administration is providing Israel with \$30 million in food shipments—if more is required to feed the Arab population in the Gaza strip and in West Jordan more should be made available. On the other hand, no purpose is served by continuing food shipments to Algeria, the Sudan, Syria, Iraq and above all to the United Arab Republic. Over 23,000 tons of food-stuff is now scheduled for delivery to these countries. Economic assistance of any kind should not be given to the Arab countries which have broken diplomatic relations with the United States or which make clear their determination to con-

tinue their warfare against Israel. I had sent a telegram to Secretary of State Rusk on this matter some days ago and am encouraged to note that some technical assistance contracts with the UAR have now been terminated. But more can and should be done in halting the flow of aid still in the pipeline and in insuring that no further aid programs are undertaken until a peace settlement is negotiated.

The solution of the refugee problem, however, will require more than the shipment of food and clothing and the establishment of new camps, necessary as these things may be. There are, in my view, two important requirements which must be met if a just and equitable solution to this long-festering problem is to be achieved. The million or more refugees must be integrated into the social and economic structure of the Middle East. The preservation of refugee camps as centers for political opposition to the existence of the State of Israel can no longer be tolerated. Plans for the absorption of the refugees should be drawn up by the Arab States and by Israel and Israel should recognize its responsibility for achieving a solution to this problem. This will take some time. However, immediate action can be taken to correct a serious shortcoming in the administration of refugee programs by the United Nations. In my October 1963 report on the Middle East, I pointed out that 99 percent of the employees of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency are locally recruited. Most of them are refugees themselves. Even if the UNRWA leadership was dedicated to the concept of training Arab refugees and settling them in Arab countries or in other countries as useful, productive citizens, the vast majority of UNRWA employees could not, because of their backgrounds, be dedicated to carrying out such a policy.

At the time I wrote the report, I advocated the establishment of a United Nations Middle East Peace Corps. This would be formed along the lines of our own Peace Corps, composed of volunteers from countries, other than the countries involved, to work with the refugees in a well-financed program to educate and train the refugees, to help them obtain employment, and to assist in their resettlement. Funds could be made available from aid grants and from local currencies owned by the United States which resulted from the sale of agricultural commodities under Public Law 480.

These recommendations are as valid now as they were when they were made in 1963. I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts in the chapter on refugees contained in my Middle East report at the conclusion of my remarks.

However, the most disturbing aspect of the Middle East situation which has developed since the end of hostilities is the fact that the Soviet Union and perhaps Czechoslovakia are determined to re-equip Egypt with military weapons and aircraft. While such action poses no immediate military threat to Israel—recent events have shown that the possession of large numbers of modern military weapons does not transform the Arabs into effective soldiers—it can have the

June 27, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8941

most serious consequences in fostering the Arab delusion that the results of their defeat can be wiped out and the clock turned back to May 1967. The Arabs would, once again, be encouraged to devote their energies to chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of military supremacy over Israel at the expense of economic development and internal reconstruction. Once more, the Middle East would become an area of cold war conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union, with all the dreadful possibilities of a direct military confrontation.

Unfortunately, the initial press reports on the meeting between President Johnson and Premier Kosygin do not indicate that any agreement was reached on curbing the incipient resumption of the arms race in the Middle East. Nonetheless, this remains an area in which American diplomacy can and should operate. First, by sharply curtailing its military equipment deliveries to the Middle East. Data I have obtained from the Department of Defense indicate that substantial aid in the form of grants and sales of military equipment were made to the Middle East countries in 1967. Second, by seeking out opportunities for a meeting of the principal countries supplying arms to the Middle East.

The June 17, 1967, issue of the New Republic carried on excellent editorial which made two important points: Israel, in defeating Arab aggression, scored a victory for the United States and Europe the magnitude of which can be appreciated if one contemplates the situation if there had been an Israeli defeat; and, second, the best course for the United States to follow in the Middle East is to let the dust settle and await the emergence of new directions and forces in the Arab world.

In my report on the Middle East already referred to, I questioned the wisdom of continuing U.S. economic aid program to Nasser in view of his announced intention of using such aid for aggression, and of our contributing to the arms race in the Middle East. The Department of State defended these programs as contributing to the lessening of tensions in that area. As events have shown, the Department of State could not have been more wrong. Perhaps it is not too much to hope that we have now learned the lesson that our military and economic assistance will not divert a country bound on a course of aggression.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the editorial from the New Republic of June 17, 1967, entitled "The Israeli Victory," an article by military writer S.L.A. Marshall entitled "Middle East War: The First Ever Won by Air Power," which appeared in the Anchorage News on June 26, 1967; an article by Nadav Safran and Stanley Hoffmann in the Nation for June 26, 1967, entitled "Guidelines for Policy," and selected excerpts from my report on the Middle East submitted on October 1, 1963, to the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

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

[From the Nation, June 26, 1967]

THE MIDDLE EAST: GUIDELINES FOR POLICY
(By Nadav Safran and Stanley Hoffmann)

(NOTE.—Mr. Safran and Mr. Hoffmann are both professors of government at Harvard University, the former specializing in Middle Eastern affairs and the latter in international relations. Their recent publications are as follows: Safran—The United States and Israel and Egypt in Search of Political Community (both Harvard University Press); Hoffmann—The State of War (Praeger) and Contemporary Theory in International Relations (Prentice-Hall.)

Crises such as the present one in the Middle East are very dangerous monuments for the international community generally and for the United States specifically, but they are also moments of great opportunity if they are wisely treated. After the Cuban missile crisis came the opportunity for the test-ban treaty and a détente in Europe. Positions that have been frozen may melt in the heat of war; assumptions that served as a premises for rigid positions may be confirmed or denied by the test of reality. Consequently, notions which appeared totally unrealistic only a week or two earlier become premises for sound action. The crucial aim is to allow vision and imagination to catch up with the changed realities.

The first notion to be assimilated in the present context is that the recent Israeli-Arab war was not like the war of 1956. This time all the Arab countries were involved, the leading Arab country had taken the initiative in altering the *status quo*, and had openly challenged Israel to an armed test. Israel, for its part, acted without the help of outside powers, and at the risk of losing its political existence if its expectations of military success had proved wrong. Consequently, what is involved now is no mere violation of the armistice agreements, which could be repaired and sanctioned by the restoration of the *status quo ante* as the UN chose to do it in 1956 (under U.S. leadership and despite Israel's objections; Israel's warnings about the dangers of such a restoration—merely camouflaged by the fragile presence of UNEF—have been vindicated). Whatever international lawyers may say juridically on this question, there is no doubt that the premises of the armistice agreements have entirely collapsed. A complete revision of the political relations in the area is required.

The most important change wrought by the war is the possibility it opens up, for the first time since 1949, for the conclusion of peace: real, formal, lasting peace treaties. There were two fundamental reasons why the Israel-Arab conflict has been so intractable since the conclusion of the 1949 armistice agreements. One was that the Arab countries, with the exception of Jordan, had very little if anything to gain from peace, while Israel had very little it could concede to the Arabs to induce them to make peace. The Arab governments sensed they could avoid making peace both because, thanks to the machinery of the armistice agreements established by the UN, the formal continuation of a state of war did not expose the Arab states to the possibility of penalization through the resumption of hostilities (this has been throughout history a crucial factor in inducing the losers of a war to move on to peace), and because a formal state of war gave them the advantage of denying Israel some of the benefits of peace (such as diplomatic relations and free passage through the Suez Canal). Arab governments therefore found it convenient to sit back and dream of revenge.

The second reason was that Egypt, as the leading Arab country, exerted a heavy pressure to discourage other Arab countries from making peace. It is significant in this respect that the other Arab countries did not dare

to sign even the armistice agreements until Egypt itself had signed.

The present war has affected the first reason fundamentally. Israel has made crucial war gains which it can concede back in exchange for peace, and the Arab countries have an incentive to give something in order to recover their losses. The United States can make this a key to an enduring settlement if we do not encourage any impression on the part of the Arabs that periodic defeats can be incurred on the battlefield because they will soon thereafter be erased on the diplomatic front.

And the present war has also drastically affected the second reason which has kept the Arab countries from accepting peace. Egypt has led its Arab associates into a war in which its own armed forces have been crushed and the other Arab countries have suffered grievous losses; any Egyptian claim to leadership has been shattered and Egypt's capacity to intimidate other Arab countries from reaching a settlement with Israel has been diminished. This is particularly true with regard to Jordan. Of course, President Nasser has shown in the past a capacity to convert military defeat into political victories; but he has succeeded heretofore *only with the help of outside powers*—like ourselves and the Russians in 1956—and only where the setback suffered was neither as total and unmitigated nor as obviously inflicted by tiny Israel as is the present one. If, therefore, we make it our conscious purpose not to do anything to help restore Nasser's Pan-Arab leadership and, on the contrary, do what we can to convey the facts of his defeat to his people and the other Arab peoples, the second fundamental obstacle to peace in the past will have been minimized.

Another factor which must be considered in this connection is the attitude of the Russians. Until very recently, the implicit expectation of Nasser and of the Syrian Government that in a showdown with Israel the Russians would come decisively to the rescue, as they did in 1956, has encouraged them to think in terms of an eventual violent and "final solution" of the Israeli problem rather than of some kind of peaceful accommodation. The attitude which the Russians actually took in the recent war—stopping as it did short of action—must be reckoned as encouraging a fundamental settlement.

Indeed, the Russian attitude may well forecast a basic reorientation of Soviet Middle East policy which, if the United States helps, could be extremely useful in arriving at an enduring solution. In the four or five years following the first Soviet "breakthrough" in the Middle East by means of the 1955 arms deal with Egypt, the Soviets tried at each crisis occasion to achieve recognition as a member of the club of Middle Eastern powers, only to be repeatedly rebuffed by us. Accordingly, they went on to build their position in the area through intensive cooperation with Nasser's Egypt and with other willing Arab countries and succeeded so well that when we, early in the present crisis, finally invited them to join the club, they decided to hold back. Apparently they hoped that a triumph by Nasser would eliminate the West completely and leave Russia as the one big Middle Eastern power. The collapse of Nasser's position after the Russians had invested so much in building it up might lead the USSR back to the idea of asserting its influence on Middle Eastern affairs through the big powers' club rather than on its own. This does not mean that the Russians would abandon their involvement with Nasser, Syria, et al., since those associations would remain useful as a justification for their membership claim. But it does mean that they would be more interested in a stabilized situation. And it is consonant with the present course and long-term interests of U.S. policy to make the USSR a partner, as long

as Soviet behavior contributes to moderating the international system.

It should not be lost sight of that that defeat of Nasser (and his allies) not only unfreezes the positions underlying the Israeli-Arab dispute and opens up prospects of a far-reaching reorientation of Russian policy but also makes likely the liquidation of the Yemen conflict and the easing of the problem of Aden and South Arabia. The materialization of these prospects, as of all the other opportunities, would depend decisively on our *not* doing anything that might permit Nasser to regain a position of Arab leadership.

Against this background it becomes possible to suggest what we, in the United States, should seek to accomplish by taking advantage of the new opportunities for settlement. As often at such moments, there are maximal and minimal objectives.

As a maximal objective, we should strive to achieve complete formal peace, including a solution to all the key problems of refugees, boundaries, transit of men and goods through waterways, on land and in the air. The means through which this might be achieved must be left to the professional diplomats; but two crucial observations must be kept in mind:

(1) We must avoid at all costs putting the Arab countries together on one side of the table and Israel on the other. This would be a sure formula for the reassertion of Nasser's Pan-Arab leadership and for encouraging intransigence. The example to follow is that of Ralph Bunche, who presided in 1949 over the conclusion of the armistice agreements, and who succeeded only by bringing the Israelis face to face with one Arab country at a time. Reinforcing this experience is the sad lesson of the Palestine Conciliation Commission which doomed its mission of peace to failure from the moment it got the Arab countries together as one collective side in the negotiations.

(2) We should not dump the problem of finding a settlement in the lap of the United Nations—General Assembly or Security Council. This would be a sure formula for disaster. The Israeli-Arab conflict is one of the most complex international problems. It calls for alert, patient, wise statesmanship, and not for UN resolutions. These are inspired by a motley of extrinsic considerations on the part of the voters (often totally ignorant of the elementary facts of this situation), and they can obtain the number of votes necessary for adoption only at the cost of either extreme vagueness or dangerous political compromises. The UN may be made to play an important role only as a subsidiary and support to the work of quiet and deliberate statesmanship. This must be provided by the big powers jointly and separately, in conjunction with the Middle Eastern countries concerned. A Lucarno-type agreement might be a useful framework, permitting the formal association of the big powers with a peace settlement in the role of parties and guarantors.

The minimal objective should consist of some package such as the following:

(1) Joint and separate big powers formal guarantees of the territorial *status quo* before the crisis, rectified to reduce the most glaring threats to Israel's security, plus specific guarantees regarding free navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal.

(2) An arms rationing scheme for the Middle East to which would adhere all potential suppliers, restricting shipments to weapons needed for minimum internal security.

(3) The placement of all nuclear installations in the area under the control of an international atomic energy agency.

(4) A specific formal commitment by Egypt renouncing belligerent rights, with particular reference to the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba, and similar commitments

on the parts of all other Arab countries with specific references to control of borders, infiltration into Israel, etc.

(5) The Gaza Strip to be put under Israeli military control, with an appropriate presence of and role for the United Nations.

(6) The big powers, jointly and separately, to launch a major program of economic and technical assistance to all Middle Eastern countries in order to encourage them to turn their attention to problems of development and welfare. This, together with the diversion of resources which have gone into the arms race since 1955, should open up hitherto undreamed-of prospects of real progress. It would be criminal to allow a return to a situation whereby Egypt, for example, spent \$4 billion over a twelve-year period on defense and armaments, while its people were starving and while its government had to go begging for a measly \$60-million loan. The same applies *mutatis mutandis* to all the other countries of the area.

One final note on the tragic problem of the refugees: As part of the maximal plan, one might expect Israel to make a significant contribution by taking back a certain number of refugees and compensating the remainder. The other Arab countries and the world at large should also make a contribution by absorbing additional numbers. For the remainder, a program of rapid development supported by the United States and the world should provide opportunities to reconstruct their lives.

As part of the minimal program, the placing of the Gaza Strip under Israeli control should permit the launching of rehabilitation programs on a massive scale, should facilitate the movement of the refugees to places anywhere in the world where opportunities beckon, and should depoliticize and defuse the most embittered and miserable concentration of refugees. As for the refugees elsewhere, the measures envisaged in relation to the maximal scheme above would apply to them.

In conclusion, American steps in relation to the current crisis in the Middle East should be based on the following considerations:

¶ The basic U.S. interests and purposes in the area are to keep the peace; to assure secure transportation, communication and trade, and to keep any actual or potential enemy from controlling its resources.

¶ The foregoing basic purposes entail these operational objectives: (1) To terminate the nineteen-year-old Arab dream of the eventual destruction of Israel. (2) To prevent control of the Middle East by any single political leader or group actually or potentially hostile to the United States. (3) To contain Nasser, and oppose any political leaders who may arise of the type of Nasser, Ben Bella, Nkrumah, or Sukarno. (4) To prevent growth of Soviet power in the area while seeking to channel Soviet influence through a collective big-power concert.

[From the Anchorage News, June 26, 1967]
MIDDLE EAST WAR: THE FIRST EVER WON BY
ARAB POWER

(By S. L. A. Marshall)

Although I have been closer to Israel's armed forces than any other westerner during the past decade and have written more words in praise of its professional competence than any other critic, it is a bit embarrassing now to discover that I erred on the side of understatement. They were better than I knew.

This month's conflict made the 100-hour war of 1956 a study in slow motion. Spellbound, we all witnessed a war that went only 70 hours from the opening gun to the cease-fire, and it was David, not Goliath, who won. More impressive still, the decisive blow was struck in the first three hours and the tac-

tical follow-through, though dramatic, was anticlimactic.

Any resemblance to the 1956 war was incidental. Air operations by the two sides in 1956 were marginal in their effect on the battle as a whole. This time they were decisive. The first war ever to be won primarily by air power, it was a fulfillment of the late Gen. Billy Mitchell's dream, more than 40 years after he said the balance would be that way from then on. The Nazi blitz against Poland in 1939 had much the same design, but that one was relatively clumsy and Hitler failed to win a war with it.

Israel had to win in the way she did, such was the aggregate superiority in modern heavy weapons and aircraft that the Arab states possessed. In big machine power, their advantage was approximately 2 to 1. The debacle did not prove that Soviet-built heavy weapons are inferior, but only that Russians had entrusted them to inferior hands.

Massive shock surprise is the only key to swift, sure success in war. With the Arabs in a frenzy and screaming for war, with armored columns lunging toward Israel's borders, it looked to the world as if her chance for a smashing surprise was rapidly slipping away. United Nations inertia and big power procrastination were about to compel Israel to accept a hopeless envelopment.

Israel achieved surprise through the sheer unprecedented violence, superb timing and extreme accuracy of the opening blow. That first strike ranged from Baghdad to Damascus to Cairo, an operating radius of about 750 miles, and the synchronization had to be little short of perfect.

Then there was something else: Israel had accurate, complete intelligence of the enemy air and armor, which fact was proved in the opening round. The credit for that should go to my old friend, Gen. "Rabbit" Yariy, the former attaché for Israel in Washington, now 62, of Israel's general staff. As the curtain went up, 25 enemy air bases were hit, while on the ground Israel's columns at first sideslipped Egypt's tank concentrations to knock off the Gaza Strip and get on the high road to Suez, a coup demoralizing to the Egyptians.

Note that it was well after the air battle was fought and won, by which time it became possible for the sky fighters to assist the armored spearheads through the worst of the Sinai defiles, that the Egyptian tanks massed around Abu Agueila and strung out along the Kuntilla-Mitla Pass axis could be taken on separately and beaten. These are elementary tactics. All field commanders love them. Few pay the sedulous attention to detail that wins great prizes at low cost.

After the Arab air threat was shattered, mainly on the ground, Israel's armor could take the full gamble, spreading thin, to race West and overrun all of Sinai. The risk was acceptable only because by then Israel's air power ruled the Middle East skies.

About Arab intelligence, it suffices to say that there is no such thing really. In 19 years of living next door, the Arabs have learned absolutely nothing about how Israel's military think and fight, and of this came their great fall. The Arab military affliction is a binding pride combined with a stimulated hatred of Israel, and these things themselves exclude a reasoned reckoning of military problems.

Maximum use was made of Israel's several military advantages. They are: (1) A compact population and highly mobile reserve that enable the call-up and outfitting for combat within 48 hours; (2) interior lines that afford a choice of which enemy to smash first, in this case, Egypt; (3) a superior doctrine on war-making that emphasizes velocity, acceptance of extreme risk, the need to keep battle forces moving and the moral quality in leadership.

We have beheld no miracle, no master stroke by one genius, but a redoubtable per-

June 27, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8943

formance by the many, boldly planned, bravely executed.

[From the New Republic, June 17, 1967]

THE ISRAELI VICTORY

To appreciate the shattering significance of Israel's victory, one must try to imagine the world as it would have been had Israel lost on the battlefield or remained passive only to expire later from slow strangulation. The Middle East would have become an exclusive Soviet preserve. The Arab chauvinists who called themselves socialists would have had either to do Russia's bidding or be swept away. All U.S., all Western influence, would have been eliminated in very quick order. And these repercussions would have been felt far beyond the Middle East. Let us not, therefore, forget what we owe the Israelis.

The Russians had staked Nasser and every other inflammatory anti-Israel fanatic in the area. A Russian triumph, would have been regarded by the entire world as Moscow's impressive revenge for a series of defeats suffered in recent years—Soviet rebuffs in Berlin, the retreat in Cuba, the failures in the Congo, Ghana, Latin America, Europe. The present defensive posture of the Soviets in Europe would in all probability have changed overnight. Moscow would surely have been greatly tempted to launch immediately a propaganda barrage aimed at bringing West Germany into line, would have reestablished command by disciplining such wayward "satellites" as Rumania. Communist parties in non-socialist countries, in France particularly (de Gaulle notwithstanding), would have been under heavy pressure to again switch the line from coexistence to revolutionary class struggle. All this was in the cards, because the laws governing totalitarian movements—whether communist, fascist or Arab socialist—require an offensive along the entire front, once there is a major breakthrough in one sector. Russia would have recovered the undisputed leadership of the communist camp and would have presented Washington with one of two choices: divide the world for the time being into spheres of influence, with the U.S. withdrawing into a "Fortress America"; or face the likelihood of an atomic confrontation.

Moreover, this sharp swing in the pendulum of power would have come at a time when American morale was sapped by a series of moral and political disasters. An Israel that did not have the courage to strike for its own survival would have been demanding that the U.S. fulfill its commitments—commitments which four American Presidents gave her, and which Lyndon Johnson solemnly reaffirmed only two weeks ago. But would the President have done it? Would he have run American ships through the Egyptian blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba? The best hunch is that he would not, though Washington's pledges were incomparably stronger and incomparably more binding than the loose promise of economic help, under conditions which were never met, which President Eisenhower gave to the late Diem of Saigon and which are the origin of the present American open-ended involvement in Vietnam. And what of the American domestic scene had Israel been forced to demand that Lyndon Johnson make good his word that the waterway to Ellat must be kept open.

As it worked out, the President could talk and do little. And that was most fortunate for the US—and perhaps for Israel, too. How could Mr. Johnson have been expected to do more than he did? Had not most of the Vietnam hawks in Congress suddenly become the most lenient doves in the Middle East? And the Vietnam doves who became Middle East hawks, what did they propose if not vigorous action? There was no consensus here. In the United Nations, had not U Thant precipitously and shamelessly bowed to Nasser's ultimatum to withdraw UN troops? Quite

plainly, the UN was not prepared either to protect Israel or to prevent Israel from protecting itself, and the Security Council discussions gave final proof of the world organization's incapacity to act decisively when the Great Powers are not of one mind. Furthermore, had not most of the reputed experts on world strategy painted an awesome picture of Soviet capability, indeed of the Soviet willingness to throw large military forces into any Middle Eastern battle? And think of Lyndon Johnson's predicament had Israel gone down under a combined Arab onslaught, and the problem then would have no longer been political or strategic, but action simply to prevent genocide?

This grim scenario was, happily, never played out, for Moshe Dayan made good his promise that Israel wanted no American or British boys to die for his country. Israeli boys did it alone. Their victory has changed the world balance of power more decisively than anything that has happened since World War II, including the Soviet retreat in Cuba. For the first time in decades, the United States, without firing a shot—while proclaiming its nonbelligerence and even neutrality—has scored an immense victory, one equivalent to the ruin of Soviet prestige in the Middle East and everywhere else. There has been an unprecedented defeat of the most vociferous haters of America. And last but not least, events have proved that de Gaulle, this modern symbol of political sophistication and of cold realism, can be deadly wrong, and that limitless cynicism is not always the best policy.

The final score has not been marked up, however, and depends on what the US does in the months, perhaps years, ahead.

How can this potential victory be made real? First by remembering that American initiatives in the Middle East in recent years have been a mixture of folly and naïveté. Washington initiated the Baghdad Pact (then refused to join it at the last moment). That pact, instead of stabilizing the Middle East and guarding it against Russian penetration, opened the gate wide to Soviet influence. In 1956, the US rescued Nasser, for which it got no credit whatsoever; the credit went entirely to Moscow. What the US did was to help undermine Britain as a world power, feed anti-Americanism in France and jeopardize Israel's security. Hoping against hope, the State Department after Suez poured into Nasser's Egypt, into Algeria, into most of the other Arab states, immense amounts of American foodstuffs, money, and in some cases arms, for which it got little but abuse. Our off-and-on-again flirtation with the enemies of Israel not only made life more precarious for the Israelis but created grave problems for such non-Arab countries as Iran and Ethiopia.

Now what? The President and his advisers should make haste very slowly. Let the dust of the fighting settle. Let's see what regimes the Arab states will have in a month or six months hence. None of the governments responsible for the Arab defeat in 1948 survived for long. Many Arab regimes may not survive the current debacle.

If one thing has been learned in the past week, it is that the Israelis can take care of themselves and have a pretty realistic sense of what is feasible. They have no intention of keeping all land their soldiers occupy. Obviously, however, the Israelis will not return to the *status quo* which gave rise to the conflict. They will certainly do whatever they believe necessary to prevent the Arabs from starting a fourth round. Added territory poses immense political, economic, social and moral problems for the Israelis. They will have to establish a new coexistence with a large Arab majority, which cannot and should not be turned out, and which no one in Israel dreams of expelling. The wisest course for the US will be to help Israel in this undertaking, when and if such help is invited. Later, too, the time will be ripe for a generous

American offer to the Arab world, which does not breed only more hatred, as have our interventions in the past.

Outside the Middle East, thanks to the Israelis, the US is in a position she has not been in since the resolution of the Cuban missile crisis. Temporarily, at least, new opportunities beckon. The US can today do many things it could not do, or thought it could not do, only two weeks ago. We have often spoken of negotiating from strength. Now, the President can, without fear of any loss of face, offer to de-escalate the war in Vietnam. He can afford a pause in the air raids against North Vietnam, and wait for Hanoi and the Viet Cong to ponder whether the moment for negotiations there has not arrived.

[Excerpts from the report of a study of U.S. foreign aid in 10 Middle Eastern and African countries, submitted by Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Oct. 1, 1963]

III—J—EGYPT (UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC)

II. Current political background

Col. Gamal Abd el-Nasser, President of the United Arab Republic (Egypt), has been responsible, more than any other single individual, for keeping the political caldron boiling furiously in the strife-torn, arid Middle East since July 23, 1952. He has also been responsible for the other nations in this area diverting funds from sorely needed economic developments to arms.

He is still, 11 years later, pouring oil on whatever brush fire breaks out there, seeking his own personal and Egypt's national aggrandizement, in that order.

And he is doing so with the assistance of the United States which still continues to prop him up and, whenever he gets in over his head, to bail him out.

That is not to say that the dove of peace would have settled in the Middle East during these past 11 years if there had been no Colonel Nasser. There is in that troubled area of the world too long a history of political instability and the existence of such factors as poverty and disease to attribute all the woes of the Middle East to Colonel Nasser alone.

But the fact remains that he is the only ruler of any of the nations in that area who avowedly and persistently seeks to export his own brand of economic and political socialism and urges the violent overthrow of neighboring governments. In this regard, he is on a par with the Communists with whom he is professedly at loggerheads, but whose arms and economic aid he willingly accepts.

The parallel between Khrushchev's Russia, Nasser's Egypt, and Hitler's Germany is striking.

Both Egypt and Russia are police states where individual freedoms are ruthlessly suppressed. So was Nazi Germany.

Both Egypt and Russia are states in which the central government owns and operates the total economy. So did Nazi Germany.

And, most importantly, both Egypt and Russia want to export their own brands of government, being willing—and speak openly of their willingness—to repress resistant peoples by force if necessary.

So did Nazi Germany.

As one highly qualified writer has stated:¹ "The promotion of a regime like that of Egypt therefore would seem to be dangerous. For while it is entirely possible to stabilize it through subsidies, it cannot, in the presence of the Soviet Union, be influenced in the direction of a peaceful or liberal development. American assistance has only a very indefinite assurance of Egyptian good will to go on. And even while stabilizing the authoritarian regime it indirectly serves to finance Cairo's

¹"The United States and Egypt," Arnold Hottinger, *Swiss Review of World Affairs*, October 1962, p. 17.

S 8944

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 27, 1967

subversive campaigns in the neighboring countries.

"Many Americans who listen to these criticisms with complete understanding nevertheless ask: 'But what else can we do but help Nasser? Can we look on passively while he slides into the Russian range, or is the victim of a putsch in his own country? Who will guarantee that his successor will not be even more dangerous? Should one give the Soviets the opportunity to nestle even more comfortably in the country via their economic policies?'"

"It seems to us that such questions overestimate the danger of a pro-Communist overthrow in Egypt today, but fail to envisage clearly enough the possibility of a Communist revolution after 5 or 10 more years of authoritarian state socialism. Today, it seems to us, there is still a chance for a return to power of an older generation of Egyptians which grew up with liberal ideals." [Emphasis added.]

This same thought was brought forcefully home to me when I visited Egypt in February 1963. It is definitely a police state, as much so as Communist Russia, which I visited 2 years ago. There, too, Nasser is "Big Brother" just as Lenin and Stalin were in Russia, and as Khrushchev seeks to be. The economy is controlled by the state just as firmly as it is in Russia.

As I stood in one of the principal squares in Cairo watching preparations for a major speech by Colonel Nasser that evening and saw the multitude of large posters bearing his picture and as later I heard his speech with its slogans and stirring platitudes, I, too, felt that all that it would take to have that government become a Communist bloc nation would be to add a few slogans and change a few pictures—or maybe the pictures would not have to be changed.

It must be remembered that it was Colonel Nasser himself, after the Suez Canal fiasco in 1956, who gave the Russians their first foothold in the Middle East. It was Colonel Nasser who invited them into Egypt with their arms and their technicians.

In that connection, the following testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 30, 1963, on H.R. 5490 (Foreign Assistance Act of 1963) at page 437 is most interesting:

"Mr. FARBSTEIN. According to the book, there were 150 U.S.S.R. personnel in Yemen in 1961, but since the revolution in September 1962 the number of U.S.S.R. personnel has risen to about 450. How many do we have there?"

"Mr. GRANT. [Deputy Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, Department of State]. Is it under a hundred?"

"Mr. GAUD [Assistant Administrator, Bureau for the Near East and South Asia, Agency for International Development]. It is under a hundred Americans."

"Mr. GRANT. I might note on that, Mr. Farbstein, that it was the leader of the present royalist regime that invited the Russians in, several years ago. So that we have an interesting reversal of positions."

"Mr. FARBSTEIN. Except that the facts as I stated them are correct, aren't they?"

"Mr. GRANT. Yes; there have been increases. One of our real concerns there has been that the Russians would greatly increase the number of technicians that they have in Yemen. They have been making notable efforts to try to get an enlarged position."

"Mr. FARBSTEIN. * * * You say you assume they are trying to have more people admitted into Yemen, the suggestion being, therefore, that they couldn't get them in under the old regime. Now, with the new regime, they are trying to get them in, and not only are they trying, but they are succeeding." [Emphasis added.]

Representative Farbstein's interrogation serves to point up a disturbing aspect of the

relationship of Egypt, Syria, and Yemen's new regime to the Kremlin. (Iraq can be included in this trio, but it is not included in these Comments because it was not among the 10 countries studied.) Egypt has been the most adept at playing the Soviets off against the United States. All three of these Arab States are absolutely dependent upon Soviet arms—so much so that Soviet transport jets were standing by to transport Egyptian troops to Yemen even before the revolt broke out there and have continued to furnish the transportation for the Egyptian troops in Yemen and their supplies. All three countries, while blowing hot and cold with respect to local Communists, continue to welcome technicians in sizable numbers from the Soviet bloc countries. And most recently on September 3, 1963, in the Security Council of the United Nations, the Soviet Union vetoed a resolution sponsored by the United States and the United Kingdom condemning the "wanton murder" of two Israeli farmers by Syrians within Israeli territory 2 weeks before. The resolution was supported by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Nationalist China, Brazil, the Philippines, Norway, and Ghana. It was the third time since 1954 that the Kremlin had vetoed a resolution opposed by the Arab nations. Despite the military maneuvering of these three countries with the Soviet bloc nations, United States economic assistance continues and most generously. This policy is in sharp contrast to the threatened U.S. crackdown on Pakistan because Pakistan had signed an agreement with Communist China providing for the establishment of flights between Dacca and Chinese cities and had signed agreements with Communist China with respect to border demarcation and trade.

When I spoke to Colonel Nasser he stated that, after the poor showing made by his soldiers against the English, French, and Israelis, his officers had demanded that he accept the Soviet offer of arms.

Against this statement must be placed the fact that the three-party invasion was precipitated by his rash action, in a fit of pique, in seizing the Suez Canal—a lifeline for Britain, France, and Israel.

Today, militarily, Egypt is completely dependent on Soviet bloc countries. Colonel Nasser has maneuvered himself into the position of being completely dependent on Communist Russia for a continued flow of arms and parts. Should that flow be cut off, Egypt is militarily unarmed. Syria and Iraq are in the same position. And those are the very countries in which the Nasserites seem strongest.

It is difficult to obtain any reliable figure as to how much military and economic aid has been going to Nasser from the Soviet Union. The best figures are that it is roughly equivalent to \$920 million, although not on as liberal terms as ours. We sell Colonel Nasser Public Law 480 food and fiber for Egyptian pounds which are used for the development of Egypt and its people. Soviet Russia sells Egypt weapons in exchange for cotton which is used for the benefit of Soviet Russia and its people.

One cannot help but wonder where our policy vis-a-vis Colonel Nasser will ultimately lead.

What have been the reasons advanced for this buildup by the United States of Colonel Nasser as the big man in the Middle East?

The State Department justification for its policy of appeasement was ably set forth by Warren Unna, a staff reporter for the Washington Post in his News Analysis on January 11, 1963, before the revolt in Syria and Iraq. Mr. Unna stated:

"Moreover, to justify its gamble on Nasser, the administration points to the following 'positive' steps he has taken:

"Nasser now is trying to reestablish the United Arab Republic's links with the West, particularly in Europe, and last month pro-

visionally joined with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

"He and his country have done a complete turnabout in the Congo—from being one of the chief supporters of the late Patrice Lumumba and his leftist successor, Antoine Gizenga, to joining ranks behind the United Nations in its current efforts for Congo unity.

"Nasser has played down his country's Arab holy war with Israel, proposed to his colleague's a while back that the issue be put in the icebox and, for his pains, has been accused by Syria of "subversion."

"Nasser personally kept a strict silence a few months ago when it became known that the United States was going to sell Hawk missiles to Israel to help that country defend itself. In former years, this would have been the occasion for a major anti-U.S. campaign.

"Nasser proved more forthright than many of his fellow nonaligned leaders at the August 1961 Belgrade conference when he condemned the Soviets' sudden resumption of nuclear testing.

"Nasser, a big booster of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro in the past, is considered to have been surprisingly moderate when the United States had its showdown with the Soviet Union over Cuban missile bases last fall.

"All of these factors are said to convince administration officials that Nasser, despite his penchant for interfering in the internal affairs of his Arab neighbors, still comes out on the plus side, in permitting room for reasonably friendly relations with the Free World."

Mr. Unna's column is set forth in full as exhibit III-J-A.

"EXHIBIT III-J-A

"[From the Washington Post, Jan. 11, 1963]

"AMERICAN AID FOR NASSER FACES REVIEW

"(By Warren Unna, staff reporter)

"United Arab Republic President Gamal Abdel Nasser's open participation in the revolt in Yemen and his hospitality to potential Saudi Arabian and Jordanian rebel leaders are beginning to raise questions over the wisdom of the United States friendly aid program to the United Arab Republic.

"The Israelis fear the success of the Nasser-assisted Yemeni military group in pushing out Yemen's antiquated imamate may encourage Nasser in other foreign adventures in the Middle East.

"The London Daily Telegraph this week said the United States, in making Nasser 'its instrument in the Middle East * * * is committed to the support of an expansionist revolutionary who must, by the very nature of his appeal to Arab sentiment, continually threaten the stability which the United States is hoping to preserve.'

"It was about a year ago that the Kennedy administration decided to take a hard look at Nasser as an independent whom the United States could deal with in the same arm's-length respectful way it deals with Yugoslavia's President Tito.

"The idea was that Nasser now had decided to emphasize domestic needs over Arab and Communist-bloc involvements. U.S. officials thought there could be mutual regard, no hope or thought of conversion, but conviction that since Nasser is keeping his own house in order he and the United Arab Republic would remain within at least a halloo distance of the free world.

"U.S. economic aid to the United Arab Republic was stepped up to \$146 million a year, most of it in the surplus food stocks Nasser so badly needed to raise the subsistence level of his people.

"And more recently, preliminary consideration has been given to Nasser's desire for an international consortium, similar to India's and Pakistan's, that would enable the United Arab Republic to double her national income

June 27, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8945

of \$140 by the end of her second 5-year plan in 1970.

"But now comes Yemen, in which the United Arab Republic has invested troops, aircraft, and political direction to turn out one neighboring Arab government it didn't like and keep another in.

"And Egyptians have given considerable publicity to the four Saudi Arabian royal princes, all brothers of ailing King Saud, who defected to Cairo and recently proclaimed the 'Democratic Republic of the Arabian Peninsula.'

"Nasser's government also makes no secret of its delight over providing asylum for the Jordanian Air Force chief of staff who, along with several other Jordanian pilots, recently defected to Cairo.

And Nasser's annoyance with the regimes in his fellow Arab states of Syria and Iraq has been repeatedly proclaimed.

"Nasser also undeniably has been putting a lot of money in arms and a large army which might otherwise be devoted to economic improvement.

"But the United States still does not think it has misplaced its bets on Nasser. Administration officials are aware that his meddling in other Arab countries conflicts with U.S. policy to maintain stability and avoid Middle East disputes. But they have no objection to his doctrine of 'Arab socialism' which is aimed at raising the economic level of the Middle East.

"And they consider Nasser the one big figure of the Middle East who neither can be ignored or forced, through economic needs, into any further dependency on the Communist bloc.

"Nasser already gets arms from the Communists, and the Soviet Union is financing the construction of his giant Aswan Dam. But observers report that Nasser has sensed the danger to his own country's independence of too much involvement with the Communist well-wishers.

"Moreover, to justify its gamble on Nasser, the administration points to the following 'positive' steps he has taken:

"Nasser now is trying to reestablish the United Arab Republic's links with the West, particularly in Europe, and last month provisionally joined the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

"He and his country have done a complete turnabout in the Congo—from being one of the chief supporters of the late Patrice Lumumba and his leftist successor, Antoine Gizenga, to joining ranks behind the United Nations in its current efforts for Congo unity.

"Nasser has played down his country's Arab holy war with Israel, proposed to his colleagues a while back that the issue be put in the icebox and, for his pains, has been accused by Syria of 'subversion.'

"Nasser personally kept a strict silence a few months ago when it became known that the United States was going to sell Hawk missiles to Israel to help that country defend itself. In former years, this would have been the occasion for a major anti-U.S. campaign.

"Nasser proved more forthright than many of his fellow nonaligned leaders at the August 1961 Belgrade conference when he condemned the Soviets' sudden resumption of nuclear testing.

"Nasser, a big booster of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro in the past, is considered to have been surprisingly moderate when the United States had its showdown with the Soviet Union over Cuban missile bases last fall.

"All of these factors are said to convince administration officials that Nasser, despite his penchant for interfering in the internal affairs of his Arab neighbors, still comes out on the plus side in permitting room for reasonably friendly relations with the Free World."

Mr. Alfred Friendly, Managing Editor of the Washington Post, 3 months later on

March 27, 1962, under a Cairo dateline, had a slightly different analysis. He said:

"To what purpose does the United States support President Gamal Abdel Nasser's United Arab Republic? Why, already in this fiscal year, had it poured some \$200 million worth of aid (mostly wheat) into a nation that is a political dictatorship, a police state, and a roaring advocate of economic socialism?

"Americans here * * * have several answers, not the least of which is the argument that no better alternative can be seen. Were Nasser toppled, he would be succeeded by one of his own clique, not so able, or by the Communists. Remnants of the old regime scarcely exist, which may be just as well, since it was a remarkably conscienceless pack of hoodlums. In any event, they could never command the people's support.

"A variation of the same argument points out that cutting off American aid simply means presenting the United Arab Republic as a gift to the Soviet Union. Egypt must have huge wheat imports to survive, and will get them from Russia if it cannot obtain them from the United States. It would be in no position to bargain; Moscow could call the tune down to the last note."

Of late a new argument has been advanced in support of our Nasser buildup. That argument is that Nasser has matured since the Suez crisis and is no longer the impetuous "young officer" he was then. Thus Arnold Belchman writing for the Washington Post on July 20, 1962, from Cairo stated:

"American policy in the Middle East, and particularly since President Kennedy took office, has been to seek the disengagement of the Nasser regime from any close Soviet relationship. That policy has succeeded because of:

"Soviet ineptitude.

"U.S. firmness vis-a-vis Nasser military adventurism whether against other Arab countries or Israel.

"Tremendous internal economic problems in Egypt itself, whose solution depends on foreign aid.

"Development of a close personal understanding between President Kennedy and Nasser chiefly through a continuing exchange of letters. None of these letters has been published and their contents are not known.

"What is described hopefully is the coming of some mature, statesmanlike wisdom to the 45-year-old President Nasser." [Emphasis added.]

All these arguments in support of our foreign policy toward Egypt have been advanced repeatedly by our State Department and by many columnists whose columns reflect the State Department indoctrination.

But many of these arguments do not become tenable no matter how often they are repeated.

Consider, for example, the argument of "U.S. firmness vis-a-vis Nasser military adventurism whether against other Arab countries or Israel." The fact is that Nasser has since September 1962 been carrying on a war of destruction against the people of Yemen in which 28,000 of his troops are engaged and in which he is aided by Soviet fighter planes. The fact also is that his powerful radio transmitters constantly beam messages of hate and destruction against Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Israel. Until he succeeded in bringing about the revolutions in Syria and Iraq, his radio urged the violent overthrow of the government of those countries. Now he is engaged in a hate campaign against the Baathists in Syria because they have not seen fit to go out of existence in favor of Nasser's own followers in Syria.

The current official suggestion is to disregard Nasser's radio hate campaign because that is the way things are done in the Middle East and that both sides are doing it. A careful study of foreign radio broadcasts in that area will show that this statement is

not in accord with the facts. Nasser's radio beamed for outside consumption is the only radio preaching the violent overthrow of other governments.

It is indeed ironic that Nasser's proficiency in radio propaganda—and everyone admits that he is proficient—should have been achieved—or aided—through the use of AID funds. Thus, AID project 263-G-22-AA, for which over \$1 million has been obligated through fiscal year 1963 is "to assist the United Arab Republic to establish and operate within 5 years a 'Telecommunications Research and Training Institute' * * *. The U.S. Government set out in fiscal year 1961 to assist the United Arab Republic staff in operating this institute so that, in time, it will be well organized and efficiently operating. * * *"

I was in the Middle East when the United States recognized the revolutionary Government in Yemen and can attest that our action was greeted by our friends in Lebanon, Jordan, Syria (former government), Israel, and Greece, as anything but showing "firmness vis-a-vis Nasser military adventurism."

It should be remembered that when Nasser embarked upon his costly expedition to Yemen, his prestige was at low ebb. H. B. Sharabi of Georgetown University has described the situation accurately in his article on "The Egyptian Revolution" in April 1962 issue of Current History:

"The setback to Nasser's leadership in the Arab world came suddenly and soon, long before Syria's revolt in September 1961. In itself, the Syrian-Egyptian union was only a first step, which, if not carried farther, was meaningless in terms of pan-Arab unity; in order to exist the United Arab Republic had to grow, and the natural direction of growth was in the Fertile Crescent—in Lebanon, Jordan, and Iraq. The crucial decision in these countries was made in the summer of 1958. Jordan was rocked by a series of attempts to bring down the Hashimite monarchy; Lebanon was plunged into civil war; and Iraq experienced a military 'coup d'etat' which toppled the pro-Western regime of Muri al-Sa'id. But the outcome of these events was unfavorable to the United Arab Republic. King Hussein's position, which for a while seemed desperate, was strengthened; in Lebanon a compromise between the pro-Nasser Muslim faction and the separatist Christian groups led to the consolidation of Lebanese independence; and in Iraq, the most important country in this configuration, the new revolutionary regime, after a short period of friendship with Nasser, broke with the United Arab Republic. The Cairo-Baghdad rivalry was resumed with new fury.

"With their hopes frustrated, the Egyptians now resorted to desperate methods to bolster Nasser's declining prestige. Tactics included diatribes on the Voice of the Arabs, open support of Shawwaf's anti-Kassim uprising in Iraq (March 1959), and ringleadership throughout the area in incidents of subversion and violence such as the dynamiting in Amman of the Prime Minister's office which cost many lives including that of the Jordanian Premier (August 1960). Meanwhile, as the drive toward Arab unity began to meet with reverses, relations between Syrians and Egyptians also started to deteriorate. The United Arab Republic was beginning to crack at the seams."

There are also those who believe that the United States is out on a limb because it has sought to save Nasser by recognizing Yemen. Thus Patrick Seale in the New Republic for January 26, 1963, wrote:

"By the turn of the year, then, most neutral observers of the fighting were agreed (a) that Salal's Republic would not survive an Egyptian withdrawal; (b) that the Egyptians themselves were in embarrassing straits, committed to a grim war with little prospects of victory; (c) that the royalists had scored considerable successes but did not

seem to have the weapons or the organization for a really decisive push. This was the situation in which the United States recognized Marshal Sallal's regime. * * * The Yemen is the latest area in which Nasser has needed and has secured U.S. help. What are the arguments behind the U.S. decision to recognize Marshal Sallal?

"One view expressed by some American officials in the Middle East is that the initiative came from keen young New Frontiersmen in Washington, determined at all costs to disassociate America from the old, shaming, 'feudal' regimes of Saudi Arabia and Jordan and throw their weight on the side of progress and the forces of history. Another view is that support for Sallal was, in a roundabout way, a pro-Saudi move, intended to 'scare' the Saudi Princes into reforming themselves.

"A third, more convincing explanation, derived from more authoritative sources, is that the initiative for the American recognition came from U.S. Ambassador Badeau's Embassy in Cairo and that it was intended as a rescue operation for President Nasser. The calculation was as follows: American recognition would be followed by Britain's; the Saudis and Jordanians would falter in their support of the Imam; Sallal would breathe freely for awhile and, in the lull, Nasser could withdraw his troops with honor, claiming that even the 'imperialists' had conceded that Sallal's Yemen Republic was firmly established. The operation was presented to the world as an American-Egyptian agreement whereby Nasser undertook to withdraw his forces in return for American recognition. (Actually, Nasser's agreement to disengage was conditional on cessation of Saudi and Jordanian aid to the royalists.)

"But something went wrong with the predictions: there has been no lull; Britain has not recognized Sallal; the Imam is determined to press home his advantage and Nasser is faced with the painful dilemma of withdrawing ignominiously or doubling his stakes by throwing in more troops. In the meantime, American diplomacy is out on a limb having secured no quid pro quo for its overt support for Sallal's precarious regime."

A careful analysis of many other explanations advanced for our policy toward Nasser will show that we are interpreting Nasser's words as indicating his intentions rather than his actions.

True, he did not rant and rave when it was announced that the United States would sell Israel the Hawk missiles. True, he is accepting economic aid which he vitally needs. True, as a supporter of Fidel Castro, he was "surprisingly moderate" at the time of the crisis over Cuban missile bases—but so was Khrushchev.

But these are words. What of the deeds?

While he was talking softly, he was constructing missiles so that he could proudly parade them in Cairo on July 23, 1963—missiles constructed through the know-how of former German Nazis. Jay Walz reported that parade from Cairo in the New York Times for July 24, 1963, as follows:

"The United Arab Republic paraded two new rockets today and announced that it has developed 'the first Arab submarine, which will be tested at sea within 15 days.' One of the new rockets was a Soviet-made SA-2 ground-to-air weapon recently demonstrated in the desert near Cairo. The second was the first two-stage missile developed in the United Arab Republic. * * * This missile, called Pioneer, is of ground-to-ground type. * * * A jet fighter that thunderously broke the sound barrier over the Nile was identified as the first faster-than-sound fighter built in the United Arab Republic. * * * The Palestine Army, recruited among refugees at Gaza, participated. This army is being trained to participate in the 'liberation of occupied Palestine (Israel)' that President Nasser has promised. * * *

Two points must be stressed in connection with this arms buildup by Nasser:

1. He is doing it with U.S. AID dollars just as surely as though the AID dollars were going directly to Russia for the purchase of jet fighters or directly into the pockets of the German Nazis master-minding the design and construction of these weapons. There are some with blinders who would say that this is a misstatement—that AID dollars go for Public Law 480 food and fiber and for worthwhile development projects. To the extent that we relieve Nasser's normal budget of the cost of food, fiber, and development projects we permit Nasser to have his cake and eat it too. He can divert that much into his arms budget for an arms buildup and let the United States pick up the check for the food, fiber, and development projects.

There may also be some who would say that if the United States did not sell Nasser the food and fiber the Russians would be glad to do so. This does not jibe with the facts. The Russians are not giving anything to Nasser. They are bartering arms for cotton. They are loaning him money to build the Aswan Dam. And, finally, Russia's agricultural economy is not good enough to take on the added burden of feeding 22 million Egyptians. Russia has trouble doing that for Castro and herself.

2. Nasser's diversion of AID dollars to an arms buildup requires his neighbors to follow suit—at the expense of their own sorely needed economic development and, in the case of Jordan, and formerly Israel, at the expense of the U.S. taxpayer. (The New York Herald Tribune for Jan. 2, 1963, reported Israel's defense spending up 17 percent for this year.) Here again there will be those with blinders who will say that we have given no military assistance to Israel and comparatively little to Jordan. Here, too, those who make such statement will have missed the point. To the extent that Jordan or Israel have had to divert badly needed funds from their own economic development, because they felt it necessary to be prepared to defend themselves against Nasser's open threats, to that extent has the United States been forced to give both Israel and Jordan economic assistance which in the case of Jordan has amounted to \$325.3 million and in the case of Israel to \$878.9 million.

Many have been sharply critical of our policy toward Nasser.

Thus Vincent Sheean in the New York Standard for February 12, 1963, in an article entitled "Gamal Nasser: Tricky Riverboat Gambler of the Nile," wrote:

"The Government in Washington recognized the puppet republic of the Yemen on December 19, 1962, as Gamal's wish, just in time to save him again from a terrible disaster—this time, no doubt, the final disaster. He had supported the revolt in that dismal wasteland (if he did not, in fact, create it) in the obvious hope of striking at Saudi Arabia from there. * * * Gamal seems to know exactly how far he can travel with his American guarantee. He let Syria go without a whimper, for instance; the Americans would not have liked to see Egyptian troops in Damascus (where, in sober fact, no Egyptian troops would survive long). And yet our present Government, then new to its tasks, purred and looked the other way when he sent troops to the Yemen. His patrons in Peiping and Moscow must have laughed heartily. They do not trust him any more than we do (perhaps even less) but they work him for all they can get out of him, which is quite a lot under the present conditions. * * *

Thus Carl Leiden writing in the National Review for July 3, 1962:

"Nonetheless, it would be inaccurate to suggest that Egypt is moving in any other direction than the extreme left and it is wishful thinking on the part of those who suggest otherwise. Still there are many who

do think in this fashion, including no doubt a goodly percentage of those who officially represent the United States in Egypt."

Thus Arnold Hottinger in the article previously referred to:

"Returning to the question of American aid, * * * one suddenly realizes that virtually every argument of the proponents of this aid is of a tactical nature. Tactically, they believe Nasser may be used—for the moment at least—as a Pan-Arab nationalist Egyptian barrier against communism. They even hope to stabilize for a short time the chronically unsettled region by the predominance of 'Nasserism,' although the last 4 years have shown that 'Nasserism' is not so easy to sell outside of Egypt.

"To this argument one may well reply that if the strategic aim is to promote liberal institutions and to preserve and strengthen existing liberal systems or beginnings, then the measures which help consolidate the authoritarian Egyptian regime or extend its influence are clearly harmful. Stability purchased at the price of freedom may be a tactical necessity in certain cases; at the same time however it is a loss in terms of the overall strategic aim."

No discussion of the current political scene in Egypt would be complete without a discussion of Nasser's use of former German Nazis to work on his missile program.

Even before going to Egypt I was intrigued by a book by Sedar and Greenberg entitled "Behind the Egyptian Sphinx," which detailed charges that former German Nazis were being extensively used as a regular part of Nasser's government to train his troops, to organize the Egyptian youth along Hitler's line, and to work on missile projects.

The book was so replete with names, dates, and places that I was surprised that even though it had been published recently it had created so little stir. For example:

"Colonel Nasser's chief military and geopolitical adviser, intimate foreign collaborator, and confidant, is none other than the full-blooded Nazi, SS Col. Otto Skorzeny, who was dispatched to Cairo in 1953 upon the advice of his father-in-law, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, Hitler's former financial wizard, now president of a Düsseldorf bank, specializing in the promotion of German-Arab trade. * * * As a double insurance against another defeat by the Israeli Army, the Nasser regime has formed an Arab Foreign Legion to fight against the Jewish State. Its nucleus consists of 400 former Nazis and Gestapo veterans, who were recruited by Arab League agents in Germany. The entire project came to light when in September 1959 the authorities of Hamburg arrested Herr Wilhelm Adami, one of the principal German recruiting agents. * * * [Adami] was a Gestapo Storm Trooper and served in Poland with the Dirlewanger Extermination Brigade. * * * Nasser's State Security Cadre * * * under the direction of Lieutenant Colonel Al-Nasher, whose real identity is Leopold Gleim, chief of Hitler's personal guard and Gestapo Security Chief of German-occupied Poland, who was sentenced to death for war atrocities. * * * In the fields of political and psychological warfare, vicious anti-Western and anti-Israeli propaganda is unremittingly carried on by the Nasser regime under the direction of Johann von Leers, one of the former high-ranking Nazi propagandists in the Berlin Foreign Ministry. * * * von Leers * * * has assumed the Arabized name of Man Amin von Leers. * * *

The book contained the following specific charge:

"Only the French, with the cartesian sense of realism, thought that the presence of so many Germans in the Nile Valley was an ominous sign and could not be taken lightly nor easily be explained. Devoid of illusion, they rightly concluded that the Germans were in Egypt for the express purpose of re-establishing their power and influence in the

June 27, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8947

Middle East at the expense of the United States, Britain, and France. * * * Skorzeny's ultimate aim is to create, in conjunction with Nasser, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, and the Arab League, a German-Egyptian dominated third-power bloc and empire stretching from Berlin to Capetown, and from Bonn to New Delhi. The time is not yet ripe, however, to unmask themselves and operate in the open."

In another book, "The Boss," by Robert St. John, published in the same year, 1960, was found a repetition of these charges:

"There were hints of other activities that building many people, inside and outside Egypt. Naguib had quietly appointed one of Adolph Hitler's economic experts, Dr. Wilhelm Voss, head of the Egyptian Central Planning Board and chief adviser to the War Ministry. Dr. Johann von Leers, who had been one of Goebbels' most trusted anti-Semitic rabble-rousers, was named political adviser to the Information Department. * * * Voss and von Leers were only two. Every day additional names were whispered. Other foreigners might be trying to get out of Egypt, but the ex-Nazis were pouring in. There were hundreds of them, who saw in post-revolutionary Egypt a place they could fish in troubled waters. They changed their names so as not to embarrass their hosts. * * * Many of these men had been brought in by Farouk, but they were not unpopular with Free Officers like Anwar el Sadat, who had seen nothing wrong with Hitler except that he lost."

When in Cairo in the latter part of February 1963 I questioned the Ambassador and his top political advisers concerning these charges. They stated they had not read "Behind the Egyptian Sphinx" and that they were unaware of the infiltration of the Nasser Government by former Nazis. Our military attachés, however, were well aware of this and called my attention to it.

On April 30, 1963, I stated on the floor of the Senate:

"I visited the Middle East last fall and this winter as a member of the Committee on Government Operations, to look into the operations of our foreign aid program. I found that throughout the Middle East there was great apprehension about the growing power of Nasser and a resentment over the manifestly lavish aid which the United States was giving to him, which he uses to achieve his objectives—the objectives of conquest and domination of that entire area, the extermination of the free State of Israel and driving its people into the sea.

"We found these objectives voiced by officials in Turkey, in Iran, in Syria before the latest revolt, in Lebanon, in Jordan, and in Greece. Their expressions varied, but there was wonderment as to why we neglected our friends and built up our potential enemies, and their enemies.

"President Nasser has made no secret whatever of his purposes and intentions. His broadcasts, both through the official radio station, radio Cairo, and through the secret radio station which he entirely controls, clearly show his intentions. Opinion and expression in Egypt and the United Arab Republic are 100 percent controlled, with no freedom of the press whatsoever. In fact, there is greater control—more nearly absolute control—than is found almost anywhere else. Not only are the newspapers forbidden to print anything that President Nasser does not want, but also they are instructed precisely what to print, what not to print, what to conceal, and how to slant and color the news. Thus the people become pawns in Nasser's ambitious programs and cannon fodder in the wars of his making and planning.

"Through the years President Nasser has preached openly the assassination of the rulers and other officials of the countries which he wishes to subvert.

"It has been alleged by some defenders of our policy in this area that Nasser is softening his tone, that he is not as rambunctious or violent in his declarations as he has been in the past. That is not the case. He continues to preach assassination. He continues to preach violence. He continues to incite subversion in neighboring countries. He continues to preach warfare. He makes no secret whatsoever of his determination to destroy the little country of Jordan, which is one of the democratic hopes in the Middle East, and little Israel.

"I very much fear unless the U.S. policy of building up Nasser by pouring in money to enable him to carry on his military and subversive ventures is reversed, that there will be a bloody war in the Middle East, for which we shall bear a considerable responsibility, and into which we shall perhaps be inevitably drawn.

"As recently as March 19 of this year there was a broadcast of the voice of the Arab Nation from Cairo. I could cite and quote from many other such broadcasts, but this is a clear illustration of what is going on today; not 5 years ago, not 2 years ago, and not 1 year ago although it went on then. This type of propaganda—this type of incendiary preaching of assassination of rulers and officials of friendly countries—has been going on all through this period of time.

"The Voice of Cairo on March 19 broadcast as follows: 'Free officers, soldiers, students, and Arab brothers in Saudi Arabia and Jordan, how long are you going to tolerate Saud and Hussein?' Saud and Hussein are the respective monarchs of those two countries.

"The time has come for the army and the people to purge the Arab land of the imperialist vestiges—the lackeys who have sold their honor and dignity and who cooperate with the archenemies of the Arabs—the English, the Americans, and the Jews.' [Emphasis added.]

"These are the words of the Voice of Cairo in a country which we have subsidized and are continuing to subsidize to the extent of millions of dollars, and in greater amounts now than ever previously. These words list us among, indeed call us—Americans—the 'archenemies of the Arabs.' This is but one more example, among many, of 'biting the hand that feeds you.'

"The broadcast goes on:

"Free Arab soldiers and officers, the people call on you to shoulder your full responsibilities in the forthcoming battle for the liberation of Palestine. You will not be able to do so as long as the traitorous renegade clique is controlling the fate of the country.'

"Those words are addressed to the people of Saudi Arabia and of Jordan.

"Even the Arab people in other parts of the Arab homeland will meet great difficulties in the battle for the liberation of Palestine as long as there are people like Hussein in Jordan and people like Saud and Faisal in the Arabian Peninsula.

"Imperialism was able to establish the State of Israel in 1948 after deceiving the Arab people with the lackey Arab rulers to whom it entrusted leadership.

"Free men in Jordan and Saudi Arabia, the situation is serious. Our Arab people are irrevocably determined to wipe away the disgrace of Israel and to purge the Holy Land of the remnants of Zionism, which is hostile to the Arabs and humanity.

"Our Arab people call upon the free Arabs, both military and civilian, to unite their efforts to purge Jordan and the Arabian Peninsula of the traitors. All the Arab people stand at the side of the Arab liberation revolutions in any part of the Arab homeland, because the Arab liberation battles and the aims as regards the fate of the Arab nation are indivisible units.

"Free officers, come forward and fix the zero hour; surge like flames to the palaces

in Riyadh and Amman—the respective capitals of Saudi Arabia and of Jordan—and destroy the hireling traitors—enemies of God and of the people.

"We will then march together on our dear usurped land—Jerusalem, Jaffa and Haifa—and the crime of Israel will no longer exist.

"We call the army and the people in the Arabian Peninsula and Jordan to quick action and to bloody revolution. Death to the enemies of God and of the people.'

"This comes as the official voice of the ruler whom the Western World and the United States in particular have repeatedly saved from extinction. The United States saved him at the time of the Suez crisis. Since that time we have poured in hundreds of millions of dollars to help him, presumably to rehabilitate Egypt's economy, but in effect, finance his wars. He went into the Yemen some 9 months ago, sending in first 18,000 men, and then 20,000, and now, I am reliably informed, 28,000 troops by daily airlifts in Russian-supplied planes. That war is costing Nasser, at the very least, \$500,000 a day. It has continued for 9 months. It has cost him more than \$100 million to date. While we are pouring in money on the one hand to aid him in domestic rehabilitation he is pouring it out in warfare on the other.

"What kind of policy is that for people of the United States who are dedicated to promoting peace in the world?

"At the same time Nasser is receiving military aid from Soviet Russia, he has a great many ex-Nazis working to provide the modern weapons of destruction for his purpose to carry on the war against Jordan and Israel. In a recent book entitled "Behind the Egyptian Sphinx," which was called to our attention by our American military in Egypt, are listed a number of ex-Nazis who are wanted in Germany for their manifest crimes, who are not merely safely ensconced in the United Arab Republic but are employed to help Nasser in his sinister purpose to destroy his peaceful neighbors.

"I read the names of a few:

"SS Col. Otto Skorzeny, son-in-law of Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, who is recruiting former Nazis, and is an importer—arranges for arms shipments into Egypt.

"SS General Dirlwanger, known as the 'Butcher of Warsaw,' a Nasser military adviser on guerrilla warfare.

"SS Sturmführer Baumann, alias Ali ben Khader, who is with the Algerian rebel government in Cairo, and was involved in Warsaw massacre.

"Willi Berner, alias Ben Kashir, who is with the Algerian rebel government in Cairo, and was an SA führer and guard at Mauthausen Concentration Camp.

"Karl Luder, alias Abdel Kader, who is with the Algerian rebel government in Cairo, and was a Hitler youth leader in Danzig.

Dr. Erich Alten, alias Ali Bella, who is with the Algerian rebel government in Cairo, who played a major role in the assassination of Prof. Theodor Lessing at Carlsbad in 1934, and who was gestapo 'Commissar for Jews' in Galicia.

"Leopold Gleim, alias Lieutenant Colonel Al-Nasher, who is in charge of Nasser's state security cadre, modeled after Hitler's SS corps, and was a chief of Hitler's personal guard, and a gestapo security chief in Poland.

"Joachim Daemling, who is an adviser on special activities—concentration camps in Egypt—a former chief of the gestapo in Düsseldorf.

"Dr. Hans Elsele, who is a cochief of medical program at concentration camps; who is a former chief physician at Buchenwald.

"SS Hauptstarzt Heinrich Willermann, alias Lt. Col. Naim Fahum, who is a cochief of medical program at concentration camps and the former medical director at Dachau.

"SS Führer Bernhardt Bender, alias Col. Ben Salem, who is in charge of Nasser's security police which runs the prisons, and was chief of intelligence service of Wehrmacht security division in Ukraine.

"SS Gruppenführer Moser, alias Col. Hassan Suleiman, who is in charge of youth training.

"SS Gruppenführer Buble, alias Lieutenant Colonel Amman, who is assistant to Moser.

"Johann von Leers, alias Oman Amin von Leers, who is in charge of propaganda work for Nasser, and was formerly in the Berlin Foreign Ministry.

"Louis Helden, alias Louis al-Hadsch, former chief of Deutsche Press Agentur; works with Leers—distributes Arabic translation of 'Mein Kampf'.

"Daniel Perrit-Gentil, former SS führer, worked for Wehrmacht Intelligence Service in France during war—sentenced to death by France but expelled. Now is French program director of Radio Cairo.

"Georges Dleudonné, alias Georges Oltramare, former leader of Swiss Nazi Party. Works on anti-Semitic and anti-Israel propaganda with von Leers.

And so forth.

"What possible justification can there be for the United States to be pouring in its dollars, not only to support, but to encourage, a regime of this kind, which has drawn to itself all the elements which are antithetic to the professed purposes of the United States, in order to carry on a warfare which Nasser has never ceased to preach and for his objective to conquer and destroy.

"Unless the United States reverses its program promptly, and does more than merely study, review, and view with alarm, unless we act definitely, there is going to be a destructive war to the death in the Middle East in which thousands of people will be killed and in which we will inevitably be involved.

"I may have more to say on this subject at a future time, but I think I should again pay tribute to and commend the fine statement of the Senator from New York and say that in my view he is absolutely correct. We have been led down a false trail in the Middle East.

"It is about time that we supported and prevented the destruction of the one free nation in that area, the one that has worked for the rehabilitation of its own and other people, the one that has manifested only peaceful intentions, that is trying merely to exist and do its work to advance civilization at home and abroad.

"If the United Arab States, under Nasser would, instead of planning to go to war, emulate Israel, work to educate their people, to sanitize their countries, irrigate their deserts, and make a contribution to peace, we would have peace in the Middle East and all its countries would progress and prosper.

"It is a notable fact that of the many nations in the Middle East which have received our foreign aid, none was more conspicuous in the effective utilization of foreign aid than was Israel. None showed more public appreciation of this aid. It is somewhat depressing to note in many countries which we have helped to lift up from dire destitution, to see how little they have shown their appreciation. That has not been the case with Israel. Not only did we see signs on highways proclaiming that the roads were built as a result of joint efforts by the United States and Israel, but Israel has, at its own expense, issued a very beautiful documentary film in color, going into detail giving an historic account of what U.S. aid has done to help the people of Israel rehabilitate themselves.

"I think it is time that we realized that this is one country that honestly is for peace and civilization, that is firm in its democratic faith, whose people enjoy all the freedoms,

a little country which has no aggressive designs, that merely wants to live and let live, but which is actually also doing something for backward countries by sending its own scientists there, and that we ought to affirm the policy which we should long ago have stood for; namely, that we will not countenance invasion and destruction of Israel. We will not permit our funds to be used to finance an aggressive war in the Middle East, which, unless we adopt such a policy, is bound to come."

Previously, however, concerned about the worsening situation, I addressed the following two letters to the President:

APRIL 10, 1963.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I recently returned from the Middle East on an official trip for the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

What I saw there disturbed me greatly and, after talking to Mike Feldman, I thought I would pass on to you my observations even ahead of my official report, which will, in the main, deal with our AID program in the countries visited.

I visited Turkey, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Israel, Greece, Tunisia, Libya, and Egypt.

It is my firm conviction that U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East is set on a disaster course just as surely as it was when we thought we could appease Hitler.

I fervently hope that no future historian will be able to write a book concerning this period of U.S. activity in the Middle East entitled "While America Slept."

We propped Nasser up at the time of the Suez crisis—in fact saved him from extinction—and have been his mainstay since. Nasser's prestige in the Middle East declined with the Syria breakaway and continued to slide downward until, when his armies were bogged down in Yemen, we came to his rescue again and recognized the revolutionary government in Yemen. I have no doubt that the revolution in Yemen was Nasser-inspired and Nasser-instigated. The speed and the manner in which Egyptian troops were rushed to Yemen on Russian planes demonstrate that we are dealing with a new Egyptian military force and confirm the reports that it has been completely revamped with the aid of Russian technicians and former German Nazis.

What is hurting U.S. prestige in the other nations in the Middle East and what is hurting the administration's posture here at home with a sizable segment of our population is that Nasser is carrying on this war in Yemen for personal aggrandizement with U.S. money.

It is conservatively estimated that the Yemen adventure is costing Nasser \$500,000 per day. At that rate, since the Yemen revolution on September 26, 1962, Nasser has spent over \$100 million in waging his war in Yemen. Thus, in six months he has spent the equivalent of our economic aid to Egypt for a whole year. Of course, a portion of this is in Public Law 480 grains—but without those grains he would sooner realize the futility of his present predicament and might listen to reason. On the other hand, part of our economic aid is in the form of U.S. dollars for the purchase of goods here in the United States which Nasser needs.

The implications of our early recognition of Yemen—that it was a boost for Nasser and Nasserism—were forcibly called to our attention by officials in many of the countries visited. Officials in Turkey, Jordan, Iran, Syria (former regime) and Lebanon were especially vehement. I do not believe that the precipitate manner in which we recognized Yemen (especially before such a recognition by the United Kingdom) has helped our prestige in this area or served to strengthen the Jordanian or Iranian Governments. Had I written to you earlier, I would have added the Syrian Government to this list, but events have overtaken my report.

One important point concerning the effectiveness of our Foreign Service that strikes one in this area is the fact that very few of our representatives abroad (or, for that matter, working on the Near East Desks in Washington in the Department of State) have ever been to Israel. Such a situation is completely unintelligible to me. Our so-called Near East hands are thus representing the interests of the United States in this area without adequate appraisal of the facts. Is it any wonder that after all these years we are no nearer a peaceful solution of the problems of this area?

And finally, Mr. President, Israel itself should hold a special place in U.S. efforts in the Middle East. As the only true democracy in that area, as the one nation which has made determined and successful efforts to raise its economic level, as the one nation in the area that freely and publicly acknowledges that it has received and benefited from U.S. aid, we cannot afford—from the standpoint of our own security—to continue a policy which builds up a Frankenstein monster in that area that, openly, frankly and persistently announces the order of its next victims—Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Israel—and whose official radio voices continue to preach assassination of the officials of these countries.

The oft repeated excuses that the Nasser line on this point is "softer" than it was a year ago are not borne out by the facts. In this connection I must point out that when Hitler published widely his plans in "Mein Kampf" people likewise refused to heed.

We are doing the same thing with Nasser. Will we again wait too long—until grown strong with our help and independent of that help, he turns and swallows up country after country, including Israel?

One thing which will, I believe, relieve the pressures in this area is for the United States promptly to guarantee the borders of Israel in the same manner in which the borders of Saudi Arabia were guaranteed. We have backed and filled so often in the past with Nasser that we must give him no chance at misunderstanding our purpose and intent. A public guarantee of the borders of Israel by the United States would do much to assuage the fears of Israel—which today, with Nasser's increased trained military force, has much more to fear than ever before—and might also serve Nasser with an excuse to desist from his threats.

I would be glad to come up to talk to you at any time convenient to you.

With all best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

APRIL 12, 1963.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is to supplement my letter to you of April 10, 1963, after my conversation with Mike Feldman, concerning U.S. policy in the Middle East.

In that letter I did not underscore strongly enough the thought that we are supporting an arms race in the Middle East just as surely as though American dollars were used directly to pay for the arms purchased.

Under Public Law 480 we are supplying a vital part of the food needs of the Egyptian people. As a consequence, Nasser is left free to exchange his cotton for Russia's missiles. Because Nasser has missiles, Israel must purchase the Hawk from us, at an expense upward of \$25 million and an increase in the size of her standing army trained to use these modern, sophisticated weapons. This \$25 million could be spent to a much better purpose on the economic development of Israel just as the \$100 million spent so far by Egypt on Nasser's war in Yemen could have been better spent on the economic development of Egypt. Similar comparisons could be made with respect to the other countries aided by us in the Middle East

June 27, 1967

such as Jordan and Iran which feel compelled to step up their own defense budgets.

I make these comments to you with a full awareness of the historical and political background of the tensions in the Middle East. But the time has surely come for the United States to take a firm stand and declare that it will no longer permit its aid dollars to be used for an arms race or for aggressive adventures beyond a Nation's own borders. We cannot continue to aid—directly or indirectly—in maintaining or increasing the tensions in the Middle East. As Nasser subverts one country after another, his high-powered radios—also indirectly-supported by the United States—blare across the Middle East preaching violence against Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Israel and actual assassination of their rulers. About 3 weeks ago Nasser's radio was predicting: "But the day will come when those who sought shelter with Husayn [Hussein, King of Jordan] will lament their fate, when they watch the people dragging Husayn in the streets."

I earnestly believe that at least one way to lessen the tension in the Middle East would be through a U.S. declaration that we will guarantee the borders of Israel and Jordan just as we have made similar declarations recently with respect to Saudi Arabia's borders. We should of course not continue to subsidize Nasser's costly military adventures beyond his borders.

But it is essential that our intent to safeguard the borders of Israel, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia is made crystal clear, publicly, not only to Nasser but to the entire world.

With all best wishes, I am,

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

I have now received the following letter from Assistant Secretary of State Fred Dutton:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., July 25, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The President has asked the Department of State to comment further on matters raised in your letters regarding U.S. policy in the Near East. The Department is pleased to have this opportunity to review with you some of the elements of this policy.

The Department believes that the principal questions which you have raised concerning our policies in the Near East do not arise from any failure of our policies with respect to the Free World confrontation with Communism in that area. It should be remembered that Free World interests in the Near East were at their greatest peril in the mid and late fifties, when we had no aid program to the United Arab Republic, and that our policies of recent years have been paralleled by a material but gradual reversal of that dangerous situation. Today Soviet presence, prestige, and influence in the Near East have diminished to the lowest point in many years. At the same time, the capacity of the United States to exert a constructive influence on a wide variety of issues important to the Free World, while still limited, is far greater now than at any time in the past, and the United States is listened to with respect in every capital in the area.

The Department agrees, of course, that tension and danger are inherent in many of the specific points you list. The Department is very much aware of this situation and is determined that these tensions and dangers not be excited by a U.S. posture governed by impatience and hastiness rather than planning and perseverance.

The President's statement of May 8, in which he reiterated this Government's opposition to the use or threat of force in the Near East, relates directly to the principal recommendation of both your letters. The President emphasized not only that the United States would support appropriate measures in the United Nations and adopt

other courses of action, but also that it supports the security of both Israel and her neighbors.

As the President pointed out, the balance of military power in the area has not been changed by recent developments. This does not, however, mean, lack of concern with the Near East arms race and the dangers it carries for the future. The United States is unalterably opposed to the introduction of nuclear weapons of any kind into the area and considers the acquisition of sophisticated offensive weapons to be a luxury which neither side can afford. The United States does not condone the diversion of the scarce resources of the area to the arms race or to such tragic events as the Yemen strife. It has avoided contributing to the arms race and continues to work to reduce the tensions which foster it. In the case of Yemen, as you know, the United States has exerted efforts to arrange a disengagement of the United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia.

The Department appreciates the concern expressed in your letters that U.S. assistance might make it possible for the United Arab Republic to acquire arms thus presenting an increasing threat to Israel and other countries, to engage in radio propaganda, and to become involved in the internal affairs of other Arab countries such as Yemen. It has accordingly kept the program under stringent review to assure against such possibility. Again it is worth noting what the situation was in 1957 and 1958 when there was no U.S. program of assistance to the United Arab Republic. During those years, Arab-Israeli hostility was most intense, Syria and Egypt merged to form the United Arab Republic, Yemen and Egypt affiliated themselves, the pro-Western Government of Iraq was overthrown, the United Arab Republic carried out the greatest expansion of its armed forces and, as noted above, Communist influence soared.

In determining its policy toward the United Arab Republic, the United States has done so only after thorough consideration of all factors in the light of its national interests. Assistance to the United Arab Republic, as noted above, continues to be designed as carefully as possible to assure its use for internal development purposes. Over three-fourths of U.S. assistance to the United Arab Republic has been in the form of surplus agricultural commodities mainly sold for local currency, part of which is used to meet U.S. expenses and the balance of which is used for economic development purposes.

As in the case of many countries seeking to meet national security requirements, military programs of countries in the Near East inevitably absorb resources which might otherwise contribute to development. But U.S. interests, the Department believes, will not be served by ignoring or rejecting legitimate requests for assistance to facilitate economic progress or, for that matter, for food itself. It would only increase the tensions without curbing priorities which are given to military preparedness. The absence of the oft-alleged correlation between U.S. economic assistance and United Arab Republic arms acquisition is well illustrated by the fact that the United Arab Republic's most intensive procurement of arms occurred while the United States suspended aid in the post-Suez period. This procurement was financed then, as now, primarily through surplus United Arab Republic cotton not disposable in Western markets at reasonable prices. On the other hand, the United Arab Republic's more than threefold increase in its economic development budget has occurred after U.S. economic assistance was resumed. The \$700 million increase in the United Arab Republic's annual development accounts is some four times larger than the amount of U.S. aid.

Of course, our program of assistance to the United Arab Republic has been paralleled by development assistance to other

countries in the Near East which has contributed substantially to their growth and stability. During the period fiscal years 1949-62, for example, we provided Israel and Jordan with over \$400 and \$190 per capita respectively, while providing \$26 per capita to the United Arab Republic.

With reference to your concern that officers dealing with Near Eastern affairs either at our posts in the area or in Washington may not have visited Israel, the Department wishes to assure you that many of our Foreign Service officers in the Near East have visited Israel and are encouraged to do so. Most of the Department's Near Eastern specialists have visited Israel, some of them a number of times.

In closing, the Department would like to assure you that it is not and cannot be indifferent to the dangers of the Near Eastern situation. The Department has taken and is taking steps designed to reduce or eliminate the tensions underlying the Arab-Israel dispute and to keep to a minimum the flow of arms to the area. The Department seeks to conduct these policies and actions so that they will not of themselves precipitate an adverse chain of events which would be difficult if not impossible to contain and be welcome only to the Soviet Union.

It has been amply demonstrated in the Near East that the use of an assistance program in this area as a bludgeon to force solutions will not work where deep-seated beliefs and longstanding grievances are held. Experience also has shown that the American interest in denying the Communists a position dangerous to us in the Near East and our interest in easing the tensions of the area to permit increasing stability is best served by maintaining and multiplying ties with the countries of the Near East.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant-Secretary.

IX. The refugee problem

Six years ago, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Humphrey, in his report on "The Middle East and Southern Europe" had this to say about the refugee problem:

Since the responsibility for creating the Arab refugee problem derives from the Palestine war and the U.N. partition resolution, the world community must share the blame for letting the problem go unsolved for 10 long years. In the United Nations we have salvaged our consciences by contributing to the support of these wretched people without coming to grips with the real problem of helping them to find a new and decent way of life. It is high time that the United States took the initiative in and out of the United Nations to bring about a generous and effective solution of the problem.

Excerpts from Senator Humphrey's report are reprinted as exhibit IX-A.

"EXHIBIT IX-A

"EXCERPT FROM THE MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTHERN EUROPE REPORT OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON A STUDY MISSION

"* * * Nor can the United States or the West afford to temporize further with the problem of Arab refugees. Living on a bare subsistence level in wretched camps maintained by the United Nations, rootless, jobless, disillusioned, and embittered, these hapless people, now numbering 900,000, are a challenge to the conscience of humanity.

"The refugee camps have become hotbeds of political intrigues deliberately fomented by Communist and anti-Western Arab agitators. They are breeding grounds of hatred for the United States and sources of political instability for the countries that harbor them.

June 27, 1967

"Half of the refugees are now under 15 years old, a fact of tremendous significance in terms of an ultimate solution of this problem. It means that, despite the clamor of professional refugee leaders for a return to Palestine and the insistence of the Arab Governments on repatriation to their former homes, half of the refugees have in fact no roots in Palestine at all. They were either less than 5 years old when they left that country, or were born in the refugee camps in Arab States. To return them now to an alien society they have been taught to despise would be as self-defeating and unsatisfactory as abandoning them to mature in the appalling atmosphere of hopelessness which now pervades the refugee camps. The destiny of these young Arabs clearly lies in an opportunity for a productive and self-reliant life in an Arab environment and culture.

"Since the responsibility for creating the Arab refugee problem derives from the Palestine war and the U.N. partition resolution, the world community must share the blame for letting the problem go unsolved for 10 long years. In the United Nations we have saved our consciences by contributing to the support of these wretched people without coming to grips with the real problem of helping them find a new and decent way of life. It is high time that the United States took the initiative in and out of the United Nations to bring about a generous and effective solution of the problem.

"The facts of the situation themselves point to the only possible solution—the provision for the vast majority of permanent homes and tolerable livelihoods in the Arab States, and a commitment by Israel to accept a limited number of token repatriates.

"Iraq is desperately short of people. Rich in resources of oil, land, and water, Iraq needs additional population to exploit its potential productive capacity. Experts estimate that the country could absorb at least 3 million, perhaps 5 million, additional people. Iraq, moreover, has shown a disposition to accept immigrants from the refugee population. Five thousand have already been taken in without any appeal for U.N. assistance by the Government of Iraq. With help from the international community to defray costs of resettlement, the entire refugee population could readily be absorbed in that country alone, with benefit to the indigenous population.

"Syria, while less richly endowed with natural resources, is also underpopulated. With some help, it could assimilate a substantial number of refugees with benefit to itself. As many as 200,000 refugees could be settled in the Jordan Valley if the Johnston plan of the United States for developing the Jordan River Valley were accepted by the Arab States.

"The fact is that the Arab States have for 10 years used the Palestinian refugees as political hostages in their struggle with Israel. While Arab delegates in the United Nations have condemned the plight of their brothers in the refugee camps, nothing has been done to assist them in a practical way, lest political leverage over Israel be lost.

"This is not to say that Israel has no responsibility for an ultimate solution of the problem. The Government of Israel has already disclosed its willingness to compensate the refugees for property left in former Palestine; the United States has offered to lend Israel the money. All that is necessary is to set up the machinery and establish the procedures under which compensation would be paid.

"On the other hand, repatriation of all, or even a large number of refugees, by Israel is no longer possible. In the first place, Israel has accepted and settled some 900,000 immigrants, many of whom were in fact refugees from Arab States where repressive measures had made their lives intolerable. Furthermore, surrounded by nations which insist

upon exercising rights of belligerency against her, it would be suicidal for Israel to admit a large group of immigrants whose whole indoctrination for the past 10 years has been one of hatred for the Jewish state. To do so would be to establish a fifth column inside the country.

"Moreover, from the viewpoint of the refugees themselves, repatriation to Israel would result in bitter disillusionment. They would necessarily have to live in a society foreign to their own background and culture, and assume all the obligations of citizenship in a state which they have been taught to despise.

"Nevertheless, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion told me that the Government of Israel would be prepared to admit a limited number of refugees who would pledge to become constructive and productive Israeli citizens and not subversives. I am convinced that Israel would be willing to recognize the principle of repatriation, provided that that principle is implemented only by token numbers of refugees, perhaps admissible on a quota basis.

"All of these things should be carefully explored by a new United Nations Good Offices Commission. It should be the duty of such a commission to press resolutely and unrelentingly for a breakthrough on this critical refugee problem, exploiting every opportunity for initiating diplomatic conversation with and among the governments concerned."

Six years—and over \$118 million U.S. dollars—later Senator Humphrey's remarks are still direct and to the point. In the intervening years the United States has not exercised the leadership in and out of the United Nations so vital to any meaningful effort to prevent the continued use of these refugees as a political football in the tense Middle East.

We seem to have lost sight of the fact that we are dealing with men, women, and children who should not be sacrificed for a cause, but who can, if they wish, have a life of economic usefulness.

Each year we have gone through vitriolic, recriminatory debate in the United Nations about renewing the mandate for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency and each year we have ended the debate with a renewal of its mandate in the same plodding, pedestrian old way.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

Forty percent of the Arab refugees were not born in what is now Israel. Fifty percent of the total 1.1 million refugees are under the age of 18. Of the total of \$38.5 million received by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency from governments in calendar year 1962, the United States contributed \$24.7 million or over 70 percent. These are the basic three positive factors working in favor of a practical solution of the Arab refugee problem and of making them productive, useful citizens.

There are two negative factors working against such a solution. The first is the fact that many Arab leaders want to continue to use the Arab refugees as pawns in their continuing fight against the existence of Israel. The second factor mitigating against a practical solution of the problem is that of the total of 11,651 personnel employed by UNRWA, 11,469—over 99 percent—are locally recruited persons most of whom are themselves Arab refugees. Therefore, even if during all these years of its operation UNRWA had been in its top leadership dedicated to the concept of training the Arab refugees and settling them in Arab countries or other countries as useful, productive citizens, the vast majority of its employees were not and could not because of their backgrounds be dedicated to carrying out such a policy. These refugees have been placed in charge of teaching the young and therefore have been inculcating in them the

belief that any resettlement into the community will delay the day of their return to what they have been taught is their homeland, even though they have never been there. Such teachings cannot but continue to engender hate, unrest, and idleness.

A new approach must be found so that these Arab refugees will no longer be a thorn in the flesh of the world but will lead useful, productive lives.

It is therefore recommended

The United States should exercise immediate leadership in and out of the United Nations, offering, if necessary, to pay the total cost, but making every effort to have the cost shared, in proposing the following program:

(a) The establishment of a United Nations Middle East Peace Corps, along the line of our own Peace Corps, composed of volunteers from countries other than the countries involved, to work with the refugees in a well-financed program to educate and train the refugees, to help them obtain employment in the Arab countries or elsewhere, to assist financially in their resettlement in their places of employment, including resettlement grants and the granting of Cooley loans and grants from Public Law 480 proceeds;

(b) Present local-hire employees of UNRWA should be replaced by Peace Corps employees—who should be international public servants—as soon as these local-hired employees of UNRWA can be retained and placed in jobs elsewhere, being given training and resettlement grants, financial assistance in resettling their families, purchasing homes etc.

TRIBUTE TO ERNEST G. WARREN OF THE PRESS GALLERY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like to pay tribute to a very distinguished member of the Press Gallery, Mr. Ernest G. Warren, the Associated Press New England correspondent, who recently retired from an illustrious journalistic career that spanned 40 years.

All of us who have worked with Ernie Warren will always value his sense of fair play which is the highest tradition of American journalism. He is truly a gentleman and he always brought qualities of good humor, sensitivity, and warmth to his associations with Senators and staff members who were his news sources.

I, for one, shall miss his friendly presence in the Senate Press Gallery a great deal. But I wish him long years of good health and happy retirement, which he has so well deserved.

RULES VERSUS POLICIES IN EDUCATION, THE VIEWS OF HOWARD A. MATTHEWS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Director of the Division of Manpower Development and Training in the U.S. Office of Education is Dr. Howard A. Matthews, former Alaskan official in the field of education and a constituent of mine. Dr. Matthews has been a student of administrative law for many years.

The May 1967 issue of the American School Board Journal contains an article by Dr. Matthews entitled "Differentiate Between 'Rules' and 'Policies,'" based on a doctoral study he made at George Washington University in June 1964 of the practices and procedures of

regulations, rather than continuing the pursuit of self improvement. Our legislative committee headed by Roy Edwards, Jr., of Kansas City, is so busy they scarcely have time to operate their own businesses.

We readily admit that control officials are here to stay and generally speaking, they're very nice people—if only some of them didn't have such vivid imaginations! If a firm is shipping seed into many states today, the amount of printing required on the package can be so extensive the planting season passes before the buyer has read all the precautions and mastered the statistics.

This is probably not news to many of you, but to emphasize the importance of seed, I'd like to mention the National Seed Storage Laboratory. Here, the United States Department of Agriculture staff is affiliated with Colorado State University's Department of Agronomy, Botany, Plant Pathology and Horticulture. Under ideal temperature and humidity conditions, 52,000 seed samples are stored and their germinations constantly maintained by replacement when necessary.

This facility came into being in 1958. The purpose is to safeguard the valuable germ plasm so that no desirable kind of seed is allowed to pass out of existence. Much of interest has been written on this subject and I merely mention it to show that the Federal Government, state authorities and seedsmen are engaged in an activity which is of vital concern to all people in this nation and around the world. In case of a national disaster, this seed source would insure a fresh start for seed supplies of proven performance. This is an exciting undertaking. Our industry thru its own up-and-coming Research Foundation has been telling this story through its publications Search.

Chairman of our Seed Research Foundation is Dr. W. H. Bragonier, Dean of the Graduate School at Colorado State University, and President of the organization is J. R. Huey, another ASTA past president, of Granville, Illinois. Basic Research is still much in the picture because our industry believes there are still many unknowns in the world of seeds.

If I have another assignment, it is to convince you not only that the seed business is important, but also that our industry has done a *magnificent* job of policing itself. The late Robert White, a seedsman from Salem, Oregon, and a member of the Oregon State Senate, once made these comments in an address: "In defense of our industry, if there were no laws today regulating the sale and distribution of seed, the various state and regional associations, and most certainly the American Seed Trade Association, would recognize the necessity for establishing such regulations. There is no longer any doubt but that the buyer's interest demands protection. The seedsman is therefore not objecting to the existence of laws and regulations, but merely to their multiplicity and to their needless complexities."

Dr. A. Bryan Clark, a recent president of this association, put it this way: "It is well to remember that the function of marketing is primary and fundamental to the functions of seed breeding and seed growing. In the sequence of time, marketing comes last. And it is our observation that certain governments and certain factions within nearly all governments seem to regard the function of marketing as having little or no importance at all. On the contrary, however, if our appraisal is right, marketing is the piper that calls the tune.

"The end objective is increased food production. The partial means to this end is the widest possible use of improved strains and varieties of seed; integrated, of course, with the employment of other appropriate cropping and food processing technologies such as fertilizers, weed and pest controls and more sophisticated farm implements. The point is that the marketing phase of

the operation is pivotal in achieving widespread use, in achieving efficient and discriminating use, in integrating proper seed types with the other equipment available, and finally in bringing the all-important equation of seed costs and its per-acre utility into focus." I like to quote Bryan, because he's one of our brighter boys!

Now I don't mean to imply that regulations are a new thing. One hundred fifty years ago in Switzerland, they had a law which required that at least two men in a county where seed was sold, were to serve as inspectors of quality. And then if you want to go back to some even earlier regulations, this is recorded in Leviticus, "thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled seeds." And in Deuteronomy we read, "Thou shalt not sow thy vineyard with diverse seeds." So it would seem that none of you seedsmen could have legally sold a lawn mixture to Moses!

We all realize that trends come about gradually and that the only hope for justice comes when we stop to evaluate where we have been and where we are going. I remember when a firm's reputation depended upon what it did to build it—instead of what some authority said it could not do. The time is here when the seed industry needs protection more than regulation protection, even from the public. Let me cite a couple examples.

A few years ago, we received a letter from a New Jersey lawyer to the effect that one of our chemicals used by a client of his, had caused her to lose all of her hair. Well, in an era where hair seems so important, we spent a bad night. But none of our own people who handled the product daily, had suddenly become bald, so we did some investigating. We discovered that the lady, if that's the right term, had never had hair from birth, but that she had lived all her adult life on complaints to cosmetic firms and finally got over into our ballwick. Needless to say, she paid her own attorney.

A few weeks ago, another woman sent in \$800.00 worth of sales slips and requested a refund on seed which failed to grow. The very thought was downright insulting. An investigation in this case showed that the woman had a lot about 20 feet square, but that she had appropriated a salesperson's order book and written sales slips to her heart's content. I ask you, shouldn't the President put in his cabinet, a Betty Furness to protect industry?

Speaking of packaging and who doesn't, here is one for Betty. At a recent women's club meeting, someone estimated that eighty percent of those present wore rouge, thirty-five percent tinted their hair, eighty percent had permanent waves, ninety percent wore nail polish, twenty percent wore eye-shadow, one hundred percent used lipstick, seventy-five percent plucked their eyebrows and ten percent wore false eye lashes—the subject for discussion that day, was "Deceptive Packaging!"

According to the former chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, "One of the dangers of democracy is the worship of the average. The doctrine that all men are created equal is too often interpreted to mean that anyone who forges ahead in any realm is a traitor to the common mass from which he sprang. In a democracy there seems to be an innate horror of any kind of aristocracy, but there always has been an aristocracy of brains and energy.

"While all things fair spring from the common soil, it is from the tall hills of achievement that humanity's salvation comes. A handicap of democracy is conformity to the lowest common denominator."

I can assure you guests that within the American Seed Trade there is an aristocracy of brains, energy and imagination, determined to give the public the best in quality that it is possible to produce. We have never

been and will not become content with mediocrity.

There is much more that could be said. But we invited you here this morning to get better acquainted—not to listen to a tale of woe because in our industry we are blessed with a membership of good natured, long-suffering men who are dedicated to what they consider a necessary industry. After all, it's first, the seed. Food has always played an important part in determining the degree of tranquility in the world, so ours is a continuing challenge. We are aware of the potential in a grain of mustard seed and alive to the value of proven quality in seeds of every description. We haven't a thing to sell you this morning—and I don't know that we need your support in any particular area—but if we should, please keep your doors ajar. And don't overlook the fact that the seedsmen's hand is the one that's feeding you.

NE here
WITHDRAWING FROM TERRITORY
CAPTURED THROUGH AGGRESSION

(Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, Soviet Premier Aleksel N. Kosygin recently spent 40 minutes at the United Nations berating Israel for aggression against the Arab nations. During his discussion, Kosygin belabored the fact that the first requirement necessary for a lasting peace in the Middle East is Israel's withdrawal from captured Arab territory to the lines that existed before the shooting began.

This new attitude on the part of the Kremlin opens interesting possibilities for permanent world peace—provided the Kremlin and Mr. Kosygin are sincere in what they have to say. If one is going to discuss world peace in terms of cessation of aggression, then surely he must consider those nations victimized by Communist aggression since World War II. I wonder if Soviet desires for peace have suddenly become so potent that Mr. Kosygin is willing to lift the Iron Curtain that imprisons the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Ukraine, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Latvia, Estonia, East Germany, and Mongolia.

If we are to engage in diatribe about Israeli aggression, let us recall how just 10 short years ago, the people of the once free state of Hungary were slaughtered in the streets by Soviet inhumanity while the world stood idly by and watched. And then there is that colossal monument to Communist lack of aggressiveness, the Berlin Wall. When the time comes that Mr. Kosygin and his hoards of regimented assassins are willing to pull down that wall and all the others they have constructed in a world that longs to be truly free, then he can legitimately advise the Government of Israel about her actions.

The time has come that the world and we of the United States in particular begin demanding of the Soviet Union that it practice what it preaches. The political and social domination of nations, whether by military occupation or by control through a puppet government, is still enslavement of free men.

Similarly the acquisition of this political control, whether by subversion or

June 27, 1967

with the present system under which all commodities pay the same toll on a cubic foot basis.

The witnesses analyzed the various commodities and came to the conclusion that many commodities would accept only a relatively small toll increase and beyond that point other means of transportation or other routes would be found.

However, it was pointed out that our main agricultural commodities—cotton, corn, and wheat—were not in a position to find either other routes or other means of transportation and, thus, would be particularly vulnerable to any substantial toll increase without means of avoidance. Thus, in the ordinary course of events, if such a toll system was imposed, the greatest increases over the present structure would be directed towards those commodities least able to find an alternative to the use of the canal. Basically, they would be our agricultural commodities and thus, again, our costs of doing business would be substantially increased.

This is not a figment of my imagination. The Panamanians have been pressing for substantial toll increases during the negotiations of this treaty.

I repeat again—this proposed treaty does not seem to be in the best interests of either country. It will only further the ambitions of a few politicians who have used the canal for all these years as their main campaign issue as a smoke-screen to obscure the real problems of their country and their people. This treaty is being offered as a solution to both of our country's differences—on the contrary, I predict that it will give rise to greater and more serious problems.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, I would only hope that the male Members of this distinguished body had the intestinal fortitude in dealing with this problem that the gentlewoman from Missouri who is now addressing us from the well of the House has exhibited for the past several years.

The gentlewoman from Missouri is chairman of the subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries having jurisdiction over the Panama Canal. If I had a half dozen men as good as she is, we could take care of this Panama Canal situation.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON CITES TIMELY REMARKS OF CHARLES B. MILLS AT AMERICAN SEED TRADE ASSOCIATION CONGRES- SIONAL BREAKFAST

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I had the pleasure and privilege to act as master of ceremonies at the congressional breakfast given by the American Seed Trade Association as part

of their 84th annual convention. I was honored to read to the assembled seedsmen and my many colleagues in the House and Senate a message from the First Lady to Mr. Joseph Harris, my distinguished constituent, president of the Joseph Harris Seed Co., Rochester, N.Y., and retiring president of the American Seed Trade Association, congratulating him and all our Nation's seedsmen for their fine contributions to the national beautification program.

Mr. Harris has not only ably led the Seed Trade Association as president, he is a leading citizen of his community as well.

The American Seed Trade Association is one of our Nation's oldest and best known trade associations. The seedsmen have proven their willingness and ability to aid agriculture both domestically and internationally whenever the need arises. Their association represents an industry noted for its realistic approach to the problems of this Nation. We in Congress can contribute much to solving our country's agricultural problems by building a strong and responsive partnership with American seedsmen. We need their wise counsel, and they need our help, because this vital part of our economy is undergoing severe stresses in this changing world.

The American Seed Trade Association's message to us yesterday morning was humorously yet strongly voiced by M. Charles B. Mills, chairman of the Board of O. M. Scott & Son in Maryville, Ohio, a company responsible for beautiful lawns throughout the country.

As former president of ASTA and present member of its board of directors, he took justifiable pride in the progress the seed industry has made and of its vital importance in the world today.

For my colleagues who were unable to attend yesterday's fellowship breakfast, I commend Mr. Mills' wise words to you:

Keep your doors ajar to the seedsmen of our Nation and remember that it's the seedsmen's hand that feeds you.

ADDRESS BY CHARLES B. MILLS, AMERICAN SEED ASSOCIATION CONGRESSIONAL BREAKFAST, TUESDAY, JUNE 27

Honored guests and fellow workers in the Nation's most vital industry: In case you didn't know, without us, people would breathe nothing but dust, die of hunger and have no flowers on their graves. I defy you to find another industry which can make such a claim.

Eight years ago about now, we had come together on a similar occasion. Many of you were here then—some weren't reelected! I'm going to tell the same story which was inflicted on you at that meeting. If you remember it, another little laugh won't hurt you. The husband of a certain lady in northern New York State, took the hard way out by jumping in the Niagara River and going over the falls. A next door neighbor, known for saying the wrong thing at all times, was urged by her husband to let the grieving widow suffer quietly. "You'll just make matters worse," he told her. "Let her suffer quietly!" But after six months passed, she felt that in the interest of good neighborliness something must be said. So when the widow responded to her knock, she said; "Well Mary, since I saw you last, a lot of water has gone over the dam!"

And so it has with us. Since we met here

last, many things have happened, some tragic, some revolting and some merely routine. The Nation has become involved in a costly and perplexing conflict, lost a president by assassination, developed a few hundred new inventions, produced better and cheaper seed, made many explorations in outer space, adopted Medicare, given one Congressman an extended vacation, introduced hundreds of new songs, livelier dance steps and a whole raft of deodorants. In spite of all this, you're looking surprisingly well, prosperous and happy. This is no small achievement. Of course I wrote this before I saw you, but I won't take it back.

All the changes in those eight years have not been progress, but I can truthfully say to our guests that in the seed industry steady and creditable progress has been made. You probably get a stomach full of statistics, so I won't bore you with many.

American Agriculture has advanced more in the past 50 years than in all the prior years of our history. Agriculture employs six million more workers than the combined employment in transportation, public utilities, steel and the automobile industry—agriculture assets total 230 billion—a kind of figure which doesn't startle our guests, but astounds their hosts.

When the early settlers of our country cleared the forests and prepared the land for cultivated crops, they were in urgent need of forage plants for livestock feed. They had depended on wild rye and broomstraw, both natural grasses, but these were poor producers and grazing and droughts hindered natural seeding and wrought great damage to pastures. In due time, supplies of hay were inadequate to provide the winter needs of the colonists' livestock, so attention was turned to "artificial meadows" through the cultivation of improved grasses. Increases in livestock feed developed rapidly supporting ever larger numbers of the livestock which is the foundation of an agrarian economy. Our third President, Thomas Jefferson, so ably pointed up the importance of good seeds when he stated "the greatest service which can be rendered to any country is to add a useful plant to its culture." This quotation will sound familiar to our past ASTA president, Bill Herron, since he used it in one of his addresses.

The world's future will be dark unless more great strides are made in food production. By the end of this century, the population of the underdeveloped regions of the globe is expected to more than double. To feed these masses and improve their diet modestly over the present standards, food supplies would have to increase 306% in the Far East, 207% in the Mid East, 238% in Latin America and 159% in Africa. By contrast, food production in these areas as a whole rose only 54% during the past 25 years.

But I mustn't bore you with these depressing figures. We want you to go away refreshed from your breakfast and not famished from my remarks. You've probably wondered already why I was invited to speak here. It was for either of two reasons—first, no one else would, or second, the committee wanted ignorance represented. They figured you people from the hill would feel sorry for us when I got through.

My major objective is to impress you with the importance of the seed business, so I want to say with due modesty, that we're on first base. Ours was one of the earliest trade associations, organized in 1883. The purpose was an attempt to solve certain postal problems with vegetable seeds and to find better means of improving seed quality. This objective was bearing good fruit long before any such effort on the part of Government came to light. It would be refreshing if improving quality might still be our chief concern. But our energies now must often be devoted to defending ourselves against over-

June 27, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

military force, can be called by no other name than aggression.

As the Israeli Foreign Minister observed the other day:

The time has come when we must point the finger of accusation and truth at the Soviet Union and say, "You are the only aggressor in the world today."

There cannot be a double standard of conduct if nations are to cooperate peaceably in this world. If the "super-powers" are going to assume leadership for achieving world peace, they must be prepared to abide by their pronouncements. Instead, the Soviet Union assumes the attitude "Do as I say, not as I do."

One wonders what direction Kosygin's oratory would have taken if the Arabs had been victorious and were now in control of Jewish territory. In view of past performances, Mr. Kosygin's formula for peace in the Middle East appears to be one of Russian expediency and nothing else.

The names have changed; yesterday it was Berlin, today Israel—and tomorrow who knows? But trite Communist dialog remains inevitably unvaried. Let Mr. Kosygin learn that old American cliché, "Actions speak louder than words"—and then the world can begin to take his pronouncements seriously. Let the Soviet Union pull down its walls of insincerity and falsehood, of enslavement and terror. Then—and only then—can the world be truly free.

THE LOBBYING ACT

(Mr. RESNICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago Congress realized that individuals and organizations appearing before it might be tempted to influence legislation for their own private gain rather than for the good of the Nation. With that in mind, Congress passed the Lobbying Act so that everyone would know the nature of individuals and organizations attempting to influence pending legislation.

This law requires every lobbying organization to file an affidavit with the clerks of the House and Senate, reviewing the sources of its income, its expenditures, its purposes, and its chief personnel. The intent of the law is clear: to let the public know who is influencing what legislation, and for what purpose. Thus, for example, when the AFL-CIO comes down to Washington to influence legislation by testifying before the various committees of this distinguished House, we know who they are, whose interests they serve, and what their purpose is. When an organization misrepresents itself or its purposes, or fails to properly reveal its true interests or the sources of its funds, the law must deal with it.

It is my duty today, Mr. Speaker, to disclose to the Nation that one of the largest and best-known organizations in American life has for many years been masquerading as one kind of organization when in reality it has been something quite different. The organization in

question is the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Over the years the Farm Bureau has been representing itself to Congress, the Nation, and the American farmer as a farm organization deeply and exclusively devoted to promoting the vast interests of the American farmer.

I have made the shocking discovery that the Farm Bureau has not been representing the American farmer; it has been using him. It has been using him to build one of the largest insurance and financial empires in the United States. An empire which is bringing great profit to a select handful of men.

Last week the Farm Bureau testified before the Subcommittee on Rural Development of the House Committee on Agriculture, of which I am chairman. Since then I have spent a lot of time looking into that organization. My investigation has revealed the shocking fact that the American Farm Bureau Federation is a gigantic, interlocking, nationwide combine of insurance companies with total assets of almost \$1 billion. I have evidence that the granting of membership in the Farm Bureau is purely and simply a device for selling insurance and other services.

While we have not yet uncovered all of its assets, companies, and business connections, or even all of its insurance companies, we do already know that in addition to its insurance businesses, the Farm Bureau also operates a multi-million-dollar mutual fund dealing in stocks, bonds, and other securities.

Let us look at that typical American farmer, Mr. Charles Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Not long ago, Mr. Shuman was featured in one of our national picture magazines, dressed in overalls and waving an ear of corn. Mr. Shuman must certainly rank as the king of all gentleman farmers. His home is in Chicago. No doubt he occasionally visits his picture-book midwestern farm. But in addition to heading the American Farm Bureau Federation, he also happens to be president of the Farm Bureau Mutual Fund and the American Agricultural Mutual Insurance Co.

I can assure you that Mr. Shuman is not unique. Virtually every officer and director of the American Farm Bureau Federation is an officer or director of one or more insurance companies. Their life insurance companies alone—not including their many casualty and fire insurance companies—have over \$3.5 billion of insurance in force.

Our farmers have been taken in, lock, stock, and silo. No one can tell me that the interests of the overworked and underpaid American farmer are the same as billion-dollar insurance companies. In fact, I would say these interests are usually in head-on conflict. What I cannot understand is why an organization like the Farm Bureau has been able to pull the wool over our farmers' eyes for so many years, and why it has been allowed to appear before countless congressional committees over the years misrepresenting itself as a farm organization. Who can even begin to estimate the damage this subterfuge has done to the cause of American farmers?

Mr. Speaker, in the days to come, I plan to document these charges—and others—in great detail for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope that these facts convince all Americans—especially our farmers—that the American Farm Bureau Federation would be more honest in its relations with Congress and the public if it changed its name to the American Farm Insurance Co.

In addition, I plan to look into possible violations of the Lobbying Act resulting from the revelation of these previously unpublished activities of the Farm Bureau and its officials.

ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE HOUSING ORDER

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, 1967, Secretary of Defense McNamara announced an order declaring that off-base apartments in the Andrews Air Force Base area, which discriminate, would be off limits to servicemen.

I have been concerned with this disgraceful situation for some time. No American should be denied decent housing because of his race. It is doubly galling when taxpayers' money—through Federal spending—indirectly maintains discriminatory practices, as in the Andrews case. There are other military installations throughout the country where similar conditions exist. Similar measures must be taken to end such discrimination. This is made more urgent by the failure of the Congress to pass a fair housing measure.

On May 9, 1967, I wrote the Secretary of Defense urging that housing in which discrimination is practiced be declared off limits, and one June 9, 1967, wrote to Brig. Gen. Douglas C. Polhamus, the base commander, urging prompt action. I am pleased that the order has been issued. The Department of Defense has a responsibility to American servicemen to insure that equal opportunities in every area are available to them wherever they may be serving.

I should also like to commend ACCESS, an organization which has worked diligently for the promulgation of this kind of order.

The civilian agencies of the Federal Government also have a responsibility to insure that no discrimination occurs within their purview. Recently, I was shocked to learn that the Federal Communications Commission does not have regulations prohibiting discrimination by its licensees. I have urged the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission to use his power to eliminate discrimination in employment.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD my correspondence with Secretary of Defense McNamara and General Polhamus, the base commander of Andrews Air Force Base:

MAY 9, 1967.

HON. ROBERT S. McNAMARA,
Secretary, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Mr. J. Charles Jones, Chairman of an organization called ACCESS,

H 8100

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 27, 1967

has brought to my attention a problem which I consider to be very important.

According to Mr. Jones, there are several places in the United States where racial discrimination is practiced in reference to available housing for servicemen. I know that the Department has conducted a survey and is aware of this problem. Mr. Jones suggests that the most effective way of dealing with this problem is to declare any housing developments, apartment houses, and mobile home courts whose owners discriminate against Negroes as "off-limits" for service personnel. Naturally, such an order would not affect those who are already housed in such residences.

For the future, however, it would seem that the threat of putting a home or apartment house under the sanction of "off-limits" would force owners to open their housing to all. This is particularly true as it applies to those landlords who have purposely situated their buildings near military installations to provide housing for servicemen.

I would appreciate hearing your opinion of this proposal and whatever other proposals you may have to eliminate once and for all this illegal discrimination.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. RYAN,
Member of Congress.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RYAN: Secretary McNamara has asked that I reply to your letter concerning the suggestion of Mr. J. Charles Jones that the "off-limits" sanction be employed against owners of housing who discriminate against Negro servicemen.

Numerous communications have been received requesting that all housing that is not available to servicemen because of their race, color, or creed be declared off-limits. At present, base commanders have the authority to request the approval of the Secretaries of the Military Departments for imposition of the off-limits sanction in cases of discrimination against personnel.

It is considered that the mandatory, nationwide application of the off-limits sanction—with a view toward eliminating racial discrimination in housing available to military personnel—would be of questionable effectiveness and would raise significant legal issues, both as to procedures and enforceability. To invoke such an action, without careful analysis of the specific needs and problems of each area, could create chaotic conditions in the residential status of thousands of Defense families. Particularly relevant from a legal viewpoint are requirements of due process in evaluating each factual situation. Furthermore, such action would downgrade, rather than enhance, the responsibility of each base commander to achieve our objectives. Only full commitment at every level of command to the proposition of equal treatment will bring the type of progress which is being sought.

Enclosed for your information is a recent announcement of a program designed to bring about equal opportunity and treatment in housing. Under this program, installation commanders will determine the extent to which facilities are available to all military personnel and their dependents without discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, or national origin and attempt to reduce and eliminate such discrimination whenever it is found.

I appreciate this opportunity to inform you of our actions and of our plans for the future.

Sincerely,

JACK MOSKOWITZ,
Deputy Assistant Secretary (Civil
Rights and Industrial Relations).

JUNE 9, 1967.
Brig. Gen. DOUGLAS C. POLHAMUS,
Andrews Air Force Base,
Camp Springs, Md.

DEAR GENERAL POLHAMUS: I am writing to call your attention to the problem of racial discrimination in off-base housing in the area surrounding Andrews Air Force Base. I have received a number of letters from airmen and their families expressing outrage that this deplorable situation should exist. I share their indignation.

I have recently received a reply to my inquiry from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Rights and Industrial Relations, Mr. Moskowitz, in which he notes Deputy Secretary Vance's memorandum of April 11, 1967, entitled "Equal Opportunity in Off-Base Rental Housing," which makes the responsibility of Base Commanders clear. According to Mr. Moskowitz's letter to me, a copy of which is enclosed, "Base commanders have the authority to request the approval of the Secretaries of Military Departments for imposition in the off-limits sanction in cases of discrimination against personnel."

I know that you will share my concern about discrimination against those who are serving our country, and I will appreciate your prompt attention to this matter.

With kindest regards,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. RYAN,
Member of Congress.

THE FLAG: SYMBOL OF OUR HISTORY

(Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 21, 1967, I supported H.R. 10480, which outlaws the intentional desecration of our American flag. This legislation was passed to protect the dignity of our flag and the spirit for which it stands.

Mr. Speaker, this is a symbol of our heritage. All Americans share a certain nobility which finds its beginnings in the cold North Atlantic winter, which men endured to first reach Plymouth Rock. The shot fired at Concord was heard around the world and this heritage grew. There were bloody footprints left in the snow at Valley Forge, and this heritage grew. John Hancock, John Adams, and the other leaders of our revolution gave meaning to this heritage. They roused the hopes of those who would be free throughout the world.

Can we today say that our flag stands for naught and that patriotism is old fashioned? I hardly think so. As a Congresswoman, I represent American men and women who have sacrificed their time and energy to continue the strength and freedom of America. Pensively and purposefully they know, and act patriotically, to continue the best form of government and society yet devised by man. These citizens feel proud of the contemporary and historical evidence of our living Constitution. For them the flag symbolizes past and present achievements which often have resulted from momentous decisions in the face of great controversy.

The truth of freedom, the right of equality before the law, and the safeguards of our check-and-balance system

guarantee that the individual's voice will be heard.

Mr. Speaker, today as in the past, we have patriotic dissension and, unfortunately, we also have those self-expressive detractors of all that is good in our American form of government.

Generations of American men and women have fought and died to preserve the liberty, freedom, and form of government that our wise and farsighted forefathers gave to us.

The history of American citizens, one and all; the history of national will to responsible self-government; and the history of our Nation based on unity with diversity clearly are embodied in the symbol of the Stars and Stripes.

The timelessness and the timeliness of our flag shall never be lost on the true patriot, whether he agrees or dissents with passing policy or passing public opinion. Only the detractors of all that America stands for would defile or desecrate the American flag.

(Mr. TAFT (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. TAFT'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. KUPFERMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CONWAY, MASS., IS 200 YEARS OLD

(Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. REINECKE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I bring to the attention of my colleagues the bicentennial celebration of the beautiful New England village of Conway, Mass. This lovely and tranquil hamlet, nestled in the hills of Franklin County, portrays the courage, character, and fortitude of our pioneer ancestors, and mirrors the progress of our country as it moves into today's modern age of business and technology. I would like to share with my colleagues and friends a brief review of the highlights of the history and accomplishments of Conway and the people who hail it as home.

Conway's origin stems from pre-Revolutionary War days. In 1712 the General Court of Massachusetts enlarged Deerfield's territory "9 miles westward into the western woods," an area which is now Conway. The first man, however, to brave the wilds of these woods was Cyrus Rice, in 1762. With his farm he started the settlement of Conway and opened the path for other brave and hardy settlers to follow. As the Reverend John Emerson, the first settled minister described these early pioneers:

These were men, who planted themselves on new and unimproved plots of land, and

S 8970

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

June 27, 1967

dependent and has to look for a job or go on to college. In some cases, he gets married and takes on the added responsibility of raising a family. In other words, he gains what no high school diploma can give him, a sense of judgment and responsibility.

In summation, I contend that lowering the voting age at this time would be a drastic mistake not only in Wyoming but all over the country. I have no doubt and a firm hope that in another ten years the voting age will be lowered if only because of the better educational "rounding" a student will obtain then but also because by then a young person will have more say in our government and *will know how to say it*. Perhaps in another ten years there will be more socially mature persons at an earlier age, but the fact remains that today no interest is taken in giving a student a strong foundation in *judgment and civics*. Unless this is improved there is little chance that a person of eighteen will be able to vote and vote in the right way.

NE
file

THE TENSE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the time for basic steps to alleviate the always tense Middle East situation is right now. As columnist Howard K. Smith wrote in the Washington Star:

The stunning Israeli victory has made things fluid. But they are already beginning to congeal again.

Mr. Smith's basic suggestion is a point well made and well worth repeating. He suggests that Israel, as a result of its overwhelming victory, is in the best position to exercise generosity and move toward solution of the Palestinian refugee problem. The Arabs, then, should recognize Israel's national existence, and the great powers should move in concert to damp down the local conflicts of the region. In this way, as President Johnson has suggested, each party can make concessions in nonessentials in order to secure what is essential—and that, of course, is an end to conflict. If this is not done, the Middle East will more than likely flare up again.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Smith's column, entitled "Basic Suggestions for a Mideast Settlement," be printed in the RECORD.

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

BASIC SUGGESTIONS FOR A MIDEAST SETTLEMENT

The Arab-Israeli conflict is complicated, but there is one simple thing that can be said about it—and that happens to be the basic thing:

The first elemental requirement for a successful policy anywhere is that it meet the basic test of plain, practical workability. Yet in this dispute, both sides base their policies on assumptions as unreal as the expectation that water will run uphill.

The Arabs expect Israel to accept national extermination, though Israel is strong enough to prevent it. Mr. Kossygin's proposal to the United Nations amounts simply to having Israel, though victorious, behave as though she had been defeated—and, though she is much the strongest nation in the region, his resolution would have her act as though she is the weakest.

And the Israelis expect the fiercely proud and hypersensitive Arabs to shrug their shoulders and live with defeat and humiliation—though 99 percent of Arab territory and 99 percent of their people remain intact, and they have friends and neighbors willing

to stake them to another, and another, and another, try at wiping out the shame.

Nations simply do not behave the way each side expects the other to behave, and they are not about to begin behaving that way now.

So, the latest Israeli victory, however complete it seems, is likely to intensify the conflict rather than lead to a settlement. Moreover, since the Israelis have provided a textbook example of how to win—i.e., get in the first paralyzing smack before your opponent can even get his planes off the ground—the situation is more volatile and prone to explosion now than it was before.

The Arabs can be expected to begin retraining armies in remote areas of the vast territory available to them, far from Israel, and to bring their forces within effective striking distance only when ready for the next showdown. And do not count on the Arabs remaining militarily inept; history amply demonstrates that defeat is a more effective teacher than victory. And the Israelis, knowing all this, will be readier to strike the first blow before the Arabs are ready.

In his speech last week, President Johnson stated the only possible terms on which settlement can be approached: Negotiations in which each partner to the quarrel, nudged heavily by the great powers, makes substantial concessions in non-essentials in order to secure what it regards as essential.

The space occupied by the Israeli nation is not essential to the Arabs. They must be induced to recognize its national existence and to end their permanent state of war with Israel. (Incidentally, their insistence that they were already at war with Israel makes hash of their charge that Israel committed aggression this month; if war already existed, Israel was just getting in the first blow in a new battle, the way the Russians got in the first blow in their Stalingrad offensive.)

And the Israelis have to assuage Arab pride and make amends ("America will play her part," the President said) to the wretchedly treated Arab refugees who once owned 94 percent of the area that is now Israel. That will call for an act of humility by the Israelis, but it is a small price to pay for acknowledged nationhood.

The first step should be taken by Israel. Overwhelming victory is the best basis for copious generosity.

The immediate next step should be taken by the two great powers. The rapid progress of Red China towards becoming a thermonuclear power should prod them to begin immediately taking steps to damp down local conflicts which China has always exploited and will soon be able to exploit fatally.

The stunning Israeli victory has made things fluid. But they are already beginning to congeal again. If there is going to be constructive action, no more time can be allowed to pass.

JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH'S "THE NEW INDUSTRIAL STATE" REVIEWED

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, former Ambassador John Kenneth Galbraith, who needs no introduction to the Senate, has written an immensely important new book entitled "The Industrial State." On Sunday, Carroll Quigley, writing in the Washington Star, provided us with a solid, well defined review, opening with the advice that the book be read, analyzed, and discussed by citizens.

Mr. Galbraith's book is a warning, perhaps, accompanied by suggestions for reform, and constitutes a major commentary upon our American way of life. I

ask unanimous consent that Mr. Quigley's review be printed in the RECORD.

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

GALBRAITH'S NEW BOOK ON INDUSTRIAL STATE HAS STARTLING IMPACT

(By Carroll Quigley)

This is an immensely important book. It should be read, analyzed, and unemotionally discussed, not by economists, but by citizens. The economists, like most academicians, are hampered by their specialist training from seeing their subject in its full social context and will be particularly offended by this volume, whose lessons, if generally accepted, would destroy economics as a separate intellectual discipline, or, at least, would reduce it back to *political economy* from which it emerged in the eighteenth century. But the warnings of this book should be considered by citizens who must pay the price in freedom, comfort, safety, and blood, if the description of our economy and of "the American Way of Life" presented here is true in only a major part.

TWO SYSTEMS

According to Galbraith, the American economy consists of two quite different economic systems: "the entrepreneuria economy" of over eleven million enterprises, largely controlled by owners and working in a competitive system to "maximize profits" which will go to these owners; and a mega-economy, (which he calls "the industrial economy") of a few hundred super-corporations, which dominate the whole economy and all aspects of our lives and are making the future in which the whole world must live. The two economic systems are totally different, the competitive one almost helpless in the market which it cannot control, and threatened by government, labor, competitors, and the whims of consumers, while the mega-economy, controlled by a bureaucratic managerial group (Galbraith calls it "the technostructure"), which seeks power, not profits and has been so successful in creating an autonomous area of such power that it can plan its own prices, production, and expansion, and has either neutralized or allied with the government, the owners, its competitors, and outside financiers, so that it can pass the costs of higher taxes, wages costs, or even dividends onto the public by simply raising prices. It seeks profits only to the degree necessary to satisfy the stockholders, pay these needed expenditures, and retains the rest to finance the corporation's unremitting drive to expand its operation so that all forces capable of threatening its autonomy and freedom of action may be controlled or eliminated.

THE SUPER CORPORATION

The two elements of the super-corporation's economic environment which it cannot control are (1) aggregate demand, that is the total purchasing power in the community available to buy its products; and (2) possible shifts in consumers' tastes which might leave its products unwanted. The first has been reduced by an alliance between the mega-economic technostructure and the government, under which the latter sees to it that its fiscal policies and its own purchases provide a market for the goods the mega-economy produces. The second is controlled by the mega-economy's expenditure of billions of dollars for the mental conditioning of consumers to the point where a well-financed advertising campaign can create needs, even urgent needs, which were never conceived of before in human history. To this end we are systematically brainwashed, and our whole way of life is being re-shaped, distorted, and corrupted to provide markets for the mega-structure.

June 27, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8969

As a part of the contest each student was required to complete an essay on "Should the Voting Age in the United States Be Lowered to 18?" and each year I am impressed with the depth of understanding and the dedication to our democratic principles displayed by these young people in their essays. This topic is one of vital interest to this age group, and their essays reflect sound reasoning which should be of interest to us all.

Of course, it would be impossible for everyone to read all these essays, but I think some of the most outstanding ones selected by an impartial panel of three judges should receive wider circulation, and I ask unanimous consent that two of these essays, written by Cozette Ann Johnson, of Basin, Wyo., and Daryl Bonicelli, of Kemmerer, Wyo., which received honorable mention in the McGEE Senate Internship contest, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SHOULD THE VOTING AGE IN THE UNITED STATES BE LOWERED TO 18?

(By Cozette Ann Johnson, Basin, Wyo.)

The question of lowering the voting age to 18 is one which has been debated for many years. I, myself, am opposed to that enactment by the state legislatures. This is, of course, a matter each state must determine for itself. To make mandatory a uniform voting age would require a constitutional amendment.

When we consider how easily the people of my age are influenced—how passionately, but temporarily, we attach ourselves to a "cause" and how difficult it is for us to distinguish the true from the false, we can readily understand why the demagogue, the dictator, and the hypnotic orator have been able, throughout history, to influence the youth of the land, as they did during the times when Hitler and Mussolini were in power. It is not mere accident that at the present time the Communists are concentrating upon our youth in order to acquire power and influence. For sound psychological reasons, the age 21 has long been considered the beginning of maturity.

There have been a number of non-sequiturs used in arguments favoring the establishment of the 18-year-old voting age. A poll taken in our school revealed several of these as quite common.

"If he's old enough to fight and to die for our country, he's old enough to vote." The qualities that are required for a good soldier are hardly applicable to a good voter. Instant obedience, quick action upon command, the unquestioning attitude at all times, quick reflexes, and physical fitness are requisites of our military men. Mature scrutiny, on the other hand, as well as critical appraisal of all recommendations, an unbiased point of view, and a philosophy that considers the good of the majority are essential for effective voting. So, to say that a youth is old enough to vote because he is old enough to fight, hardly follows the principles of logic.

"If he's old enough to marry and to pay taxes, he's old enough to vote." In some states the age of consent to marry is as low as 16 years. Statistics show that the divorce rate among such marriages is higher than it is among marriages of more mature people. The fact of emotional and psychological maturity, therefore, does not follow the low age of consent. Many a girl and boy have earned enough each year to pay the required taxes. Many girls could earn money by baby-sitting; many boys could earn money by construction work. Just because these young people are old enough to marry or old

enough to earn money, does that mean they are mature enough to vote?

Other arguments presented were that a person old enough to be judged by a court's harsh laws, should be old enough to vote. Another was that the 18-year-old today is much better informed and more highly educated than the 21-year-old living at the time when the Constitution was written. The youths that are civic-minded will stay that way; those who are interested and informed will not change. These youths will probably become even more so in the years between 18 and 21.

The poll I took in our school among students between 15 and 18 showed 54% supporting the lowering of the voting age, while 46% were against it. Although more approved it, those opposed have, it seems to me, stronger, more convincing arguments than do the others.

They believe that they should continue their education so that when they reach 21, they will be more alert and have wider knowledge to help them make the right decisions. Also, at 18 most people are still accepting their parents' political views as their own.

At 21 every person wants to be an individual while at 18 most people want to be "in" with the crowd. They prefer to follow the group rather than to make a decision for themselves contrary to the group.

They also felt that the person voting should have a "civic conscience" and that all the young people don't have it. Only a person who has been independent or who is responsible for a family's living realizes the purpose and the seriousness of voting.

Another youth wrote that before 21, most people act on impulse without realizing the consequences. They would be unable to consider the importance of voting.

The Gallup Poll taken in 1965 revealed that a majority of America's adults believe that the voting age should be lowered—57% registering their support, 39% in disagreement, and 4% having no opinion; this has remained constant for 11 years. Though this is the representative opinion of many adults, those that have the power to change the voting age don't—because they feel that it would not be a benefit to our country. Many state legislatures have rejected the proposal of granting suffrage to 18-year-olds. At present only two states, Georgia and Kentucky, permit voting at 18, one state, Alaska, at 19, and one state, Hawaii, at 20. It is equally interesting to note that nearly every representative democracy has a minimum voting age of at least 21. This is no accident, for the history of representative government—based on the concept of consent by the governed—has proven the need for political and social maturity, and a greater emotional stability than is possessed by the 18-year-old. By the time they are 21, most will have matured and become civic-minded—then they will be ready to vote. By waiting, the vote, a great privilege and responsibility, has not been risked on those incapable of preserving it. Don't you agree that this wait would be worth it?

SHOULD THE VOTING AGE IN THE UNITED STATES BE LOWERED TO 18?

(By Daryl Bonicelli, Kemmerer, Wyo.)

In my opinion, the voting age should not be lowered to eighteen years of age. I do not feel this way because a person who is eighteen is mentally incapable of voting compared to a person who is twenty-one years of age. On the contrary, in some cases an eighteen year old person is more intelligent than a twenty-one year old person, but there are such things as worldly experience, responsibility, and good judgment which in most cases cannot be taught in a classroom and are not wholly inbred into a person's character when he is eighteen. I am not saying that it is impossible for an eighteen year

old person to vote conscientiously, but I do believe that the average person develops a sense of judgment and responsibility between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one. This is the time when most of us go out on our own, develop our own ideas of life, and begin our separate vocations.

Someone who is for lowering the voting age to eighteen might point out that at this age one is eligible for the draft and active duty in Vietnam. This is very true, but if they were to say that it takes judgment and common sense to pull a trigger, I would have to disagree with them. Anyone who is physically fit and reasonably intelligent can fight in a battle, but it takes real honest and wise judgment to choose the leaders of your government with the thought that they may end this conflict in Vietnam and maybe larger conflicts to come. This is not to say that the men in Vietnam are not qualified to vote, but if someone were to say that fighting is a prerequisite for voting, I would disagree with them heartily. It takes a person who can both fight for his country and be a critical judge of human character to be a good citizen and an able voter. The person who can do both of these things well is well qualified to be a voter. In my opinion, this sense of judgment is developed after leaving high school and not during high school since a person meets more people with whom he can try out this new sense when he has left school and has been exposed to the world. Also in high school, a boy or girl is not judged on ability and talent but more on popularity. This fact alone gives an average high school student a twisted idea of what an election is all about. It is more of a popularity contest than an election. When voting for a class president or secretary, a student will not normally think about their qualifications but about how good looking or "cool" they are. When the selfsame student gets out of school and tries to apply these philosophies in an election, he is going to get the shock of his life and will wonder which way to turn. Part of this "error in judgment" comes from the lack of social education and experience of the student. I say this because I feel that schools should offer a student a strong course in social education and emphasize more strongly the civic part of life instead of always the academic and scientific part. If this were the case today, perhaps an eighteen year old person would be qualified to vote; unfortunately it is not. Considering how much stress is put on practical things in high school, I think that more attention should be paid to rounding out a student's education by teaching him how to be a well informed and responsible citizen.

Another question to be considered is when or at what age are we socially mature? It is hard to pick a specific year or period when this happens. Some people never mature, some mature early and some late, but it is hard to draw even a feasible date at which we all, on the average, mature or grow up socially. Someone might say that this is irrelevant to the issue at hand, but I might ask them why they picked a year like eighteen for military conscription. Because it is an even figure? Or because it seemed like most of us grow up physically at this age? It is somewhat easier to pick an age when most of us will mature physically than it is to estimate when we will be socially mature. The best psychologist in the world could not tell us exactly and at what precise instant we are going to come to social maturity, and I challenge anyone else for that matter to even give an approximate average year when a normal person is ready to vote. This brings up the other side of the question as to why a person must be twenty-one years old to vote. Someone might say that setting the minimum voting age at twenty-one is hardly any different than setting it at eighteen. There is only a three year difference between these two ages, but a lot of things happen to a person during this time. He becomes in-

June 27, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 8973

might write the following words about the United States in the year 1967:

"It was a time of crisis and challenge for the United States. While seeking to improve its own standards and redefine its own rights at home, that nation was tested as never before, in its pronouncements that policies to help extend human rights to other areas of the world."

And then, in conclusion, we would hope that the historian would set down this paragraph:

"America met the test."

There are those who say history cannot be made; it must be accepted.

But we Americans have never looked upon human history with fatalism or a sense of despair. We have never written off the future to the winds of chance and the whims of nature.

It is good to know history. It is even better to make it.

But before the act must come the vision.

What are the rights—and what are the corresponding responsibilities—which man may envision in the century ahead, and which he may work toward today?

Man's past rights, as previously defined, have most largely protected him against coercion by his government.

But in a world where destruction is only a half-hour away, as the intercontinental missile flies, we all know that man's rights are affected by forces far beyond those possessed by his own immediate government.

None of us needs to be reminded of that fact this week.

We know that every major event—or trend—taking place on this earth sends ripples outward to all other places.

All this is a way of saying that this truly is one world, and will become even more so.

It is thus clear that, if we wish man's rights to be nourished and not to wither, we must move beyond the goal of merely helping him resist the incursions of his immediate government.

We must, too, move beyond the business of the protection of rights to a more positive doctrine—toward their assertion.

In short, we must help man become not just protected, but liberated.

Does this seem to be new and revolutionary doctrine?

It is revolutionary.

But it is hardly new. It is, in fact, the doctrine of Thomas Jefferson—doctrine that proclaims "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" as the inalienable rights of all men.

Life that is more than mere existence.

Liberty that is not only proclaimed, but practiced.

Happiness that is found in only the full and rich life of men who are both secure and free.

We know through our own experience that the rights of man are never real unless they are constantly reasserted. We have seen what happens to them when they are left to fend for themselves.

We know in our hearts that the rights of man are a never-ending unfinished business, just as America is a nation never finished, a destination never quite reached.

The quest for the rights of man can never end at our own doorway. Nor can it be pursued in any narrow, protective sense.

Therefore, I hope you will not consider me presumptuous if I say that, here and now, we as Americans must dedicate ourselves to a new Bill of Rights and Responsibilities for the 21st Century—rights and responsibilities which fit new times and circumstances.

Let us raise our sights beyond the past and present. Let us declare ourselves for the future rights which one day all men share:

The right to peace—so that man may live and hope free from the threat of those who would march to power.

The right to justice—so that man may stand before his peers and his society on

truly just and equal basis with his neighbor.

The right to free expression—so that man may speak and be heard, despite the decisions and beliefs of any temporary compact majority.

The right to the search for knowledge—so that no man may remain another's slave through the denial of skill or education.

The right to public accountability—so that man may remain the master of the state, rather than the state become the master of man.

The right to a meaningful role in society—so that man may follow his own cadence and live with self-respect and dignity among his fellow citizens.

The right to full opportunity—so that man may lift himself to the limit of his ability, no matter what the color of his skin, the tenets of his religion, or his so-called social class.

The right to public compassion—so that man may live with the knowledge that his health, his well-being, his old-age and loneliness are the concern of his society.

The right to movement and free association—so that man may freely move and choose his friends without coercive restraints.

The right to privacy—so that man may be free of the heavy hand of the watchers and listeners.

The right to rest and recreation—so that the necessity of labor not be permitted to cripple human development.

These are the rights we seek—and must continue to seek—to make alive and real in our own nation. These are the rights, I believe, which we can do no less than seek for our brothers in mankind.

These rights will not be achieved at home, or in the world, without the exercise of consonant responsibility by men who would possess them.

Then what are the responsibilities of modern man?

The responsibility to participate—lest critical initiatives and decisions be left to those who would bend them to their own use.

The responsibility to speak out—lest silence in the face of injustice be interpreted as its acceptance.

The responsibility of public service—lest service be to self rather than fellow man.

The responsibility to support the rule of law—lest the law of the jungle become the law of human behavior.

The responsibility to protect ideals in the face of force—lest ideals be lost and violence be spread.

The responsibility to respect and defend the rights of others—lest freedom become license, and opportunity become coercion.

And these latter responsibilities, I might add, are nowhere more clearly spelled out than in two remarkable documents for the future: The Charter of the United Nations and the recent Encyclical of his Holiness, Pope Paul VI.

Both of these documents point the way to the future responsibilities in this world of the United States and other free nations. They point the way to the creative, constructive work that will be necessary if peace with freedom is ever to be achieved—the work of nation-building, of peace-keeping, of self-sacrifice in the cause of fellow man.

I know there are certain "realists" who believe both the United Nations Charter and the Pope's Encyclical to be the documents of dreamers. That they may be. But they are also realistic.

For I believe it is most unrealistic to expect man to survive through the years ahead if these documents are not heeded, and in the specific.

It is clear: The rights of each man must by necessity be limited by the rights of others and by the just-demands of the general welfare. Yet, within those limits, the possibilities of making men truly free are today but barely touched.

The first step is to have a vision of the

rights we seek. The second step is to resourcefully find the means to their attainment. The third step is to have the courage to use those means to their attainment. The third step is to have the courage to use those means until the vision is achieved.

I have faith that America has within itself vision . . . and resourcefulness . . . and courage.

I give you the Words of Woodrow Wilson: "This is not America because it is rich. This is not America because it has set up for a great population great opportunities for material prosperity. America is a name which sounds in the ears of men everywhere as a synonym with individual opportunity because it is a synonym of individual liberty."

I have faith that we shall not be diverted, at home or in the world, by the temporary crises and distractions which tempt men to infringe on the rights of others or to abandon their responsibilities.

And I have faith that the year 2000 will dawn on a world not of emptiness and devastation . . . not of oppression and conformity . . . not of self-indulgence and materialism . . . but a world in which each man stands free and equal in his search for the happier, better life than can be his.

That is the promise of the 21st century. And that is the promise of America.

NE file
MILWAUKEE JOURNAL PRAISES
PRESIDENT'S MIDEAST POSTURE

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, once again the Milwaukee Journal has hit the nail on the head in highlighting the essence and extolling the wisdom of President Johnson's position on the Mideast crisis. As an editorial in the June 20 issue of the Journal points out, the President has taken a realistic, hard-headed approach to the situation, recognizing that "the Israelis will always toe the brink of war if they insist on hanging on to all the Arab lands they won" while at the same time asserting that Israel should not give back any land until certain guarantees are granted. These guarantees includes free passage through the Gulf of Aqaba, limits on the arms race, and political independence and territorial integrity for all.

I ask unanimous consent that the Journal editorial be printed in the Record.

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

REALISM ON MIDDLE EAST

President Johnson's fine statement Monday on the middle east crisis establishes a constructive, realistic foundation for United States policy there.

Instead of reiterating the bland proclamation that this country respects the territorial integrity of all parties to the dispute, the president clearly charted a course the United States hopes to pursue in trying to restore stability and peace to the area.

That course rests on at least two key realities: That the Israelis have convincingly clobbered their Arab enemies and hold a powerful hand for future bargaining; that the Israelis will always toe the brink of all-out war if they insist on hanging on to all the Arab lands they won last week.

So most of the lands must be given back. But not, as the president stated, before certain guarantees are granted: Free passage through the Gulf of Aqaba; recognition of the "rights of national life" for the Jewish state; greater justice for the million or so Arab refugees; limits on the arms race; political independence and territorial integrity for all. Any settlement that ignores even one of these crucial conditions is almost certainly bound to fail.

Compared with the president's sensible and restrained remarks, the United Nations address of Soviet Premier Kosygin was a cloud of guff. The events of recent days undoubtedly helped dictate these respective postures. The Russians' clients lost; ours won.

The one glimmer of hope that emerged from Kosygin's diplomatic theatrics was his acknowledgment that Israel has a right to live. That raises possibilities for negotiation. If Kosygin can only impress his conviction on his Arab friends, the dark middle east tunnel may yet produce a flicker of light.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Spang in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 344, House bill 10867.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10867) to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this bill, H.R. 10867, provides a permanent debt ceiling of \$358 billion to take effect on July 1. This bill is urgently needed because the current debt limitation will expire this Friday, June 30. Unless this bill is enacted by then, the Secretary of the Treasury will have to stop issuing Federal securities at the end of this week and the Treasury soon will be unable to pay the Government's bills.

In view of the very little time that remains before the present debt limit expires, your committee has approved the bill passed by the House and done so without change. It has refrained from amending it in any way. As I noted, the bill provides a new debt limitation of \$358 billion. This limit will apply throughout the entire fiscal year 1968. Beginning in fiscal year 1969, the debt will be permitted to increase to as much as \$365 billion during the course of a fiscal year, but must fall back to \$358 billion at the close of each fiscal year.

Apart from the specific figures which I have referred to, the bill contains three other features which deserve description. First, the bill provides that the \$358 billion debt limitation I have just described is to be a permanent limitation and not a temporary limitation. The members will recall this last February, when we last considered the debt limitation, that the Senate wanted the \$336 billion provided in that bill to be a permanent limitation. We preferred this to retaining the permanent limitation of \$285 billion with a temporary limitation of \$336 billion. The Senate saw no rea-

son for this demarcation between temporary and permanent, particularly when it was so obvious that the \$285 billion limitation could not be restored in any practical sense at least for years to come.

A second special feature of this bill provides that participation certificates issued by the Federal National Mortgage Association during the fiscal year 1968 are to be included in the debt subject to limitation. As I will describe to you in somewhat greater length subsequently, the need for this action arises from the uncertainty as to whether participation certificates will be issued in the coming year or whether, in their place, additional debt will be acquired. This removes any difference insofar as the debt limitation is concerned, no matter which of these two courses is followed.

Finally, the bill extends the maximum period to maturity of Treasury notes from 5 to 7 years. Previously, indebtedness of between 5 and 7 years was classified as a bond. Bonds are subject to the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling while Treasury notes are not. As I will explore with you in greater depth in just a short while, the purpose of this is to enable the Treasury to spread the maturity of indebtedness somewhat, while still not having any appreciable effect on interest rates.

THE NEED FOR PROMPT ACTION

It is important that we approve this bill promptly so that it can be enacted into law before this coming Saturday. On that day the debt ceiling is currently scheduled to fall from \$336 billion to \$285 billion. Since the debt outstanding will be around \$327 billion, the Secretary of the Treasury will be in grave difficulty if we do not provide this new limit.

I regret that the Senate has been given so little time to debate this bill. It is not the fault of the administration, however, for they sent up the request very early in May. The legislation became delayed in the House. The House initially considered a debt limit proposal on June 7, but on that date the House rejected it. Following this action the House was unable to act on a limit to which it could reach agreement until this last Wednesday, June 21.

I do not like to see the Senate faced with the necessity of acting in haste on an important piece of legislation. I do not like it when the committee is forced to approve a bill without amendment in order to make sure that the Government's credit will be preserved. But I say to the Senate that I do not believe this situation will arise again.

I say this because this bill follows the action taken by the Senate in February and makes the debt limitation permanent. The limitation in this bill does not expire on any given date. There will not be the prospect in the future of a precipitous fall in the limit from \$358 billion to \$285 billion as has been the case in the past. In the future, therefore, if and when the debt ceiling has to be increased, there will be more time for the Senate to debate the question. There will not be this sharp fall overnight in the limit. There will be no fixed date on which the debt ceiling will fall to some unrealistic

level. Therefore, while I do not like the fact that we must approve this bill promptly and without amendment, I can assure the Senate that this situation will not arise to harass us in the future.

THE SIZE OF THE DEBT

There is no question that the debt limit increase set forth in H.R. 10867 is a large one—an increase of \$22 billion over the present limit. It is not, however, unprecedented. From 1941 to 1945, annual increases in the debt limit ranged from \$40 billion to \$85 billion. Although our economy is not on the full wartime footing that existed during World War II, the types of increases which occur in defense spending between the current period and that period presents certain parallels.

The fact is, however, that during the postwar period the economy has expanded more rapidly than has the size of the Federal debt. The debt has fallen steadily in relation to the ability of our citizens to carry that debt. In 1940, the public debt at the end of the fiscal year was \$48.5 billion. This was equal to 51 percent of the Nation's gross national product. The debt rose during the Second World War to a peak of 134 percent of the gross national product. Today, while the debt has risen to \$327 billion, it is equal to only 43 percent of the gross national product. It has fallen and will continue to fall steadily as a percentage of gross national product.

Before I conclude on this point, I want to make one further comment about the size of our national debt and its relationship to our economy. Not only has our debt gone down as a percentage of our gross national product, but the debt of the Federal Government has gone down when compared to the entire debt of our economy. In 1944 the national debt made up 58 percent of the total debt of our economy, while as of 1966 it represented only 22 percent of the total debt.

HOW THE \$358 BILLION LIMIT FOR 1968 WAS ARRIVED AT

I want to be sure that each of the Senators knows exactly how the committee reached its conclusion that a limitation of \$358 billion was required for the fiscal year 1968. I want you to appreciate, as fully as the committee does, that this is a realistic, but nevertheless tight, limitation for the coming fiscal year. Anything less than this for the fiscal year 1968 will almost surely mean that we would have to revisit this problem of the debt limitation in the fiscal year 1968.

The administration presented the committee with a table showing exactly what the debt can be expected to be on the first and fifteenth of each month in the fiscal year 1968, assuming a \$4 billion cash balance and assuming that the deficit for the fiscal year 1968 is \$11 billion—which is the deficit now projected on the basis of the administration's best current estimates. This table, which appears in the committee report as table No. 6, indicates on this basis the debt next March 15 is likely to be \$345.2 billion. I want to emphasize to you again, however, that this computation makes no allowance for contingencies, not even the normal \$3 billion contingency allowance that has been provided for in most of the debt limitations we have passed since early in the 1950's.

"liberated" countries. To insure the election of the Communist candidates, tens of thousands of people were arrested on the eve of the elections as a threat to those who protest by refusal to vote. The decisions of the "elected representatives" to "request" incorporation of the three Baltic States into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics were prepared in Moscow and carried out by the occupying Red Army.

In their zeal to impose their alien system on the Baltic States, the Soviets deported or liquidated 700,000 men, women and children from Lithuania alone, between June, 1941 and March, 1951. Notwithstanding this inhuman oppression, the peoples of the Baltic Nations persevere in their aspirations toward personal freedom and national independence.

While addressing the General Assembly, Mr. Kosygin unequivocally stated, "In the course of its 50 year history, the Soviet Union has regraded all peoples, large or small, with respect; every people enjoys the right to establish an independent national state of its own. This constitutes one of the fundamental principles of the policy of the Soviet Union. While upholding the rights of peoples to self-determination, the Soviet Union just as resolutely condemns the attempts by any state to conduct an aggressive policy toward other countries—a policy of conquest of foreign lands and the subjugation of the peoples living there."

In view of the above facts, we request the Premier to clarify the following questions:

Why has the Soviet Union continued to violate the sovereignty of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia?

When will the Soviet Union apply the principles of the United Nations Charter to the Baltic States?

When will the Soviet military and administrative apparatus be withdrawn from the territory of the Baltics?

When will the Soviet Union desist from its policy of Russification and Sovietization of the Baltic peoples?

When will the Baltic victims of mass deportation be allowed to return to their homelands?

When will the Soviet Union cease interfering in the political, social, and religious life of the Baltic States?

Mr. Premier, the Baltic Republics have a right to preserve their own languages, religious freedoms, traditions and political aspirations. Will you enact measures to correct the gross injustices imposed by Stalin on the Baltic Nations and restore independence—or are your noble words addressed to the General Assembly mere hypocrisy?

COMMITTEE TO RESTORE LITHUANIA'S
INDEPENDENCE
NEW YORK, N.Y.

(Executive Coordinators: Algirdas Budreckis, Romas Kezys, Anthony B. Mazeika, Joseph Miklovas, Anthony V. Snieckus.)

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

[Mr. FARBSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

TOWARD PERMANENT PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution which expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should encourage a permanent resolution of Middle East tensions and work toward the creation of an atmosphere which will be conducive to a lasting peace in that area. I particularly commend my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. WHALEN] for taking the lead in proposing this measure.

This resolution sets forth certain basic principles upon which a permanent peace in the Middle East can and should be achieved, foremost of which is that the President should encourage the State of Israel and the Arab nations to conduct direct negotiations to resolve the underlying problems which led to the recent armed conflict.

In addition, this resolution refutes the specious position of the Arab nations and the Soviet Union by urging the President to oppose, as any precondition of Middle East negotiations, the requirement that Israel relinquish the territories she held at the time of the cease-fire.

Although this resolution urges the President to have Israel and her Arab neighbors work out their own problems, I strongly believe that the world's major powers must bear heavy responsibility for the recent conflict. Israel and the Arab nations would benefit greatly if all agree to let their neighbors live in peace and diverted the vast sums spent on arms to economic development.

Mr. Speaker, the Middle East needs water, not war; it needs tractors more than tanks, bread more than bombs, economic prosperity more than senseless death and destruction. Therefore, I call upon not only Israel and the Arab nations, but the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and France, as well, to convene, as soon as practicable, a disarmament conference with a view toward ending, once and for all, the shipments of arms, weapons and "advisers" to the Middle East and to provide, in their place, the knowledge and financial support needed for the economic growth of the area.

I believe this resolution should be of interest to all of our colleagues and I include the text herewith, for insertion into the RECORD:

Expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of permanent peace in the Middle East

Whereas, an internal Middle East conflict inherently endangers the peace and well-being of the world community of nations; and

Whereas, an open door in the Middle East is vital to the flow of world commerce; and Whereas, by United Nations Declaration Israel legally deserves the status and rights of a sovereign nation and the territorial integrity which such status entails; and

Whereas, many thousands lost their lives in the recent Middle East conflict: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that permanent peace in the Middle East can be achieved only if:

1. The existence and sovereignty of Israel is acknowledged by the Arab nations;
2. Freedom of passage in the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba is guaranteed not only to Israel but to all nations;

3. Final settlement of the boundaries of the State of Israel is made and such boundaries are acknowledged by the Arab nations;

4. Effective restrictions are imposed upon the flow of arms into the Middle East from other members of the world community;

5. All nations address themselves to a final and equitable solution of the refugee problem in the Middle East; and be it further

Resolved, That the House of Representatives, in order that lasting peace may be established in the Middle East, urges the President of the United States:

1. To use all diplomatic resources at his command, including our membership in the United Nations, to work for the accomplishment of the five aforementioned objectives, and

2. To avoid repeating the mistake of 1956 which led to resumption of hostilities eleven years later, by opposing, as a precondition to the discussion and negotiation of the aforementioned five objectives, the relinquishment by Israel of territories possessed at the time the cease fire was effectuated, and

3. To encourage, through all diplomatic means, a resolution of the underlying problems which led to armed conflict among the nations of the Middle East, through direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab states.

PROTECTION FOR THE NATION'S LETTER CARRIERS

(Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which will make it a Federal offense to assault or kill a letter carrier in the performance of his duties.

The need for such legislation is so obvious, that I wonder why it has not been enacted before. We have made such provision in the past for post office inspectors, for employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for employees of the Secret Service, employees engaged in animal disease control work, and so forth. It seems manifest to me that the letter carrier is even more deserving of our protection, and that his lack of coverage under our statutes is an inadvertent omission.

As he walks the street with the mail on his back, the mailman is readily identifiable by the uniform he wears as a representative of the Federal Government. This makes him an easy target for any person who harbors a grudge against the Government.

When the mail is slow—when welfare checks, or annuity checks, and so forth, are delayed—disgruntled patrons occasionally try to take out their frustrations by assaulting the letter carrier who, of course, is not responsible for the tardiness in the first place. This happens more often than most of us would expect.

Under present day conditions, the Nation's mailmen carry trillions of dollars in reasonably negotiable paper in their sacks each year. This makes the letter carrier an attractive target for a smash and grab raid. Ironically the grabbing is a Federal offense, but the smashing is not. It is a crime to interfere with the mails, but not a Federal crime to interfere with the mailman.

June 27, 1967

we had a responsibility to three billion people in the world because of our strength and obligations as great powers; that responsibility was peace and trying not only to secure it for ourselves but to secure it for all human beings.

The world's peace now hangs heavily tonight upon the wisdom, judgment, and understanding of these two very great States—the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

There are deep and very serious differences in our two societies, but one thing we do have in common, as Chairman Kosygin himself said when he addressed the United Nations, is a grave responsibility for world peace in a nuclear age. Every crisis in the last 20 years has necessarily invoked that common responsibility and repeatedly we have seen the dangerous consequences of incomplete understanding.

We have also repeatedly seen that when others are irresponsible in word or in deed a very special burden for care seems to always fall upon America. So I was glad to meet with Chairman Kosygin this morning. We talked throughout the day quietly and straightforwardly.

I am glad to say to you that I found he came to our meeting in the same spirit. He had some seniority on me. He had been a grandfather for over 18 years and I had been a grandfather for only 18 hours, but he and I agreed that we both very much wanted a world of peace for our grandchildren.

We talked about the problems of the Middle East in detail. We shall continue to talk about them. We talked about the problems of Southeastern Asia. We talked about the arms race and about the need for new agreements there. We talked about the need for common action on constructive initiatives for peace. We reached no new agreements—almost, but not quite. New agreements are not always reached in a single conversation. So, we are going to eat lunch and spend Sunday together again at Hollybush.

I don't want to overstate the case. I don't want to get your hopes too high. I do think, though, that we understand each other better. I do think that I was able to make it very clear, indeed, that the strength and the determination of our country and the government are fully matched by our persistent eagerness to talk and to work, to fight for peace and friendship with all who will work and talk with us.

But all of you must remember that one meeting does not make a peace. I don't think there is anyone in the world who ever wanted peace more than the leaders in the world of countries who are not at peace. You must all remember that there have been many meetings before and they have not ended our troubles nor have they ended our danger. There is not a nation in the world we would trade places with tonight.

These meetings just have not ended our troubles and our dangers and I cannot promise you that that will not happen again. The world remains a very small and very dangerous one. All nations, even the greatest of them have hard and painful choices ahead of them. What I can tell you tonight—and I have no doubt about it at all—is that it does help a lot to sit down and look at a man in the eye all day long and try to reason with him, particularly if he is trying to reason with you. That is why we went to Hollybush this morning and reasoning together there today was the spirit of Hollybush.

I think you know me well enough to recognize that that is my way of doing things—"Come now," as Isaiah said, "and let us reason together." What I think is even more important—that is the way I think we must finally achieve peace.

Those who do not smell the powder or hear the blast of cannon, who enjoy the luxury and freedom of free speech and the right to exercise it most freely at times really do not

understand the burdens that our Marines are carrying there tonight, who are dying for their country, or the burdens that their commanders are carrying, who wish they were all home asleep in bed, or even carrying a placard of some kind.

But they can't be and still retain our national honor. They can't be and still preserve our freedom. They can't be and still protect our system. When they can be—with honor—they will be—at the earliest possible moment.

Sometimes I think of my friends who don't understand all of the cables I read from all of the 122 countries. They don't hear all the voices of despair and of all the chaotic conditions that come to us through the day. Sometimes I think of that Biblical injunction, when I see them advising their fellow citizens to negotiate and saying we want peace and all of those things.

I try to look with understanding and charity upon them, and in the words of that Biblical admonition, "God, forgive them for they know not really what they do."

I can just say this to you: There is no human being in this world who wants to avoid war more than I do. There is no human being in this world who wants peace in Vietnam or in the Middle East more than I do.

When they tell me to negotiate, I say, "Amen." I have been ready to negotiate and sit down at a conference table every hour of every day that I have been President of this country, but I just cannot negotiate with myself.

And these protestors haven't been able to deliver Ho Chi Minh any place yet.

I was not elected your President to liquidate our agreements in Southeast Asia. I was not elected your President to run out on our commitments in the Middle East. If that is what you want, you will have to get another President.

But I am going—as I have said so many times—any time, any place, anywhere, if, in my judgment, it can possibly, conceivably serve the cause of peace. That is why I went to that little farmhouse way up on the New Jersey Pike today to spend the day, and that is why I am going to get over to see my grandson by daylight in the morning.

I have been up since 4:30—1:30 this time. I have been about 24 hours on the go. Then we will fly back to New Jersey Sunday for another go at Hollybush.

All I ask of you is two things: Be proud of yourself, of your family, and of your associates for making my burden light by coming here and cleaning up this debt, wiping the slate clean, and making the Democratic Party fiscally sound and solvent where we don't have to carry a tin cup and walk around begging. That is number one. Number two—give me your confidence and your prayers, because, God knows, I need them.

I looked at all my communications the other day, my phone calls, and my visitors and I finally observed to one of my assistants, "Why does nearly everybody say something ugly to the President?"

He said, "Mr. President, I have worked here for 29 years. I was here with Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Truman, Mr. Eisenhower, and Mr. Kennedy." And, he said, "Somehow or other the people just don't seem to like Presidents."

That may be true at times, but when I read about my decline and my defeat, I look back over the problems that other Presidents have had and I don't seem to remember many of them that the American people turned their backs on in a time of crisis or in a time of war.

Whatever the prophets may say and whatever the columnists may write—back to Lincoln's time, at least—that is all the time I have had to research, since I started reading these columns—no President has ever been turned upon when he was engaged in trying to protect his country and its interests against a foreign foe.

So about all the strength that we have and the strength of our system, the strength of our courageous young men who are ready to die for that system, and the strength that comes from your confidence and the comfort that comes from your support and to every man and woman in the room tonight, whatever color, whatever religion, whatever party—there are not all Democrats here. Some Republicans want to help the President, too—I want to say this: You will never know how much the confidence that you have given me tonight means to me and how much strength it will give me in the days ahead when I will need it most.

Thank you. Good night.

OPEN LETTER TO PREMIER KOSYGIN

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on June 22 there appeared an ad in the New York Times paid for by the Committee to Restore Lithuania's Independence, one of whose directors is Mr. Anthony B. Mazelka, my constituent, and a director of the Lithuanian World Review. I believe it to be a proper question to Premier Kosygin, especially when Premier Kosygin now calls on the great free nation of Israel to simply give up territory valiantly won against the aggressor nations of the United Arab Republic. Soviet Russia refused to even permit the question of the captive nations to reach the U.N. Assembly for discussion—nations taken by an aggressor.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the aforementioned ad clearly sets forth the facts and I herewith submit the copy of said ad:

THE BALTIC QUESTION: OPEN LETTER TO PREMIER KOSYGIN

On June 19, 1967, the Soviet Premier, Aleksel Kosygin, in addressing the United Nations General Assembly, accused Israel of continuing aggression by occupying the territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan.

Mr. Kosygin defined continuing aggression as attempts "to interfere in the internal affairs of independent countries and peoples, to impose on them, from the outside, political concepts and views alien to them on the social order."

The Soviet Premier is adept at defining continuous aggression, for his state has a long record of conspiracy against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent nations. While vituperating against the State of Israel, Mr. Kosygin would do well to consider his own government's continuing aggression. The most conspicuous victims of joint Soviet-Russian and Nazi German aggression are the Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

The annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union was pre-determined by the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of August 23, 1939. The agreement stated: "In the event of territorial and political rearrangement in the areas belonging to the Baltic states (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Finland), the northern boundary of Lithuania shall represent the boundary of the spheres of influence of Germany and the U.S.S.R."

While the attention of the world was focused on the Blitzkrieg in the West, the Soviet Union imposed its "sphere of influence." On June 15, 1940, troops and tanks of the Red Army poured into the Baltic States. Moscow hastily set up puppet governments. A single list of representatives, hand-picked by Moscow, was proposed to the

June 27, 1967

The postal inspection service informs me that during a recent 6-month period there were approximately 40 robberies of letter carriers in the performance of their duties. This hazard is growing and it is time that we provide an effective deterrent through Federal prosecution.

If a letter carrier is assaulted on the job today he must bring action in the local courts himself. Local courts are too often not deeply concerned with protecting the persons of these valuable Federal employees.

We must make it perfectly clear to potential wrongdoers that the entire protection and support of the Federal Government is behind the letter carrier as he walks the streets of America, and that those who dare to interfere with him physically do so at the risk of incurring stiff reprisals from the Government he represents.

The legislation I have introduced today will do that.

(Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. RODINO'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

U.S. FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

(Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee is scheduling an initial set of hearings in mid-July on the future of U.S. trade policy. As chairman of that subcommittee, I have recently announced some of our plans.

The lead witness at the first hearing, on July 11, will be Ambassador William H. Roth, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations. Testimony of congressional delegates to the Kennedy round negotiations will be heard Wednesday, July 12. On Thursday, July 13, distinguished foreign observers have been invited to give their views on the position of the United States in the trading world of the future; the Honorable Kenneth Younger, Director of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, and Dr. Aurelio Peccei, executive manager of Olivetti General Electric, Milan, will testify then. At a final hearing, on Thursday, July 20, there will be a summing up; on that occasion the witnesses will be David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and George Ball, formerly Under Secretary of State.

The intention of the subcommittee is to look forward as well as backward, and to try to anticipate the problems of the future. In so doing, we expect to achieve a worthwhile congressional appraisal of U.S. trade policy.

A number of study papers, written on invitation, are in preparation to assist members of the subcommittee. These papers will be published later.

But the limited number of hearings, and the fact that these papers are invited, may work against our intention to canvass the widest range of opinion on trade policy. It has been decided therefore to invite interested parties to present their views on U.S. trade policy in writing to the subcommittee.

Since the subject of the subcommittee's study is the long view of our trade policy, our questions are about what is to be negotiated and how it is to be done, what issues are becoming less important, and what more important. It is intended that we should broadly assess the national interest. It is not that we should ignore or minimize the special or sectoral interests, but that our attention should be focused on issues of policy for the next 5 or 10 years.

Within these broad limits, the subcommittee proposes to publish the statements of interested persons and groups. Since the invitation is extended generally, the subcommittee reserves the option to refrain from publishing statements or parts of statements that are either too long or not germane to the issue of the future of U.S. trade policy.

I request that interested parties send their statement before July 31, 1967, to Congressman HALE BOGGS, Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, Joint Economic Committee, Room G-133, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

And I ask unanimous consent that the substance of a form letter, addressed by a member of the Joint Economic Committee staff to a few who have already inquired, be placed in the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
June 27, 1967.

DEAR Mr. _____: Congressman Hale Boggs, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, has asked that I respond to your inquiry concerning the Subcommittee. As you know, the Subcommittee has scheduled an initial set of hearings, in mid-July, which is the first stage in a Congressional appraisal of future U.S. policy.

The intention of the Subcommittee is to canvass a wide range of opinion on the subject, and the limited number of hearings may work against this purpose in the short run. It has been decided therefore to invite interested parties, including yourself, both by letter and through the Congressional Record, to present in writing their views on U.S. Trade Policy.

You will understand that the Joint Economic Committee is not a legislative committee and that the subject of the study is the long view of our trade policy. Our questions are about what is to be negotiated and how it is to be done, what issues are becoming less important, and what more important. It is intended that we should broadly assess the national interest. It is not that we should ignore or minimize the special or sectoral interests, but that our attention should be focused on issues of policy for the next five or ten years.

Within the broad limits described in the preceding paragraph, the Subcommittee proposes to publish the statements. Since the invitation is extended generally to interested parties, the Subcommittee reserves the option to refrain from publishing statements or parts of statements that are either too long or not germane to the issue of the Future of U.S. Trade Policy. If you wish to submit a statement, please send it, before July 31, 1967, to Congressman Hale Boggs, Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, Joint Economic

Committee, Room G-133, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.
Sincerely yours,

NE file

THE PRESIDENT'S WISE WORDS FOR THE FUTURE OF THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. NIX (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has offered a reasonable and flexible policy for bringing peace to the Middle East. And by so doing, he has earned the gratitude and support of all the American people.

I am glad to report that the Philadelphia Bulletin, in an editorial, warmly praised the President's speech of last Monday. The paper finds that Mr. Johnson's discussion of the Middle East, "in contrast to that by Premier Kosygin, was well reasoned and carefully restrained."

The Bulletin continues:

Mr. Johnson displayed commendable initiative in outlining this country's position in advance of Premier Kosygin's address . . . The President, in urging all to avoid the early adoption of rigid positions, left open a way to negotiations from the posture of flexibility that is so vital to effective diplomacy.

We can only hope that responsible voices at the United Nations and elsewhere, who are involved in the future of the Middle East, will heed the wisdom of the President's words.

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the excellent editorial from the Philadelphia Bulletin.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, June 20, 1967]

THE PRESIDENT'S PRESCRIPTION

President Johnson's discussion of the Middle East, in contrast to that by Premier Kosygin, was well reasoned and carefully restrained.

Mr. Johnson very properly stressed Israel's right to live. This right, which Israel's Arab neighbors refuse to grant, has been the root cause of the Middle East's troubles for the past 20 years. Properly, too, Mr. Johnson made very clear this country's position that the Soviet supported effort to force Israel back immediately to its pre-war lines would bring nothing but new hostilities.

As a very practical matter Israel's sole bargaining power in the negotiations that must come with the Arab nations will be the territory she gained—and continues to hold.

The President declared that a real and lasting peace in the Middle East will come about only as the result of agreements reached among those who live and must continue to live there. With this declaration went an admonition to Israel against permitting her very considerable military gains to make her insensitive to the rights of her admittedly militant neighbors.

Mr. Johnson displayed commendable initiative in outlining this country's position in advance of Premier Kosygin's address before the United Nation's General Assembly. The President, in urging all to avoid the early adoption of rigid positions, left open a way to negotiations from the posture of flexibility so vital to effective diplomacy.

With this went Mr. Johnson's pledge that the United States will help the nations directly involved to reason together and live together. He offered help specifically in solv-

H 8122

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 27, 1967

ing the refugee problem which has afflicted the area as a cancer.

It is, as Mr. Johnson said, a time for patience rather than propaganda and for magnanimity rather than malice. For, as Mr. Johnson pointed out, the peace of the whole world is at stake.

The President's temperate approach will, hopefully, set a favorable diplomatic climate for a critical week—a week in which some detente must be reached.

PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES USED BY SOME OEO OFFICIALS

(Mr. NICHOLS (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, before long, this House will be called upon to act on the request by the Office of Economic Opportunity for funds for continuing the so-called war on poverty. In the last few months, I have become very familiar with the working of the poverty program, and would like to enlighten my colleagues as to the practices and procedures used by some OEO officials.

Last summer the Dallas County and Selma City Board of Education operated a joint Headstart project. This project was a success, and local officials there had every reason to believe that their Headstart would again be funded this year.

Here is a telegram received by my office and by local officials in Dallas County on June 6:

After final review by our staff today, we expect to approve your summer Head Start program. We need one more piece of information to complete our processing, and a representative of our regional staff is there in Selma today gathering this data. If we have all these details in hand tomorrow, we would hope that we can complete and approve your summer Head Start program at that time.

FRANK SLOAN,
Regional Director, OEO, Atlanta.

One the basis of this telegram from the regional director, the school officials began making their final plans for Headstart. You do not take a program of this magnitude and begin it overnight. OEO officials drug their feet as long as possible, in fact too long, to allow our people time to effectively and efficiently plan a Headstart program.

Four days later, Dallas and Selma officials received a letter from Mr. Sloan saying that he had tentatively concluded that the application should be refused. The reason it was refused, according to Mr. Sloan, was that it was designed to serve only Negro children on a segregated basis and to tokenly serve only white children on a racially segregated basis.

Mr. Joseph Pickard, superintendent of city schools in Selma, answered Mr. Sloan's charges in a letter dated June 12. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter a copy of his letter in the RECORD at this point:

JUNE 12, 1967.

MR. FRANK K. SLOAN,
Director, Southeast Region,
Office of Economic Opportunity,
Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR MR. SLOAN: Today, June 12, 1967, I received a copy of a letter from Mr. Alfonso McGhee of your office stating that you had

tentatively concluded that our Project Head Start application should be refused.

Mr. McGhee's letter makes a number of statements that I believe need some attention:

(1) "The proposed program, as reflected by center locations, staff recruitment and assignment and recruitment of eligible enrollees, appears to be designed to substantially serve only eligible Negro children and their families and to serve them on a segregated basis and to totally serve the eligible white children and their families on a racially segregated basis."

As I understand the Head Start Program, it is designed to help the severely disadvantaged youngsters who will be entering school in September to have a two-months' program that will offer them experiences that they need before they begin regular first grade work. The vast majority of eligible children in Selma are Negro. Therefore, it follows that if the eligible children are to be served most centers will be predominantly Negro and some may be entirely Negro.

After two very successful Head Start Programs in 1965 and 1966 which were taken advantage of by Negro children only, this year our plan included a fifth center which would take care of white and Negro children on a desegregated basis. A majority of the children at this center are white, but Negro children are included also.

(2) Quoting from Mr. McGhee's letter again:

"The historically white school which would be used as a center reflects a design to serve eligible white children and their families on a token and segregated basis."

The above statement is categorically untrue in that Negro children were definitely enrolled at the center mentioned. Also, attention is again called to the fact that the vast majority of eligible children are Negro. Few white children can qualify for Head Start because of low income requirements.

(3) Quoting again from Mr. McGhee's letter:

"It would probably follow that a program staff at the all-Negro centers would be comprised of all-Negro personnel and the program staff at the historically white school would be comprised of all white personnel."

The above statement is not only untrue, but it was made despite the fact that an investigator named Sampson was told the exact numbers of personnel of each race to be used at each center. As a matter of fact, the personnel to be employed were twelve (12) Negro teachers and four (4) white teachers, and eleven (11) Negro aides and five (5) white aides. All white aides were scheduled to work at the four centers that have been historically Negro centers. Two (2) Negro aides were assigned to previously white center. Two (2) of the white teachers were assigned to historically Negro centers.

Another quotation from Mr. McGhee's letter:

"In violation of OEO guidelines (that each center serve the eligible children who reside in a separate, compact, geographic area whose boundaries are drawn without regard to race) the proposed program would allow enrollees to choose to attend any center on a freedom of choice basis. This is probably intended as a signal to both Negro and white enrollees that they would be expected to attend the center in schools which has historically been designated for their respective races."

This statement is basically untrue. Children were recruited to attend the center closest to their homes according to boundaries set up for the program. In perhaps two or three instances white children, eligible by income standards, had moved from one area to another but requested to attend the center that was definitely expected to be desegregated. We would have been glad to tell these children that they must attend the center closest to their new residence if this were requested by OEO officials. However, I

know of no such request from the investigators, Sampson and Webster.

Also, I should like to point out that during the four days (June 7-10) that the investigators, Sampson and Webster, were in Selma, at no time did either of the gentlemen do me the courtesy of calling on me to discuss the entire matter. I was told on Wednesday, June 7, that they would see me on Thursday, but at no time on Thursday, Friday or Saturday did they request a conference.

These investigators did call a meeting of four (4) of our Negro principals without any authorization from this office. I question this procedure and other techniques used by the investigators.

Finally, I should like to mention your telegram of June 6, which gave us every reason to believe that the project would be approved. As a matter of fact, I received Mr. McGhee's letter a half hour after the program was scheduled to begin.

I should be delighted to discuss this matter with you if I can give you other information.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH A. PICKARD,
Superintendent.

Selma and Dallas County officials felt it would be useless to ask for a hearing, but somehow five officials showed up in Selma last week. What happened is best expressed in this article from the Selma Times-Journal:

Actually, no one really expected anything to be solved at the hearing in the first place. Nobody wanted it except the Office of Economic Opportunity and they probably regret it a day too late. And, well they should. James H. Keller, Assistant General Counsel for OEO, contributed poorly toward enhancing the sharply diminished image of OEO. He was arrogant, conceited, and ridiculous. He could have done as well by charging into town brandishing an old union saber and riding a camel.

Indeed, the man obviously grasped the opportunity and the excuse for the hearing for use as a forum to spout the usual bureaucratic mouthings for which he undoubtedly will receive a few brownie points in Washington at the next gathering of the faithful. Gnats! And so much for Heller, too.

Unable to convince the sociologists in OEO that the facts are the facts, and that even the idealists in the poverty program cannot change them, the local Dallas County and Selma officials could have very easily sent some 700 deserving youngsters into the streets for the summer. But, they did not do this. Instead, they are carrying out a program without the help of the \$150,000 in Federal OEO funds. These 700 students are being given the benefit of an outstanding program this summer, utilizing the same staff that had been lined up for Headstart. Volunteers have offered to act as teaching aids and health aids. Local people have donated educational toys and books. Parent and teacher organizations in the area are furnishing each child with a toothbrush and toothpaste. The county health department is planning to send immunizations and other medical supplies to each center 1 day a week.

These children will not get some benefits that they would have under an OEO-sponsored Headstart program. They will not, for instance, get measles vaccine or dental work such as fillings and teeth cleaning. Under OEO they would have had a breakfast, midmorning snack, and lunch. The local program will be able to

June 27, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 8139

deception, subversion and the strategy of terror are not outworn myths but the preferred instruments of the Communist Party.

"In our revolutionary world it is vital that understanding of social justice, individual responsibilities and threats to world order keep pace with rapid scientific discovery. Young Americans are idealists, looking for meaning in their own lives and for good causes to serve. The freedom and well-being of people all over the world for years to come may depend in no small measure on the wisdom and competence of ascending generations in this nation."

The ABA program, it was explained, features academic experts, journalists and consultants to government on such subjects as: (1) The Principles and Potential of Modern Democracy; (2) Permanent Factors in Soviet Foreign and Defense Policy; (3) Soviet and Chinese Youth Today; (4) Communist Propaganda Techniques; (5) Schisms in the Empire of Marx; and (6) Modern Capitalism and the Economic Dogma of Marx.

Each lecturer or panelist is cross-examined by a team of outstanding teachers who relate problems in the classroom to the expertise of the scholar.

Participants in the course are furnished copies of a teacher's syllabus entitled, Democracy Confronts Communism in World Affairs. This 297-page syllabus of 34 chapters was prepared under the auspices of the ABA Committee.

Also attending the meeting were the following members of the ABA's co-sponsoring committee: Morris I. Leibman, chairman, a member of President Johnson's Advisory Panel on International Problems; Charles Maddock, chairman-elect, the General Counsel of Hercules, Inc.; and Louis B. Nichols of New York City, executive vice president of Schenley Industries, Inc.

Representing the Archdiocese School System at the meeting were Rt. Rev. Monsignor Raymond P. Rigney, superintendent of schools; Rt. Rev. Monsignor Edward M. Connors, associate superintendent of schools; Rt. Rev. Monsignor Joseph T. O'Keefe, director of communications center; and Brother Augustine, director of secondary curriculum.

The lecture series will include the following:

1. Modern Democracy: Principles, Paradox and Potential.
2. Twentieth Century Totalitarianism: Common Characteristics.
3. God, Man and Society: The Premises of Communism.
4. Humanism, Individualism and the Moral Premises of Western Civilization.
5. Origins of the Cold War.
6. Permanent Factors in Soviet Foreign and Defense Policy.
7. Controversial Issues in the Court of World Opinion: Peace, Poverty, Race and Class (Myth vs. Reality)
8. Rich Nations and Poor Nations.
9. Propaganda: Magnitude, Methods and Major Themes.
10. Schisms in the Empire of Marx: Tito, Mao, The new Soviet Intellectuals, the European Satellites.
11. Soviet and Chinese Youth today.
12. Modern Capitalism and the Economic Dogma of Marx—a panel discussion.
13. The law, The Citizen and The State: Contrasts between U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.
14. The Russian Proletariat in contrast to American Labor, Aims, Methods and Achievements.
15. Religion under the Commissars.

JAMES H. SCHEUER

(Mr. HATHAWAY (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I have known Congressman JAMES SCHEUER, of the 21st District in New York, for some time, and have an enormous respect for his ability. Recently he has sponsored H.R. 9840, the Bilingual Education Act, which is of particular interest to me. I would like to insert an editorial from *El Tiempo*, a Spanish American paper in New York, that pays the Congressman appropriate tribute for his work on this bill:

JAMES H. SCHEUER

Few Districts in Congress are represented as thoroughly and conscientiously as the 21st, where young, dynamic James H. Scheuer makes it a full-time job—despite all his business interests in Puerto Rico and his intense civic activity.

From his District office at 159 East 165th Street in the Bronx, and from the House of Representatives Mr. Scheuer has initiated a great deal of constructive legislation.

We are thinking particularly of HR 9840, the Bilingual Educational Act which he introduced in May. This bill seeks to correct the many inequities that now exist for 2,000,000 non-English-speaking children who live in the United States, of which nearly 70,000 are in New York City elementary schools.

As Congressman Scheuer points out, "these children suffer from grossly inadequate educational opportunities available to them and their consequent inability to compete effectively for jobs when they leave school.

"There is an invisible but real barrier of verbs and nouns, idiom and nuance which has cut these children off from effective participation in the mainstream of American Life," Mr. Scheuer adds.

The Bilingual Education Act would provide assistance to local educational boards and establish bilingual education programs. New York would be provided with federal funds to help provide high quality education for children from non-English-speaking homes. This could include free training programs for teachers in bilingual areas.

Mr. Scheuer's bill also proposes to upgrade the quality of the entire program of schools where large proportions of the children come from non-English-speaking and low income homes, including intensive early childhood programs for the pre-school and the kindergarten age children.

We hope the bill is approved, and congratulate Mr. Scheuer on his thinking.

NE file
PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP: LYNDON JOHNSON AND THE MIDEAST CRISIS

(Mr. WHITE (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, editorial opinion around the country is only now beginning to recognize the solid leadership of President Johnson in the current Mideast crisis.

The President kept his head. He worked through the United Nations in an effort to prevent war, and then to achieve a ceasefire after the shooting had actually begun.

And finally, a few days ago, he laid down his five principles of peace to restore order to that troubled area. All reasonable men who believe in liberty and territorial integrity can support those principles in good conscience.

In brief, in complete contrast to most other world leaders, President Johnson

has given us a display of diplomacy and statesmanship of rare quality.

President Johnson has shown the world that there is a middle ground between appeasement and unilateral intervention.

It is a middle ground which all Americans can support. I support it, and I trust the Congress supports it.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD a fine editorial from the *El Paso Times*, supporting President Johnson's policies in the Middle East:

STERLING LEADERSHIP

President Lyndon B. Johnson has come in for some criticism of his conduct of the affairs in Vietnam, but it is becoming increasingly clear that he handled the upheaval in the Middle East in a masterful manner.

President Johnson kept his head when some senators, including Wayne Morse of Oregon, a dove in the Vietnam war, demanded that our country test the Egyptian blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba.

Although President Johnson stated, "The United States considers the gulf to be an international waterway and feels that a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegal and potentially dangerous," United States officialdom generally was cool to the idea of testing the issue by sending a U.S. ship into the Gulf of Aqaba.

How right President Johnson was has been proved by subsequent events.

Had we taken the bull by the horns and sent a U.S. vessel into the blockaded area the whole world by now might be involved in war. It seems certain that the excited Nasser would have fired on the U.S. ship. That would have brought quick reprisals.

It is deeply regrettable that the Arab World turned on us as a result of a malicious lie fabricated by Nasser that U.S. and British planes helped the Israelis.

We like the idea of relief in the Middle East being extended on a regional basis. There was talk that the Johnson administration was working on possible war relief and reconstruction aid to Israel and Arab countries in the wake of last week's fighting.

We think the United States should extend any economic aid possible to both sides.

We insist, however, that any aid extended by the United States to the Arab countries should not be used for rearming and getting ready for another "holy war" with Israel. Nasser has been talking about regrouping and challenging Israel again.

We want no more of that, at least not with assistance furnished by us.

Up to this point, President Johnson has done extremely well in handling the Middle Eastern crisis.

We are among those who wish to congratulate him for his level-headed leadership during that ordeal.

(Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HANNA'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matters.)

[Mr. CONYERS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to ex-

H 8140

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 27, 1967

tend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CONYERS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

EAST-WEST CENTER GRANTEES

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of my colleagues a most outstanding essay by Miss Cheryl Kimoto, of Kohala, Hawaii, regarding the impact of East-West Center grantees on the local population. I am inserting the full text of Miss Kimoto's essay here, not only for its revelation of a seldom-mentioned advantage of having the foreign students in our midst in Hawaii, but also for the insight of the comments and the thoughtfulness of her conclusion.

Miss Kimoto won the Statewide Pacific and Asian Affairs Council 1966-67 contest in Hawaii with this essay which I herein make available for the wider reading it deserves:

A NEW DIMENSION OF REALIZATION THROUGH
THE EAST WEST CENTER GRANTEES
(By Cheryl Kimoto)

The visits from the East West Center Grantees are most effective in PAAC activities. Through our research and discussions at conferences, we share our knowledge of the world and its dilemmas in the effort to fulfill the purposes of the PAAC. However, it is easier to perceive "first-hand" information, than it is to understand information which is read from a book. Because the grantees are natives of their respective countries, the information which they relay to us seems to have genuine meaning, and this has enabled me to realize, and to understand the world with a better perspective.

Speaking with the grantees has impelled me to think about the importance of language in communicating; of how the ability to speak different languages breaks one barrier of world perplexities. I have also become aware of the fact that many children of foreign countries have the opportunity to learn various languages through schools and community groups. All the efforts these foreign students put into learning English, and other languages as well, are very significant in overcoming one hurdle of world understanding through language communication.

It's amazing how direct and true statements from a grantee can make a person realize what he might never have even thought of before. The visitor from Vietnam has said that in her country, teen-age girls use make-up sparingly (unlike many American girls) and that they spend more of their time studying instead. They have also told us of the strict discipline which is present in the homes and schools. It makes me wonder if many American teen-agers are too commercialized, and if they take studying as a mere pastime. It is these little things which seem unimportant now, but it may affect the type of government America will have in the years to come, for it has been said that "the youth of today will be the leaders of tomorrow." And it is the type of youngsters we have which will affect the role our country will play in the future international scene.

The grantees bring out their native cultures also. During the recent East-West Center visit, the club planned a party where we could get acquainted and at the same

time, learn from the grantees. This was an evening of enjoyment, teen-type music, dance, and most of all, learning. Something which really impressed me, however, was a contrast to all that went on in the pavilion. The sun had faded and only the moon and the stars made their way through the sky, while the ocean waves rhythmically rushed to shore and gently receded back again. In this beautiful and serene scene, I heard the singing of an Indian (dressed in his native costume), praying to his god beneath a tree as the moon cast the shadows upon the rocks. I've never experienced anything more impressive than this scene of nature, solitude and prayer.

It may seem trivial to write of this experience but through this, I really began to think about the world and its people. It made me realize that there are basic cultures in all countries, such as religion, and the love of nature.

It is so easy to read the statements, "... All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable Rights . . ." but to realize that these statements are true through actual experience, carries more meaning. Through the grantees, I have been able to realize that people are people, no matter how each person differs from another in his physical features, beliefs in gods, and ways of life. This awareness leads me to strongly feel that discrimination of a country or race has no basis, and that there is a legitimate hope for world-wide peace to take a firm start from this idea of human equality.

After meeting and conversing with the grantees, all the countries of the world seem to be "closer" to each other. And when the visit has ended, one not only has gained a better insight of the world and its people and problems, but also, he has gained new friendships.

DR. DAVID Z. ROBINSON APPOINTMENT AS VICE PRESIDENT OF
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

(Mr. SCHEUER was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House of the appointment of Dr. David Z. Robinson, member of President Johnson's Office of Science and Technology, as vice president for academic affairs at New York University. His appointment, effective July 1, was announced by Dr. James M. Hester, president of New York University, who said of him:

Dr. Robinson has played an important role in shaping national policy for science and education. He can make a major contribution in shaping the future of New York University.

In 1961 Dr. Robinson joined the White House staff as a technical assistant to the special assistant to the President for science and technology. He has also been a staff member on panels of the President's Science Advisory Committee dealing with basic research, high energy physics, computers in higher education, and Project Westford. He has worked with the Bureau of the Budget on problems of the administration of Government research grants, and has been a member of the advisory committee of the science and technology task force of the President's Crime Commission. In addition, he has been an observer of the Federal Council for Science and Tech-

nology panels of high energy physics, materials research, and atmospheric sciences.

Dr. Robinson is a fellow of the Optical Society of America and was national lecturer of the society in 1960-61. He is a member of Sigma Xi and Phi Beta Kappa.

Dr. Robinson will take on much of the responsibility for planning and administering New York University's instructional, research, and public service programs. In the increasingly complex relations between urban universities and the city, this young scientist should be able to take a leading and innovative role in bringing the two into greater harmony. His keen knowledge of government and technology will enable him to take a leading role in the updating of New York University's educational processes.

COMMENCEMENT REMARKS BY MR.
LEO S. TONKIN

(Mr. GRAY (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, at the recent 10th commencement exercises of the growing and excellent St. Thomas Aquinas College in Sparkill, N.Y., a stirring charge to the graduates was given Mr. Leo S. Tonkin. The commencement remarks of Mr. Tonkin were noteworthy for their simple, yet most profound thoughts.

I certainly commend the reading of this speech to my colleagues in the Congress, as well as to all those interested in the tomorrows of our young and esteemed graduates of 1967.

I take especial pleasure in calling Mr. Tonkin's remarks to your attention, for this young man is known to many of us as having served with distinction in a number of congressional staff positions over the past years.

He is now the president of his own federal relations educational firm, Leo S. Tonkin Associates, Inc. In this position, Mr. Tonkin is now enjoying a reputable career working directly with educational institutions, and encouraging them to be creative and dedicated in their planning and development.

Following Mr. Tonkin's commencement remarks, St. Thomas Aquinas College saw fit to bestow on him their 1967 Cardinal Spellman Award and medal. At this time, I insert Mr. Tonkin's commencement address in the RECORD:

Your Excellency, Archbishop Maguire, Reverend Monsignor, Reverend Mother, Evangelist Marie, Reverend Dean, Sister Marie Enda, Members of the Board of Trustees & Faculty, Reverend Fathers and Sisters, Ladies and Gentlemen, and, indeed, most splendidly, graduates of the Class of 1967.

I feel most happy and indeed honored to be with you today, this wonderful milestone in your lives. When Mother Evangelist Marie asked me to deliver today's commencement address, I readily accepted with pleasure and anticipation. It is always good for someone working in Washington to have an opportunity to leave that Babylon on the Potomac for a few days, and just retire somewhere alone or sometimes to talk with many of the fine people around the country who

A 3300

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 27, 1967

Its Time To Be Stiffly Correct**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**
OF**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the recent performance at the United Nations, in which diplomats of many lands pounded the propaganda drums, using the United States as a whipping boy in far too many instances, it is well to evaluate the attitude that we ought to maintain in dealing with foreign lands. A very penetrating and imaginative article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones in the Washington Star on Saturday, June 24, is worth pondering and, therefore, I place it in the RECORD at this point:

IT'S TIME TO BE STIFFLY CORRECT

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The time may have arrived when the American people should quit trying to be so puppy-dog friendly to the world and assume a more dignified posture of "correctness."

Americans are, perhaps, the friendliest people on earth. Part of it comes from our bigness and isolation. At home we see few foreigners. An alien accent intrigues us. In any erudite cocktail party the crowd is generally thickest around the foreign visitor.

We have, for a long time, suffered from a missionary guilt complex. It's an interesting combination of smugness and concern. We are proud of the "American way." We feel sure that our outlooks and techniques are superior to those of most other countries. We would like to share our wisdom. Hence, the missionary. On the other hand, we are easily guilt-ridden because of our relative opulence. So we give, often lavishly.

Our British cousins in their great days were somewhat like us, but not much. They were eloquently and sometimes arrogantly proud of the empire. They wept a little for the heathen. They had their heroic missionaries and teachers who went forth into the pools of ignorance and fever to discourage infanticide, stop cannibalism and outlaw suttee. But hard on their heels came the flag and the traders.

As the Basuto chief bitterly told one of my old anthropology professors, "When the white man came here he had the Bible and we had the land. Now we've got the Bible and he's got the land."

Among the more recent colonial powers you might classify, in descending order of humanity, the French, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Germans and the Japanese. The Russians were never well enough organized in the 18th and 19th centuries to seize distant lands from primitive peoples. But in their conquest and treatment of the European satellites they would go to the bottom of the list.

Only the Americans were haunted by their strength and nervous about their prosperity. Only the Americans set forth wistfully to make the world love them.

Funny thing. The Israelis bombed a U.N. force in the Gaza strip and nine Indian and two Brazilian soldiers were killed. The diplomats in the U.N. Security Council all tried to top each other in expressions of regret and grief. But 54,000 Americans died in what was billed as an official U.N. action in Korea. How much weeping did the United Nations do for our boys?

There is the human inclination to make the friend of your enemy your enemy. All our largesse to India was forgotten the moment we gave arms to Pakistan. And the Pakistanis damned us for our aid to India.

For many years Americans tried to make themselves loved in the Near East. The American University in Beirut has educated generations of Arab leaders. We were lavish with Fulbright scholarships. We poured tremendous aid funds into Arab nations, including those whose oil-rich sheiks bought Cadillacs by the shipload and rented whole hotels in Switzerland.

But because America has promoted Israel we were hated. And when Gamal Abdel Nasser, in the bleak early hours of June 6, tried to alibi the collapse of his air force by claiming that American and British planes had shot it down, the whole Near East bought it immediately. Mobs converged on the American embassies. The American libraries went up in flames.

Maybe we ought to relax. Maybe we should quit trying to be loved. Maybe we should assume that we will be spit on. America is a complacent dragon, a fine beast on which to beat with wooden swords and have one's picture taken standing on its back. Hatred of it is a huge convenience for a government entangled in its own stupidity.

So be it. If we expect to be hated we will be freer to do intelligent things. We won't have to keep shoring up corrupt regimes in the hope that they will become reliable friends. We can spend our foreign aid more wisely. We can seal off some famous rat holes.

We can say, "Look, your excellency. Your mob burnt our free library, which happens to be the biggest and best in your country. If you want it back, jail the leaders and build us a building. We'll just replace the books."

Or, "See here, your highness. We figure you'll gut us the first time it's convenient, but in the meantime we'd like to help your people. If you've got a sound plan and a way to keep your gang from cracking the safe we may bankroll it."

This kind of talk will make more sense to more people than our past habit of turning the other cheek with a sickly grin. Everybody's pal—hell; it just didn't work. Let's be stiffly correct for a change, and maybe they'll conclude we're not so crazy after all.

NE file
How the Extreme Left Reacted to the Middle East Crisis**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, almost everyone is now aware of the false accusations which the Communist world has repeatedly lodged against Israel and the United States.

In a recent article, Meir Kahane, of the Jewish Press, analyzed the reaction of the extreme left throughout the world and the Nation, to the Middle East crisis.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the June 23, 1967, edition of the Jewish Press.

The article follows:

HOW THE EXTREME LEFT REACTED TO THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

(By Meir Kahane)

The international Marxist network was unanimous in its condemnation of Israel as an "aggressor" and as a "tool of imperialism." None, not one, saw any justification for Israel's actions. All saw the war as an outgrowth of American "imperialism" and an "oil lobby plot" with the Israeli government

as a willing lackey of the United States. All backed the United Arab Republic and the other Arab states in their struggle against the "imperialist aggression."

There was, however, a certain difference between the line taken by the Communist parties of the West and others. In general the stand taken, not only by the Chinese Communists and their allies, but also by the Soviets and their East European satellites was extremely harsh, with not a word concerning Israel's right to exist. The Western communists, however (aside from the Peking-oriented ones) were caught in a dilemma. They were perfectly willing to go along with the Communist line but they were faced with the fact that the vast majority of citizens in the free countries were solidly behind Israel and looked in horror at anyone who tried to seriously suggest that the Jewish state was an aggressor. In addition, they realized that their Jewish members would be disturbed, if not worse, at any such action. They, therefore, swallowed the line—with some hedging. Let us analyze this in specific terms.

CHINESE AND SATELLITES

The Chinese, of course, dedicated to a policy of extermination of Israel, spoke out early in the crisis on behalf of the Arabs. Indeed, some days before Nasser began the sabre-rattling that led to the war, Peking had celebrated "Palestine Day" in pomp. The "holiday" which is celebrated every May 15, led the official Chinese organ Renmin Ribao to exclaim: "As long as the Palestine people and the other people persist in the struggle they will finally defeat . . . U.S. imperialism and its tool for aggression, Israel, and the aspiration of the Palestine people to return to their homeland will surely be realized."

By May 25, as Nasser's troops were mobilized along the borders of Israel, a Reuters report from Peking stated that Kuo Mo-jo president of the Academy of Sciences, said at a rally of 100,000 that "China stood with the Arab countries against what he called United States and Israeli aggression." He also blasted those who were "struggling the just struggle of the Palestinian people." With the outbreak of hostilities and the swift advance of the Jews, rallies were held, daily, in Peking to support the Arabs and a government statement declared: "The 700 million Chinese people absolutely will not allow United States imperialists and their collaborators to ride roughshod and commit aggression everywhere."

The Chinese allies, North Vietnam and the Vietcong, added their complete backing of the Arabs. President Ho Chi Minh, of North Vietnam on June 6, condemned the attack on the Arabs (it might be noted that the following day, South Vietnamese Premier Nguyen Kao Cao Ky, declared: "I'm for Israel.") The Vietcong Liberation Radio, on June 8, broadcasting from its secret jungle base in South Vietnam, promised to "step up the war against the Americans" as a way of backing the Arabs in their struggle "against imperialism."

In the United States, the pro-Peking Marxists echoed the Chinese line. Thus the fanatical Youth Against War And Fascism outfit, through a spokesman, Deirdre Griswold, declared that "Israel, in fact, is acting as a pawn of Western interests. Our people, with their sympathies, are for the Arab revolution . . . Israel is artificial." (Let it be noted here that many of this group's members are Jewish and—as they back Communist policy in the Middle East—so do they in Vietnam.)

The Students for a Democratic Society, an increasingly radical group which has taken stands that parallel more and more the Chinese line, said, through its Jewish president: "Our people do not believe that the U.S. should be the policeman in the Mideast or the Far East." Naturally, the Arabs answered with a loud Amen.

June 27, 1967

Private Harman, a graduate of Poly who lived at 319 Audrey avenue in Brooklyn was killed about 3 P.M. last Saturday by small arms fire while guarding an outpost somewhere in Vietnam, his father, Curtis C. Harman, said last night.

ENLISTED IN ARMY

His son had enlisted in the Army in June 1966, after finishing his second year at Loyola College, Mr. Harman said.

Although he was in the ROTC, he "couldn't quit and enlisted. He volunteered for Vietnam . . . said he wanted to get in it before was all over."

Mr. Harman said his son "read constantly, about the military," had majored in political and military science while at Loyola and "wanted to make the military a career."

In addition to his parents, Private Harman survived by a sister, Mrs. Joyce Filipiak, of Munich.

Certification: This is a true and correct copy of the original Resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Philadelphia on the eighteenth day of May, 1967.

PAUL D'ORTONA,
President of City Council.

Attest:

NATHAN WOLFGAN,
Chief Clerk of the Council.

Resolution on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, it is time that the United States took stock of its stand on foreign aid.

Today the United States is the wealthiest nation in the world, yet since 1949 the percentage of our gross national product which we devote to foreign aid has steadily been decreasing. Considering the phenomenal increase in the number of nations requiring economic assistance since that date, this decrease is even less justifiable. We cannot continue to isolate ourselves from this growing problem.

The General Board of the National Council of Churches has offered a resolution to this effect which I now submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION ON FOREIGN AID ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL BOARD OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, JUNE 1, 1967

The General Board of the NCCUSA affirms its support of governmental foreign aid, especially development loans and technical assistance.

The General Board, however, does not consider that the present governmental expenditures adequately discharge the responsibility of the USA for economic aid and technical assistance, and therefore records the following convictions.

The moment has come for a renewal of American commitment to international development. Public indifference and governmental retreat must be overcome. New attitudes, new policies, and new actions are required. The poverty of two-thirds of the human family is the starkest economic fact of our time. It is more than a material condition: it is a moral outrage. The sufferings and the degradation of the poor have been made intolerable in our generation, because the nations together now possess the technological capacity to lift the burden of poverty from the backs of every people. Everywhere poverty has become a seedbed of social and political revolution.

Those who know God in Jesus Christ discern afresh that His love seeks justice in the very midst of the revolutions of the disinherited. As the gap between the rich nations and the poor nations tragically expands, the imperatives of our faith cry for justice and for compassion. These imperatives require not merely inner attitudes. They call for action. They confront the United States with special force because it is of all nations the richest and most powerful. This nation has done much to develop the science and technology which provide the promise of triumph over world poverty and which have persuaded us to launch a war on poverty at home. But our very affluence tends to muffle the cries of human need and to stifle our response to them. We in the

richer nations are failing to fulfill our obligations to the two billion children of God who are poor, our brothers and sisters who bear His image and are beloved of Him as much as any one of us. We are failing morally, and we are failing politically. The policies of the United States government reflect this failure. As the costs of international development have mounted, the Executive has proposed and the Congress has voted successive decreases in the American (dollars) commitment. In 1949, during the Marshall Plan, the United States provided 2.78 per cent (approximately \$7.5 billion) of its gross national product as economic aid primarily for European reconstruction. By contrast, the US in 1967 provided only 0.57 per cent (approximately \$3.8) of the G.N.P. for economic aid throughout the world. It is true that aid to Europe and economic and technical assistance to the developing nations have called forth unprecedented funds from the United States government and have made substantial contributions to human welfare. Yet it is also true that United States development policy is in retreat at the very time that the wisdom of experience is ripening, the fruits of scientific study are becoming genuinely significant, and the opportunities for acceleration in development are rising. It is particularly unfortunate that the shrinking of American vision and support comes at a time when bitterness and despair are growing in the poorer nations.

The General Board notes with gratitude that these and other matters of far reaching importance concerning development have been put before the world in the Encyclical "Populorum Progressio" ("On the Development of Peoples"), and heartily commends to its member churches the study of the Encyclical together with the thought of Protestant and Orthodox churches on these matters. In particular the General Board expresses its gratitude at the prospect of collaboration with Roman Catholic brethren and pledges its own efforts toward this end.

The General Board recognizes that development in the complex world of the 1960's involves economic, political, cultural, and psychological matters that go far beyond governmental financial aid and technical assistance. Therefore, it is of the most immediate urgency that present governmental aid, especially in the form of development loans and technical assistance, be continued and increased. Any aid program should be correlated with a trade policy helpful to developing countries, lest the USA contribution in these areas diminish to the vanishing point. Funds for increased aid in agriculture, family planning and education are of particular importance.

We stress the necessity of greatly increased emphasis upon multilateral provision and administration of aid through the UN, its Specialized Agencies, and other international institutions. Any process of sharing or providing of aid from rich to poor is difficult. Multilateral international channels reduce these hazards by providing a framework in which unilateral pressures are reduced, and the dignity and freedom of both receiving and giving nations are enhanced. In this connection, furthermore, it is important to make increased provisions for aid funds to be less dependent upon their being spent within the U.S. economy.

The General Board directs that this resolution be communicated at once to the appropriate members of Congress, and requests the member churches take immediate steps to register similar convictions on their own part, and on the part of their individual members, to the members of Congress.

The General Board requests early completion, for its consideration and action, of the study of international justice and development now under way in the Department of International Affairs.

Increased Social Security Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege along with many other Members of the House recently to introduce legislation to update and strengthen our social security laws to provide among other things a 20-percent increase in payments to those of our older Americans who are eligible, and indeed to enlarge the percentage of our population eligible to take part in our social security program.

The Council of the City of Philadelphia, one-fifth of which I represent, recently saw fit to adopt a resolution memorializing this House to support that 20-percent increase. I present the text of that resolution at this time:

RESOLUTION NO. 315

Resolution memorializing the members and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States to support the proposed increase of twenty per cent in Social Security payments

WHEREAS, The Senior Citizens of our Nation include a great majority of elderly men and women who rely solely upon the Social Security payments they receive for their subsistence, care and shelter; and

WHEREAS, Living costs under present conditions make it difficult for these elder citizens to meet their financial needs without a realistic increase in Social Security payments; and

WHEREAS, President Johnson's proposal that Social Security payments be increased to not less than twenty per cent is unanimously endorsed by the members of the Senior Citizens' Central Association of Philadelphia; therefore

Resolved, By the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby memorialize the chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States to favor and support the proposed increase of twenty per cent in Social Security payments.

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be forwarded to Chairman Wilbur Mills and the members of the House Ways and Means Committee as evidence of the sincere sentiments of this legislative body.

June 27, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3301

Thus, the Chinese and their allies, as far as the Soviets are concerned, they and their Bulgarian running dog, clearly showed the media of television, radio and the press, their fanatic hostility toward Israel. The other East European Communists colonies joined the Russians in bitter condemnation of Israel and in thinly veiled threats against the Jewish state. None of them had a word to say against the violent Arab threats to destroy Israel; none of them declared that Israel had a right to exist.

On the other hand, the Western Communist parties were forced to twist and turn to satisfy both their masters in Moscow and the liberals they were trying to attract. This led to attacks on the Israeli Government circles (rather than on Israel itself) and a description of the Israelis as tools of Washington who, nevertheless, had a right to exist if only they would abide by the Communist book. All this, however, could not disguise the fact that the Western Communists agreed fully with the general Marxist assessment of Israel:

THE AGGRESSOR

This, for example, is how the Worker, the Communist Party's newspaper, re-wrote history in its description to its readers of the background of the Mideast crisis even before hostilities began:

"The present Middle East crisis had its beginnings last November, when the Israeli government, using the excuse of raids by Palestine Arab refugees, invaded Jordan and destroyed three villages . . . Most of the Arab states immediately began to develop mutual military relationships in preparation for further attacks by Israeli military forces.

"This uneasy situation prevailed until May 12 of this year when Premier Eshkol, impatient at the lack of reaction, threatened strong military action against Syria . . . It was three days after this Israeli threat that UAR President Nasser put his country's troops on the alert to warn Israel against what he considered to be an impending invasion of Syria. At the same time, he requested the United Nations to withdraw its troops from the Gaza Strip and the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba both UAR territory.

When the Israeli regime continued its belligerent attitude toward the Arab states, Nasser ordered a blockade to the entrance of the Gulf which is the Strait of Tiran.

"It is this blockade, which is being used as the excuse for the Johnson Administration for its threat of military intervention. (Ed. Note: The reader should note that during this same period UAR forces had been mobilized and sent to the border, a Jordan-UAR military pact had been signed, Syria had pledged to attack Israel and the Worker ignored all these things and attempted to show that the sole problem was Aqaba which they immediately proceeded to downgrade and over which they backed Nasser completely. We continue the Worker's distortion.)

"The Strait of Tiran is at no point more than 5 miles wide. It is entirely UAR territory. The Gulf of Aqaba in its entire 125-mile length, is bordered by the UAR and Saudi Arabia. The only Israeli territory on the gulf is the small port of Elath at the extreme northern end.

"Despite all this Washington claims that the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba are international waters and must be free to ships of Israel. The only basis for this is a unilateral statement by (U.S. Secretary of State John Foster) Dulles to Israel. . . .

"But neither the UAR nor Saudi Arabia ever agreed to the declaration. As a matter of fact the UAR has contended that it has been in a state of war with Israel since 1948 and can therefore exercise belligerent rights.

"The Israel regime however is pressing the issue . . . to the limit, continuing to threaten war if the UAR does not capitulate. Yet the Gulf of Aqaba is not essential to Israel's

world trade. Elath is a small port with a population of 13,000. Shipments from that port can be directed to the Mediterranean.

"Fewer threats to the Gulf of Aqaba would undoubtedly reduce tension."

Thus, the American Communist's Party interpretation of the events that led to the hostilities. It amounts to a complete backing of Nasser's stand. It amounts to a complete sellout of Israel. It coincides fully with international communism's declaration of war against the Jewish State.

In only one way, did the American Communists differ—publicly—from their Moscow masters. Of necessity, because of tension among some of their Jewish members and the fear of alienating the liberal community, the long harangue just published above is followed by ONE short paragraph which reads:

"At the same time belligerent statements by Arab governments calling for Israel's destruction aggravate the tension and play into the hands of Wall Street imperialism." Finis. That is the extent of Gus Hall's compromise with liberals. He protests against Extermination of Israel since this is too crude for sensitive liberal stomachs. Dismemberment of the country by a return to the impossible 1947 borders is fine; the total return of more than a million Arabs dedicated to wiping out of Israel is demanded; the ending of Jewish immigration is advocated; only Extermination should be eliminated—because it plays into Wall Street's hands.

The fact that Nasser was in no mood to listen to the Worker's advice and would surely have exterminated Israel had force not been used against him hardly bothered the Worker. The only real purpose of the traitors on West 23rd Street is to follow the Party Line totally and the little, cynical bone thrown to their more sensitive Jewish members and the liberal community is a small price to pay in the battle against imperialist freedom.

Danish Petition To Stop the Bombing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's New York Times carried a full-page advertisement announcing the petition of 227,000 Danish citizens to the President of the United States to stop the bombing of North Vietnam and to pursue the three-point peace program outlined by Secretary General U Thant of the United Nations. These 227,000 persons whose names were voluntarily gathered, represent only a portion of Danes who, according to public opinion polls in Denmark, are opposed to the war in Vietnam. This petition reveals the concern of the population of a nation traditionally friendly to America and makes a sincere and fervent appeal to our country to take that first and essential step which could break the existing stalemate for negotiations.

This is especially significant as the movement begins within our own Nation to make a similar appeal through similar means to obtain negotiations now. A national effort to collect signatures is now underway and in every major city in the United States, offices are being set up to

coordinate the drive. Sponsors of negotiations now share the conviction that there is no hope for a negotiated settlement as long as bombing of the north continues. I include the content of this advertisement from the New York Times in the Appendix of the Record:

MESSAGE FROM 227,000 DANES TO PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON: STOP THE BOMBING

Over a two-month period, from the 7th of February to the 7th of April, 227,000 Danes including some 10,000 high school students signed this petition to the President of the United States to stop the bombing of North Vietnam. They took their lead from UN Secretary-general U Thant's first three-point peace program stressing the fact that an end to the bombing is the first step to negotiations. It was emphasized that this was not an anti-American move. On the contrary: the signers consider their appeal also as a greeting to those Americans, including people from all walks of life, in and out of government, working for an immediate end to the war in Vietnam. They were moved by their grave concern about the development of the war in Vietnam.

TO MR. KRAG

Representatives for the signers went to Christiansborg Castle on the 27th of April and delivered the signatures to the Prime Minister of Denmark, Mr. Jens Otto Krag, asking him to make the lists available to all members of the Danish Parliament. And then to have Parliament make it quite clear to the Government of the United States that an influential section of the Danish people want the bombing stopped unconditionally as a first step towards negotiations and peace.

FEAR

Public opinion polls conducted in Denmark have shown about 50 percent of the population against the war in Vietnam with only about 15 percent for it. The rest don't know. The men and women collecting the signatures by pressing doorbells found only about one third of the people contacted dared to sign. The rest expressed either fear, or doubt about the effectiveness of this kind of action.

THE ROYAL THEATRE

Besides pressing doorbells, some of the 4,000 Danes active in collecting the signatures circulated lists at offices, factories, theatres, etc. At Copenhagen's Royal Theatre 287 members of the staff, the actors and the Royal Ballet signed the petition.

TEN MILLION AMERICANS

Taking the size of the two countries concerned into consideration, the number of signatures collected in Denmark would by comparison correspond to 10,000,000 American signatures. So it has been quite some work to get the 227,000 signatures together and of course only part of the country has been covered. People are not equally active in matters of foreign policy everywhere. Naturally enough most of the signatures come from the capital, Copenhagen, and Denmark's second largest town, Aarhus on the mainland.

WHO PAID FOR THIS AND 60 OTHER ADVERTISEMENTS

During the two months in which the signatures were collected, many different groups of Danes inserted advertisements in more than 40 daily newspapers and more than 20 periodicals. And they also paid for this advertisement. Split up according to professions the ad sponsors include: 488 professors, university teachers, doctors and other profession, 264 teacher, 4 bishop, 51 deans and other clergymen, 210 trade union spokesmen, 112 workers, 340 architects, 92 businessmen, 321 public servants and office workers, 79 students, 387 actors and artists, 121 housewives, 53 members of Parliament and Town

A 3302

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 27, 1967

Councils. Thus several thousand contributions are paying for this ad.

It was decided from the beginning that it was very important to have many small contributions, to make clear that this is not an action sponsored by any specific political party or group.

Nobody has been paid as much as a dime for his work in collecting signatures. The work has been done entirely by volunteers.

The extreme right in Danish politics, voted out of Parliament by the last election, has tried to make the signers appear to be Communists and Communist sympathisers. There are in fact Liberals, Conservatives, Social Democrats, Peoples Socialists, Communists and members of Venstre, the farmer's party, among the 227,000. As the paying group covers all professions, the signers represent nearly the whole spectrum of political life in Denmark.

The appeal to the President of the United States is in other words the appeal from one democratic people to another. And the making of such an appeal is a compliment to the United States and its form of government. Because if the 227,000 Danes had seen the United States as an isolated and completely single-minded society without any regard for its allies and their opinion, they would have taken neither the trouble nor the expense.

(On behalf of the signers.)

POUL NIELSON.
KIRKEDAMMEN 13.
ARHUS C.
CARL SCHARNBURG.
VRAA.
HENRIK SIDENIUS.
NAESBY.
FYN.

(The text signed by more than 227,000 Danes: Stop the Bombing)

(We, the signers, agree to this demand on the United States government.)

(We want the Danish government and parliament to repeat it again and again.)

(The appeal carried a picture of U Thant and mentioned his grave concern at the escalation in Vietnam. First step to negotiations must include an end to the bombing of North Vietnam.)

Conversation With Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, as a general rule, there can be no accurate evaluation of men who hold high public office until some time after their tenure of office has ended. One of this country's greatest Secretaries of State, the late John Foster Dulles, was also one of the most controversial figures of his time, and the effects of his policies are still being debated.

History must frequently depend on character sketches, vignettes, anecdotes, and personal observations that come from those who were professionally and personally close to such men. Louis Jefferson spent 5 years with Mr. Dulles as his personal security aid, and had an opportunity to know him that was granted to very few.

The following article by Mr. Jefferson, from the June 27, 1967, issue of National Review, is an interesting footnote to his-

tory. Mr. Jefferson's account of a private conversation with Mr. Dulles, held in February 1957, plainly shows that Mr. Dulles was fully aware of the grave problems still to be faced in Southeast Asia. Secretary Dulles knew the Red Chinese would continue to press into the area, and he knew they must be stopped. He also knew that unless our enemies understand our intentions, and believe in our will to act, they will move against us at every opportunity. That is exactly what has happened, and we are now paying the price for not following Secretary Dulles' advice.

CONVERSATION WITH DULLES

(By Louis Jefferson)

I spent nearly five years on assignment to the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, as his Personal Security Aide. During his last three years in office I was rarely away from him. We logged something over 300,000 miles together and I got to know him well. In the words of his widow: "Lou, you knew him better than most."

During those years with Dulles, I not only witnessed his participation in many of the events and decisions which have shaped our times, but had the opportunity to talk with him, often in unguarded moments, about his private views and deepest feelings. One of the most unusual of those conversations occurred one night over a drink in a small hotel room in Georgia.

History has been described as a series of long, dull intervals between great dramatic moments, but by February of 1957 the reverse was becoming more and more true. The scene of most immediate crisis then was around Suez. President Eisenhower, still not fully recovered from his first heart attack, was resting at Treasury Secretary George Humphrey's plantation and shooting preserve near Thomasville, Georgia. One winter-gripped Washington evening, when the need for Presidential counsel and decision on Suez was urgent, I flew down to Thomasville with Dulles to see the President. Our then Ambassador to the UN, Henry Cabot Lodge, accompanied him.

There was a chill in the air, even as far south as Thomasville, but we were whisked out to Humphrey's plantation in a well-warmed limousine. Eisenhower was reportedly playing bridge when we arrived, but quickly closeted himself with his Secretary of State and Ambassador to the United Nations.

After the talk with the President, we went into Thomasville to spend the night at a place improbably called the Three Toms Inn. I had a bottle of Dulles' favorite whiskey—Old Overholt rye—in my brief case (along with Top Secret—"Eyes Only for the Secretary"—papers, ammunition, drafting pads, assorted pills, a blackjack, phone directories, and the Secretary's favorite detective stories). Knowing that he was not just tired, but tense and troubled over Suez, I suggested a night-cap.

Sitting on the edge of a squeaking old bed in the plain, but sanitized and quite functional, room which had been assigned to him in the Three Toms, coatless and tieless, sipping Pennsylvania rye on the rocks, trying to break the hard combination of tension and fatigue, the patrician Foster Dulles peered at me that night through his heavy spectacles, and expounded pent-up feelings about the constant application required to keep peace.

Dulles had an aura of power about him. For most of his adult life he had been a man of great affairs and a participant in great events, living in the rarefied atmosphere of those whose everyday work has its effect on large numbers of people. It was a world of richly paneled partners' rooms, of elegant private clubs with the hallmark

of enormously expensive simplicity, of town houses and country homes, a world of certainty, confidence and continuity. But the aura took on a different hue that night in Georgia.

THOUGH FATALISM SUSTAINED DULLES

I was startled. With his white hair and sagging gothic features, Dulles looked like some ancient patriarch in modern shirt-sleeves. His conversation was filled with both the tough fatalism which so often sustained him, and his deep conviction that the struggle for peace was just that, a struggle. His voice was gravelly, with a touch of the pulpit in it, as the words came slowly out. There was a noticeable twitch in his eyes, but they were bright. I recall wondering in one of those odd mental flashes if John Calvin drank rye whiskey.

Just a little more than two months after his own first cancer operation, Dulles was far more preoccupied that night with the President's health than his own. He talked about how the President needed rest—how press secretary Jim Hagerly and everyone around the President told him this. He said that that made it tougher for him because he had to be very careful about taking to the President only matters which had to have the President's attention, or a Presidential decision, but that he welcomed it in a way. He mentioned Vice President Nixon's role during the period of the President's first heart attack, and said that he thought that Nixon had "handled himself very well." He rambled a bit, mentioning how hard it was to "go against old allies and dear friends" over Suez, and then went back to President Eisenhower's health. He said that Walter Lippmann "raises the President's blood pressure" but that, his eyes lighting up momentarily, he had told the President to "let the Secretary of State do the reading of Walter Lippmann." He kept going back to the President's need for rest. His feeling for Mr. Eisenhower was deep, and very genuine.

I mentioned that the President was resting at Secretary Humphrey's plantation, and that the Secretary of State needed some rest too. Dulles shrugged this off as a statement of no consequence. He crouched forward and began stirring his nearly empty glass with his forefinger. He was silent for a while. Then he said that many people did not understand his position on Suez, but that this had been true in other areas, that he had not become Secretary of State to seek public acclaim, and that we just could not "condemn aggression in one area and condone it in another." This led him into the difficulties of "waging peace" and how sometimes you had to "take chance to get peace."

After another moment or two of silence, he handed me his glass, asking me for a light one. I poured another drink and, referring to his remark about taking chances to get peace, asked him if we had really been at what had been termed the brink of war over Indochina (Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia) in 1954. He thought for a moment, and then sort of reared back on the funny old bed and said: "Well, the important thing was that we kept the pressure on the Communists—they were never altogether sure just what we might do, or how far we might go. They leaned, I think, to the view that we were bound to do more than we were probably prepared to do. I guess you might call that a 'brink.' But if they had thought we would do less than we were prepared to do, they might have pushed for more, or all of Vietnam. That would have really been dangerous. It could have meant war for us, war of unpredictable proportions."

I pointed out that we had not intervened at the crucial battle between the French and Ho Chi Minh at Dienbienphu, and that the war had resulted in the Communists' taking over part of Vietnam.

"Yes," Dulles replied, "they [the Communists] were all out for victory at Dienbien-

June 27, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 3311

Federenko and the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has been following the recent U.N. proceedings, can easily detect the obvious stream of lies and deceptions which have been continually uttered by the Soviet delegation.

Sheldon David Engelmayer, in a recent article, has listed eight remarks made by Soviet Ambassador Federenko which are in complete disagreement with the facts.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the June 23, 1967, edition of the Jewish Press.

The article follows:

FEDERENKO AND THE FACTS

(By Sheldon David Engelmayer)

If there is one thing lacking in the United Nations speeches of Soviet Ambassador Nikolai T. Federenko, it is truth. Not one word that he has uttered over the last few weeks had any semblance of truth to it. He has used the Security Council as a forum for his own bitter deceit and invective, and now he has turned the General Assembly into the newest arena for his dangerous game in the current Mid East crisis; he has even added Soviet Premier Kosygin to his list of players.

It is time for us to clear the air of Mr. Federenko's lies and deceptions. The best method of ridding ourselves of this verbal air pollution is to equate the Soviet ambassador's remarks with the facts.

Fact 1: The United Nations Security Council was called into emergency session by Canada and Denmark on May 24, 1967, to discuss the military build-up in the Middle East. The United States delegate, Arthur Goldberg, declared that the situation was critical, and called for an immediate resolution urging restraint on all sides. Only the Soviet Union stood in the way of this resolution. Meanwhile, Nasser and his band of Arab cutthroats were able to mobilize fully for their "Holy War" to destroy Israel.

Fact 2: After the outbreak of hostilities on June 5, 1967, it took two days for the Security Council to vote a simple cease-fire resolution. The Soviet Union wanted to see how the war was going. When it became painfully obvious to Federenko that Israel had totally defeated her attackers, he swiftly agreed to an unconditional cease-fire.

Now, Federenko, his Bulgarian stooge Tarabanov and India's Parthasarathi, took on a new plan of attack. They had to brand Israel the aggressor, and demand that she withdraw her troops to positions held prior to the outbreak of the war on June 5th.

Fact 3: The Soviet Union began by accusing Israel of having planned its "aggression" of June 5th "for years." Mr. Federenko declared that the Arabs mobilized their troops only after Israeli forces had begun taking up positions on the Syrian border. Federenko made this charge despite the fact that U.N. observers reported to Secretary-General U Thant that no such Israeli build-up had taken place.

Mr. Federenko told the United Nations Security Council that "the United Arab Republic, Syria and other Arab States had no aggressive designs or desires whatsoever, that they were not preparing to attack and that it was precisely Israel which feverishly went ahead with its practical attack on the Arab States."

Fact 4: On May 18, 1967, Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser reimposed the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba. Israel declared that this was an Act of War against her. For nearly 3 weeks, Israel exercised restraint, while the U.N. talkathon continued. Meanwhile, Nasser and his fellow Arab leaders called upon their people to wage a "Holy War" against Israel, until "Israel no longer exists." Instead of mouthing similar warcries, Israel Premier Levi Eshkol called for restraint, and extended the olive branch of peace to his Arab neighbors.

Federenko attacked the United States for helping Israel prepare for war against the Arabs:

"Surely everyone knows that it is precisely Washington which, by its dollar generosity and assistance, has been supporting the Israeli aggressor and which, over a number of years, has been pursuing a notorious policy of acting from a position of strength against other States . . . This is all a chain of a single imperialist plot against the peace-loving peoples who have risen to the sacred call of the struggle against the colonial oppressors in the great cause of national freedom."

Fact 5: Mr. Federenko apparently forgot the heroic citizens of Hungary who rose in October of 1956, to shake off the yoke of the Communists and restore parliamentary democracy to that land. And, perhaps, he also forgot that Soviet troops and tank divisions rolled through the streets of Hungary, killing innocent and unarmed citizens by the thousands, and maiming countless others in order to restore dictatorial rule to that hapless land.

In his speeches to the Council, Mr. Federenko pleads for justice and mercy, while he condemns the "hypocrisy" of Israel and the Western Powers.

Fact 6: If any nation has no right to talk about justice and mercy, it is the hypocritical Soviet Union. The bloodsoaked pages of Soviet history ably demonstrate the Russian idea of "justice and mercy." Between 1936 and 1938, the Soviet Union conducted a series of trials in which prominent revolutionaries were sentenced to death for treason. Among the victims of the Soviet justice were former Premier A. I. Rykov, two former Presidents of the Communist International, the former dreaded head of the Secret Police, and numerous cabinet officials. Marshal M. N. Tukhachevsky, one of Russia's most gifted military leaders during the Revolution, and seven of the Red Army's top generals were killed in June of 1937, after an alleged secret trial. This, too, was an example of Soviet "justice" and "mercy." Throughout this period many secret executions took place, and the subsequent purge caused many to be placed in forced labor camps. This, too, was "justice" and "mercy." And Russia's ruthless intervention in the Hungarian Revolution was also just and merciful, at least in Mr. Federenko's eyes.

Mr. Federenko has continuously referred to the Arab States as "peace-loving" and "friendly." He charges the United States with fanning the fires of the Middle East by militarily supporting Israel.

Fact 7: The Soviet Union has practiced anti-Semitism within its borders since 1917. They have constantly attempted to destroy Judaism by cultural strangulation and annihilation. On numerous occasions, official Soviet publications have printed cartoons and stories with definite anti-Semitic overtones. The Soviet Union has consistently held to a policy of anti-Semitism. Their actions in the United Nations are a direct extension of this anti-Semitic policy.

The Soviet ambassador has even gone so far as to accuse West Germany of aiding "the aggressive nature of Israel" by supplying her with gas masks.

Fact 8: Gas masks have yet to be used as weapons of aggression. Only a warped

mind can charge that a defensive item such as a gas mask can be used to destroy tank columns. It is common knowledge that the gas masks were for use by Israel to protect herself from the hideous use by Nasser of chemical warfare, as he did against Yemen.

These are facts which Mr. Federenko blatantly and unashamedly ignores. But, Mr. Federenko has never really cared for facts. He enjoys his fiction better.

Fascist Threat to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, "you can fool all of the people some of the time, some of the people all of the time but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

Clever words and phrases may camouflage aims and objectives, but eventually the mask is removed. Socialism, under any subterfuge just cannot be kept secret when it starts hurting the people.

I include "Analysis—America's Fascist Threat," by Hans F. Sennholz, from the June 28 Review of the News following my remarks.

Perhaps those who appeal and work to subvert the people under liberty-denying laws in the name of peace, progress, and prosperity are in the true sense not liberals, but are furthering the police state controls, recognized by many as national socialism or fascism.

AMERICA'S FASCIST THREAT

(By Hans F. Sennholz)

At one time or another most conservatives and libertarians have been called Fascists, although their principles of society, government, and economy are diametrically opposed to the tenets of Fascism. But it is a curious fact, ascertainable by every objective observer, that American liberalism evidences numerous similarities to the manifestations of Fascism. In particular, the economic policies of Fascist dictators are surprisingly similar to the economic programs of our liberal administrations. President Johnson's "Great Society," for instance, evidences characteristics which in other places were called Fascist.

In his *Autobiography* (Hutchinson & Company, Limited, Paternoster Row, E.C. 4, The Mayflower Press, Plymouth, England) Italian dictator Benito Mussolini explained what Fascism is all about: "I think that Italy is advanced beyond all the European nations: in fact, it has ratified the laws for the eight-hour day, for obligatory insurance, for regulation of the work of women and children, for assistance and benefit for afterwork diversion and adult education, and finally for obligatory insurance against tuberculosis. All this shows how, in every detail in the world of Labour, I stand by Italian working classes. All that was possible to do without doing an injury to the principle of solidity in our economy I have set out to do, from the minimum wage, to continuity of employment; from the insurance against accidents, to the indemnity against illness; from income for old age, to the proper regulation of military service. There is little which social welfare studies have appraised as practical to national economy or as wise for social happiness which has not already been ad-

A 3312

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 27, 1967

vanced by me. I want to give to every man and woman so generous an opportunity that work will be done, not as a pain, but as a joy of life. . . . But beyond the State's labours, is Fascism, harmonizer and dominator of the Italian life, standing as the inspiration." (pp. 254-255)

The Fascist Italian Dictator spared no effort or expense to promote Italian education and culture. Also recreation and sports were developed at government expense. A decree of May 1, 1925 established recreation as a government project, the expressed aim being "the healthy and profitable occupation of the worker's leisure hours, through institutions for developing the worker's physical, intellectual, and moral capacity." This project (Dopolavoro) provided inexpensive vacations and excursions; courses in adult education and public library facilities; lectures and theatrical performances.

In the words of the Dictator: "One of the reforms which I have promoted, following it closely in all its successive developments, is the reorganization of schools. . . . The gravity and importance of school problems cannot escape the attention of any modern statesman mindful of the destiny of his people. The school must be considered in all its complete expression, Public School, Intermediate Schools, University Institutions, all exercise a profound influence on the trend, moral and economic, of the life of any nation. From the beginning this has always been on my mind. Perhaps my early experience as a schoolteacher added to an inescapable interest in youth and its development." (Page 259.)

Mussolini was also proud of his many Fascist achievements in the field of public works. "The policy of public works in Italy," he asserted, "had always had an electoral character; works to be done were decided here and there, not according to an organic plan and to any plain group of voters. I stopped this legalized favoritism. I instituted Bureaus of Public Works, entrusting them to persons in whom I have complete confidence, who obey only the central powers of the State, and are immune from pressure by local interests. In this way I was able to better sensibly the conditions of the roads of the south; I mapped out a programme for aqueducts, railroads and ports. All that is just, finds in the Italian bureaucracy an immediate comprehension. All the offices of governmental character have received a new impulse and new prestige. The great Public Utilities of the State, railroads, mail, telegraph, telephone, the monopolies, function again." (Page 268.)

"Today the State is not an abstract and agnostic entity; the Government is present everywhere, every day. Who lives in the ambit of the State, or outside the State, lives and feels in every way the majesty of law. It is not a thing of small account that all Public Utilities are conducted with an efficiency which I might call American, and that the Italian Bureaucracy, proverbially slow, has become eager and agile." (Page 269.)

Compare these Fascist programs of aid to education, labor legislation, social security, public works, and roads and ports with the economic programs of the Great Society. And, if you please, compare Mussolini's remarks with President Johnson's Economic Report: "Education will not cure all the problems of society, but without it no cure for any problem is possible. It is high among my own concerns, central to the purposes of this Administration, and at the core of our hopes for a Great Society." (Page 94.) President Johnson's Great Society legislation also provided for job training and work experience for young and inexperienced workers. It created out-of-school programs such as the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps, a Work Experience Program, an Adult Basic Education program, a Manpower Development and Training program, and many others.

In matters of public health President Johnson points at his achievements as proudly as Mussolini—and they are again the same achievements. In the words of his 1966 Economic Report: "Among the most important actions of the 89th Congress was the provision of health insurance for the aged under Social Security. Medicare will protect families against the economic risk of major medical expenses in old age. Benefits for 17 million Social Security beneficiaries, plus benefits from general revenues for almost 2 million additional elderly persons not covered by Social Security, will amount to about \$3.5 billion in 1967 and will cover at least 40 per cent of the total medical costs of the aged."

The President also says he is proud of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which is "to promote investment in the health, education, training, and work experience of the poor which will enable them to contribute more effectively, and thereby to earn incomes more comparable to those in the rest of society." (Page 111.) Regarding housing, roads, and harbors the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 and other legislation "constitute a major Federal effort," the President said. His numerous other programs deal with transportation, agriculture, research and technology, natural resources, and many others.

Generalissimo Francisco Franco's Spain is now marching in the Great Society footsteps. During the 1940's when Italian Fascism and German Nazism were still in vogue, General Franco imitated their economic policies. But the near-bankruptcy of the Spanish state and the wretched living conditions of the people after more than ten years of orthodox Fascist rule caused Franco to set a new course. Retreating from radical socialism—though remaining a vigorous and effective anti-Communist—he began to imitate the New Deal, Fair Deal, New Frontier, and the Great Society of the United States. In economic policy Generalissimo Francisco Franco has become a faithful disciple of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. In fact, the economic program of what the liberals call "Fascist Spain" differs little in substance from the Great Society program of Lyndon Johnson in everything except awareness of the Communist threat (a vital instance in which the attitudes of Generalissimo Franco are by far to be preferred).

On October 20, 1963, Franco introduced a 4-year national development plan. This new economic and social plan is indicative of the new appearance of the Franco regime. In substance, the Spanish government embarked upon a planned economy fashioned after the Great Society of Lyndon Johnson. As its central objective, Spain's plan for economic and social development sets out to achieve, as rapidly as possible and in conditions of economic stability, rising standards of living, advancement of education, and greater welfare for all Spaniards of the present generation and those to come. Three fundamental intentions form this objective: *social integration*, which is the progressive leveling of individual incomes; *social mobility* through equal opportunities and social advancement; and access to *higher levels of training and education*, as well as ownership and social and economic leadership.

The plan defines very broadly the policies to be followed: It acknowledges that financial stability is vital to success and that official price guidance is required. To maintain the over-all equilibrium of the economy (a) total public expenditure is to be covered by ordinary revenue; (b) external equilibrium is to be achieved through higher earnings from invisibles, capital inflows, and the expansion of exports; (c) appropriate short-term policies are to be pursued to prevent an over-extension of demand; and (d) an incomes policy is to be elaborated. An Incomes Commission will submit semiannual

reports to the government on the current distribution of incomes, and prepare measures to implement a more equitable distribution.

Government enterprises are also to be promoted in Spain through rationalization of accounting procedures and official subsidies and credits. However, the plan does not touch upon the many privileges of state enterprises and does not propose to limit their highly privileged position. In fact, the government offers its "public sector" new privileges, called incentives, in an attempt to stimulate more economical operation. And, in an attempt to remove the sectorial and geographic differences that exist in Spain, the government is even organizing "growth centers" to aid the underdeveloped regions and spur local industrial development.

In 1965 Spanish costs of living rose 9.4 per cent, and more than 4 per cent in 1966 despite "corrective" measures—including massive food imports. The impact of these imports was reflected in the balance of trade: imports rose by 34 per cent and exports by 10 per cent in 1965. The 1965 trade deficit of 2 billion dollars was not fully absorbed by revenue sources, and the over-all balance of payments showed a negative result, which reduced Spain's gold and foreign exchange holdings precariously.

Most of Spain's inflationary problems sprang from chronic budgetary deficits. In 1965 the Gross National Product was calculated to have risen 7.8 per cent in real terms, and a similar rate was achieved in 1966. The per capita income rose rapidly in 1965 reaching 35,600 pesetas or \$600. The daily minimum wage for unskilled worker was raised by 40 per cent to 84 pesetas of \$1.40 a day. And finally, to restrain the level of demand created by inflation and credit expansion, the government resorted to austerity measures which included restricted bank loans, cuts in allocations to official institutions, and a guideline for wage increases.

This short description of the Spanish economy and Spain's economic policies could be taken directly from an official report on the American economy. In both countries the planners are proud of their 4-year national developments that are to bring greater abundance and opportunity to their subjects. Rising standards of living for the poor are promised in both countries. The three fundamental objectives of the Franco regime—social integration, social mobility, and higher levels of training and education—are also, we are told, the most important objectives for the Johnson regime. While both leaders talk a great deal about financial and monetary stability, both employ monetary depreciation and economic instability. Both promise over-all equilibrium of the economy, and both deliver instability and insecurity. In their fiscal policies both promise balanced budgets and subsequently suffer huge deficits. Both endeavor to raise wages through minimum wage legislation and seek a more equitable social integration. While both occasionally talk about individual enterprise, both are promoting government enterprises through public subsidies and credits. And in an attempt to remove the sectorial and geographic differences that exist in both countries, both governments are building "growth centers" or "model cities" that are to aid the underdeveloped regions of their countries. Both promise more.

This is not to imply that the political regimes of Francisco Franco and Lyndon B. Johnson are identical in form and substance; merely that the economic policies are similar and that the inevitable effects are identical. Certainly the government of Premier Franco has taken a far more realistic attitude toward the dangers of International Communism—an area in which he is much to be admired. We realize that the Spanish form of government constitutes military rule, and