degree. We can only triumph over that army to the extent that we manage to reduce its morale. Its morale is undermined by infliction of casualties and repeated surrenders.

I call to the attention of my colleagues the proposition that Latin American Communists will try to "draw the enemy to fight in places where his living-place is clearly an actual situation." In plain language, this means that attempts will be made to force us "the enemy," to fight on unfavorable terrain, and at times and places of our choosing.

As Guevara says, this is the example of Vietnam; and if one, two, or more Vietnames can take place simultaneously throughout the world, then U.S. "imperialism" can ultimately be defeated, say the Communists.

SOVIET "RESTRAINT" ON CASTRO

We have all read newspaper reports in recent days to the effect that the Soviet support for Castro and his subversive activities is actually decreasing. Soviet Premier Khrushchev talked of sending Castro "a note" that the United States had made the same proposal.

As a result of Khrushchev's talk, the Cuban government has said it wants no more support. This is not surprising, for the Soviet Union has not supported Castro's regime. The latter has been actively encouraged by Washington, which is why its support was so great.
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As in Venezuela, the Communists in Colombia are divided between “hard-liners” and “soft-liners.” Such a division ought properly to contribute to the weakness of communism but it apparently does not, and within the very leadership of the Colombian Communist Party are to be found some of the most blood-thirsty and militant guerrillas.

GUATEMALA

Finally, in Guatemala, there has also been intense rural guerrilla activity, although it seems to have been brought under control for the time being. The one question being asked in relation to the Guatemalan success in suppressing to some extent the guerrilla activities, is the sudden growth of private vigilante groups which exact their own justice from the Communists. To one of these groups, known as MANO and NOA, launched their counterguerrilla campaign by declaring that they would murder five Communists for every murder committed by the guerrillas. As the operation was passed, the organizations raised the ratio, until at one point they were threatening with a ratio of 20 to 1. In recent weeks, there has been a dramatic decrease in the number of murders committed by the Guatemalan Communist guerrillas. It will be instructive to observe developments in Guatemala following the LASO meeting.

WHO CONTROLS CASTRO?

Mr. Speaker, the question is frequently asked, “Who controls Castro—Moscow or Peking?” I do not pretend to have a categorical answer to this question, but I would like to discuss it very briefly.

Earlier I spoke of the long-standing claims that Fidel Castro’s Cuba would eventually collapse under its own bureaucratic and military weight, and the Soviet Union would one day tire of pumping a million dollars a day into a “worthless” island in the Caribbean. We know now that predictions of this amount are ill-founded, and the fears of Castro’s heads rolling off his bed are justified. In my opinion, the Cuban revolution is a school of thought which seems to arise with each crisis situation, and which seems to imitate to those who would act forthrightly the opposing label of “hotheads.”

One might justifiably ask whether it really matters at this point who controls Castro. Does it any good to debate the points when Castro himself is defying the will of the majority of Latin America and is openly trying to overturn Latin American governments?

We have seen that President Johnson’s administration is taking far too lightly the Latin American LASO meeting of Communist strategists opening Friday in Havana. Administration preoccupation with Vietnam and apparent complacency with Communist adherents abroad warn of our own doorstep may result in an outbreak of some Viet-

1 El Mano—“The Hand”
2 NOA—New Anticommunist Organization

leader Guevara called for, have sprouted up, to take action? Will the administration refuse to use the same humane but effective weapons which are available to us—diplomatic, economic, and psychological—and if so, when is it too late, and we are forced again to use military means?

WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

In the meeting of the Tricontinental Conference of January 18-24, Cuba has seen the designs of the world Communist movement are for the underdeveloped world. And, yes, I do not hesitate to use the phrase “world Communist movement.” We have all heard too much about the alleged “disintegration” of world communism. It is time to look hard and long at such evidence as: Who participates in these meetings? You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the three largest delegations at the Tricontinental Conference were from Cuba, Soviet bloc, and Chinese, in that order. Thus, we hear speculation about the disintegration and in some respects it may be true. But clearly, when we are speaking of a unifying, broad-based strategy, composed of all the leading world Communists, who leads the guerrilla movements around the world? May we find that it is all of the Communist world that is supporting North Vietnam in its aggression against the south. Just as important for other guerrilla activities in various countries around the world comes from all of the Communist countries.

This “hard look at the evidence” which the administration has failed to take. It is here that the Congress can play a truly vital role, as the reports which I have already mentioned, show. In this spirit, it is my hope that I intend to take the floor of the House later, when the meeting of the Latin American Solidarity Organization is over, and the evidence is in, to again appeal to my colleagues of the import of this meeting.

It will be most interesting, Mr. Speaker, to observe the reaction of the administration to what takes place in Havana. Many Members of both Houses are watching with great interest the revolutionary performance that is to be put on this week in Havana. They will also be watching with great interest to see if we respond appropriately. For it is an issue which cuts across the aisles of both Houses, and which touches our domestic security. Members of the Congress, as well as the American public, will indeed be watching Havana and Washington.
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SHIPS TO JORDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Halpern) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, news dispatches from Jordan inform us that King Hussein is planning to arm the civilians of Jordan, and to institute a program
of general military training for all Jordanians.

At the same time, the administration of the United States is quietly seeking methods of financing new shipments of arms and military equipment to Jordan. We have already written the facts and come up with a terrifying total of more war, more bloodshed, and more destruction in the ravaged Middle East.

I take this floor to announce that I, for one, will never support any authorization for more arms to Jordan until that nation justifies its statement that its program of military rearmament is planned only for defensive purposes.

The only way Jordan can prove that intention is by signing a peace treaty with Israel, because as long as Jordan remains at war with Israel, we can expect any American armaments and supplies to be used in eventual battle against Israel.

I ask my colleagues to remember that King Hussein has collaborated with the Communists and the Arabs, who are threatening Israel and the West. Israel is our ally in that dark and bloody corner of the world, and the future of Israel is inexplicably bound up with America's best interests.

It should be made absolutely clear to King Hussein, now and not at some future time, that unless he shows concrete evidence of responsibility by signing a peace treaty with Israel, that American taxpayers will not be asked to provide him with a single bullet.

By the same token, Mr. Speaker, I mean that arms should not be provided either directly or indirectly. I have been deeply concerned with the possibility that some means of arms aid to Jordan might be devised, since the revelations made by Mr. Widnall last weekend about armament financing by the Export-Import Bank.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall], one of the most distinguished members of the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, points out that 39 percent of the Bank's loans were made for arms purchases. What is more, large credits were granted to nations without the official knowledge of executives of the bank.

I join the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] in demanding a thorough review of the Bank's financing of arms sales to foreign nations, before we are asked to extend the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank. And I insist that no such credits be granted to Jordan, or any other Arab nation, until it agrees to end the state of war in the Middle East.

It is all the more important that the United States take a firm stand in this matter, in view of the situation recently to get arms to Egypt and Syria, which must one day tempt those nations to make a sneaky "Pearl Harbor" attack on Israel. Unless we demonstrate our support to Jordan by providing them pro-American nation with all necessary arms.

Such a demonstration becomes a vital factor in keeping the Middle Eastern tinderbox from bursting into flame once more, since France cynically terminated its sale of jets to Israel in a bid for Arab and Communist favor.

The least we can do is to supply Israel with all necessary arms and other equipment to replace Israeli equipment depleted in the conflict, and to balance the new flow of Mig-23's and other super-sophisticated weapons from Russia to the Arabs.

We owe this support to a nation which has stood for 20 years as a bastion of democracy in a most undemocratic part of the world. We owe it to mankind as our contribution toward maintaining the balance which may overcome the inflammatory warmongering of puppet Arab overlords and the Communist plotters who pull the strings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

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

RIOT DISASTER AREAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.]

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the terrible outbreaks of mass violence in many cities this summer have torn the fabric of our entire society. All America has been badly hurt, but the most immediate victims are those whose homes have been burned, the businessman whose stores and stocks have been wrecked, the children who have been deprived of food and clothes, and the citizens whose freedoms have been completely smashed.

We do not in any way condone mob violence, criminal assaults on life and property, and anarchic attacks on order, but we cannot condemn the innocent victims of this violence to a future more poverty-stricken and hopeless than their past.

The physical destruction wreaked by riots has in some cities been worse than that which could be caused by a hurricane or quake. The emotional devastation wrought has been far greater, because the victims have not only natural disasters beyond man's control, but disasters born of human excesses, multiplied in inhuman proportions.

I believe that the victims of these explosions should receive emergency assistance equal to that traditionally given to the victims of natural disasters.

The existing powers of the executive branch in such situations are unspecified. Just this afternoon I went to the Office of Emergency Planning, in response to Governor Romney's formal request for disaster aid for Detroit, has indicated that legal grounds for action may not exist at all.
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There was no objection.

AMERICAN TRAGEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time because under the 1-minute rule it would hardly enough time to cover even one facet of events that have transpired in this week of American tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, half the Members of the House have stood in this well, at some time this week to speak on the race violence in Newark, Plainfield, Detroit, Cambridge, and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the time is here for this Congress to act when one of our local papers carries the very serious headline which—in two words summarizes this situation, “American Tragedy.”

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the Members of the House of the fact that this situation is not getting any better.


Just before I came on to the floor I was out in the Speaker’s Lobby scanning the Associated Press teletype. I took the liberty to tear a portion of the roll as it was being hung on our bulletin board. To furnish as a basis for some of the remarks I will make in a few minutes, I want to call to the attention of the House today, Thursday, July 27, Item 16 was headed “Phoenix Racial Riot,” pointing out that violence and vandalism has erupted for the second night in that city.

Item 17 was on “Cambridge,” which pointed out that teargas had to be used in Cambridge, Md., to disperse a mob of rock-throwing Negroes.

He 18 pointed out that a mob of Negro teenagers, on fashion-able 12th Avenue in New York City looting one man’s shop of over $15,000 of merchandise and at Columbus Circle a Negro mob attacked a young married couple, disrobing the woman and robbing her husband.

The next item was entitled “Chicago Racial,” reporting incidents of firebombing, window smashing, and looting on the West Side Wednesday night.

“Cincinnati Racial” mentioned the fact firebombs flew again in that southeastern Ohio city with a new damage estimated at $500,000 and a department store building set on fire by firebombs and other fires including a paper box factory.

Toledo in northern Ohio was not spared. There 48 arrests were made when firefighters were attacked by gangs.

On the west coast, San Francisco police had to seal off part of the Fillmore district when gangs of Negroes started throwing firebombs.

Back on the east coast, Philadelphia policemen arrested 35 persons in South Philadelphia for window breaking in South Philadelphia.

These incidents happened in our America within the last 24 hours, but without a doubt the most shocking of all were the comments made right here in our Nation’s Capital by H. Rap Brown, who told a crowd of a hundred or more applauding night last night that his wish was registration of Washington “don’t come near Washington should be burned down.”

If there should be any doubt that my comments are based on hearsay, I hold this in my hand a paper which has just been taken from the teleprinter and is marked Item 112, Associated Press, entitled “Rap Brown in Washington.”

The man who spoke those words in Washington today is the same H. Rap Brown who was chairman of the National Conference on Black Power held in Newark last weekend. It is the same H. Rap Brown who was shot and arrested over at the National Airport, and holds a short time in the Alexandria, Va., city jail under a proceeding against him as a fugitive.

According to our Washington papers, Rap Brown, who is Stokely Carmichael’s successor as national chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, was released in Alexandria late after midnight last night when he was freed on bail under a bond arranged by one of the ousted teachers from Howard University. He now faces extradition to Dorchester County, Md., where he is charged with making a speech that touched off a night of arson and shooting in Cambridge last Monday evening. One reason that will be asked by many is why the delay until this week ar- rangement on the charge that he is a fugitive and should face extradition.

Mr. Speaker, there has been far too much levity made even by ordinarily serious-minded Members of this House and more by others outside the Congress of the antiriot bill recently passed by the House as a deterrent against those who would travel interstate to incite riots.

Well, in answer to those who would laugh at this bill, it can be answered that here in Rap Brown we have an example or illustration that should be used to emphasize and underscore the fact that this antiriot bill which assesses a substantial penalty against those individuals traveling from State to State to incite a riot is needed and could be made even more effective against madmen like H. Rap Brown, who traveled interstate from New York to Cambridge, Md., and now to the Nation’s Capital.

About all you have to do is look at what happened within the last few days. Brown stood up in Cambridge, Md., and made a speech before 400 youths urging
has taught us that the foot soldier is still our most indispensable force for national security. And this war has also emphasized that all of the computers and tabulators in the world cannot replace an inspiring and courageous general officer.

But General Westmoreland has succeeded in defining the Vietnamese as do few Americans. And he likes and admires them—and believes in their future.

General Westmoreland has said of the Vietnamese:

"They are not only big physically, but big morally."

This sums up the kind of man the general is.

The general is an excellent speaker—a fact many Americans round the country are discovering for themselves. He has been meeting with both civic and educational groups whenever possible, reporting on Vietnam and placing the conflict in true perspective.

I share with my colleagues some of his thoughts as expressed before the Texas delegation, and from other appearances across the country.

On the nature of the war in Vietnam, the general says:

"This is one of the most complicated, complex, frustrating, multi-sided efforts we’ve ever been engaged in . . . We’re fighting it—and the government and the people—morally and psychologically and militarily—and all at the same time.

General Westmoreland believes that our objectives in the I Corps area are to be destructive and constructive. He says:

We have to destroy the armed enemy. But we have to positively assist the Vietnamese people to rebuild their country and to shape their own destiny.

He emphasizes that our military efforts in Vietnam are a “shield behind which reconstruction may start and have some chance of succeeding.” We have to assist the people “to reconstitute their government and their social institutions, re-establish their schools, their homes, and their means for making a living. Make no mistake—both sides are after the people.

He has little patience with those who are over critical of the South Vietnamese military. He says:

"They are short of manpower, of leadership, of trained personnel. Well, why shouldn’t they be? Those people have been fighting this war for 18 years. I’ve got the fullest confidence in the potential of their armed forces."

And he says that in the I Corps area the Vietnamese forces have done “a magnificent job.”

He emphasizes over and over that this is a battle to win not territory—but the minds and hearts of the people. "The face of a soldier has to be much more than a man with a rifle or a man whose only object is to kill. He has to be part diplomat, part educational politician—and 100 percent human being."

Our men have met this challenge. They are young and resourceful fighting men who can look the VC in the eye one day and show a villager how to build a playground for the children, the next.

The general says:

"I have never ceased to be amazed by the understanding of these young Americans. They’re coming to a totally foreign environment, met a people beleaguered by 18 years of war, suspicious of foreigners, as far removed from their experience as if they’d come from another planet, yet the American serviceman can grasp the plight of these Vietnamese, and sympathize with them and understand them.

Our troops, he says, are the ambassadors at the hamlet level. And they do a really superior job.

The general makes clear that he believes in the future of the South Vietnamese. I Corps, he says, was long believed to be a very poor part of South Vietnam because it has not been able to produce rice that is needed elsewhere. But, he says, this is not because the capability is not there. I Corps now has the only coal mine in South Vietnam—a mine taken from the Vietcong. This mine is now under government control and under U.S. protection. It is producing several hundred million tons of coal, and the Vietnamese are building a large thermal electric generating area to serve all five of the northern provinces with electricity.

At present, only the cities have electric power. But once electricity is installed in these rural areas, the farmers will be able to install water pumps in the rivers and pump water into nearby rice paddies. This means they will have two crops instead of just one.

The Vietnamese are also building a fertilizer plant as byproduct of the coal, and this fertilizer can be used by all of the rice paddies in I Corps area. The meaning of this, says the general, is that rice production will increase by nearly three times as much as is now presently produced, enabling Vietnam to better feed its own people.

He notes other fine economic potentials in the I Corps area: abundant sugar—abundant sugar—a sugar mill is being started with American assistance, a fishing—a fishing—a canning factory is being planned—and some of the world’s loveliest beaches that could make the area the playground of Southern Asia.

These objectives, the general makes clear, will not be accomplished overnight. But he does think that we are headed in the right direction. In his words:

"We are making progress . . . and I am confident of the outcome.

Nor does the general predict a quick outcome to the fighting. The war, he feels, depends on two factors: First, how many troops the North Vietnamese Army is going to throw down on us and keep taking the terrible losses they are taking. Second, how many troops we are going to put in the country to stop them.

General Westmoreland thinks we may be in Vietnam for as long as 12 to 15 years. He does not think the fighting will rage that long, but American forces will be needed to maintain security. He notes that our troops have been stationed in Korea for a long time and he adds that South Vietnam has as much potential for economic and political growth as Korea, and a strong South Vietnam will give the United States a strong and valued ally in Southeast Asia to bind Communist forces in that part of the world.

To Lewis Walt, there is no confusion or apprehension about America’s commitment to the policies of the United States.

We cannot abandon these people. For, as the General said:

"If we withdraw it would only be a matter of days before the Viet Cong would be back in, and they would be killing."

I am proud of a country that is able to produce men like General Westmoreland. And I am delighted that the American people now have an opportunity to see and listen to the General explain our hopes and aspirations for the people of South Vietnam. The General is neither a hawk nor a dove. He is only a peace-seeker—dedicated to a fair and prompt settlement of this continuing bloody war. But he is also committed to our seeing the job through until a settlement can be reached with the Communists.

And here, too, he reflects our Nation’s hope that ways can be found to induce Hanoi to join with us in the search for peace. But until that day comes, Lewis Walt and others like him, will shoulder the burden of securing a decent life for a people and a country that have known little but war all of their lives.

He told us:

"The most dramatic change that I have observed out there in the past year is the attitude of the people. Two years ago that Vietnamese people in I Corps were fraught with fear and a gaining confidence in their own government and in their own institutions and they see a much better world for themselves resulting from our presence in that troubled country."
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so mesmerized by hopes to restore relations with Arab nations now hostile to us that we oppose both Arabs and Communists on a one-sided and disastrous bid for detente.

We are beginning to forget that the conflict in the Middle East started when the Arabs, armed and encouraged by Russia, decided to gang up on Israel, cut off her access to the seas, mass on her borders, and destroy that pro-Western democracy. Israel was termed an "outlaw" and her friendship with America and the free world.

The world saw another saga of David dealing with Goliath. But Goliath is being revived.

I call attention of the House to the following transcript of actual statements by Arab leaders at the outbreak of the war last month. The Russians would rewrite history in the manner of "1984" to distort the facts. The time has come to refresh our insights on how the present situation is developing.

The transcription of Arab statements of June 6 and 7 follows:

**Arab Statements Prior to the Egyptian Attack on June 5, 1967**

1. President Nasser of Egypt, 1700 GMT, June 4: "The Israeli forces have moved and so did the heroic Iraqi army and the Iraqi people. The liberation has now begin. We had to prepare ourselves for the decisive battle with the enemy and when we felt we were victorious the war was over." The UNEF was evacuated and we returned to the Gulf of Aqaba, which we have closed.

2. Prime Minister of Iraq, 1700 GMT, June 4: "Brothers and guests, God has imposed a Holy War on us. We will thus be participating with our brother stragglers on the horizon of Peace; we are prepared to fight for our legitimate rights." The entire Iraqi people have risen to the level of battle.

3. Prime Minister of Jordan, 1600 GMT, June 4: "Today the Arab nation is moving as one nation to face its responsibilities. We are ready to fight for our legitimate rights. The entire Jordanian people have risen to the level of battle."

4. President of Egypt, 0800 GMT, June 6: "The Arab nation has united its views and ranks to repel every aggression and restore the usurped rights and territory. Masses of our Arab brot... Rest assured and be joyful about the imminent return and liberation."

5. Amman Radio, Jordan, 1015 GMT, June 5: "Jordanian Royal Air Force planes have begun bombing targets in the enemy territory. The bombing is still in progress."

6. Amman Radio, Jordan, 1030 GMT, June 5: Proclamation by Joint Command: "The Jordanian, Iraqi, and Syrian air forces are carrying out massive bombing of targets occupying our occupied territory. The bombing is still in progress."

7. Amman Radio, Jordan, 1030 GMT, June 5: Proclamation by Joint Command: "The Jordanian, Iraqi, and Syrian air forces are carrying out massive bombing of targets occupying our occupied territory. The bombing is still in progress."

8. Jordanian Air Force, 1030 GMT, June 5: Proclamation of Jordanian military spokesmen: "Our valiant forces have occupied Arab lands and completed the enemy's dismemberment before we advance on them. We are now advancing on military air bases. Our victory is overwhelming."

9. Amman Radio, Jordan, 1030 GMT, June 5: "Arab brothers: The battle with the state of gang has begun. To arms, O Arabs. To arms, masses of our people. The hour of the battle has struck. The march toward Palestine has begun."

10. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0725 GMT, June 5: "In the name of Allah, the Exalted, the Creator of Man. O Arab, let us unite our efforts to fight the war. The Syrian people, the Socialist Arab Bath Party, are responding. Strike and we are on your side on the firing line."

11. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0745 GMT, June 5: "Brothers: Today is your day, the day of freedom and the day of the return. Millions of Arabs are backing you. Strike! Millions of free people in the world support you. Strike! The toilers and honest people bless your step. Strike! They bless you as you radiate fire and light. Strike. Strike."

12. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0815 GMT, June 5: "Our Arab land, flame up and burn the Invaders. Destroy them all. To arms, O Arabs! To the heart of occupied Palestine! Resign to Invader's rule."

13. Damascus Radio, Syria, 0900 GMT, June 5: Statement by the Supreme Commander of the Army: "The zero-hour has begun. Airplanes are flying, enemy's cities, positions, and installations. O masses of our Arab people: Arab Syria has entered the battle. Syria is now engaging the enemy and destroying its positions. The Arab revolution will not retreat before fully destroying the Israeli existence in our Arab homelands."

14. President Al-Atasi of Syria, 1200 GMT, June 5: "Our present battle will be one in the formation of a new story from imperialism and Zionism. No international force can oppose the will of the struggling Arab people."

15. Damascus Radio, Syria, 1300 GMT, June 5: "At 1200 today a telephone contact took place between President Jamal Abd Al-Aziz and Chief of State Dr. Nur ad-Din al-Atasi, President Abd an-Naim emphasized that the Arab people in Egypt and their allies may be the first to receive the battle to the end. Chief of State Dr. Nur ad-Din al-Atasi emphasized that the Arab people in Syria and their valiant army are determined to continue the battle until victory."

16. Damascus Radio, Syria, 1320 GMT, June 5: "Iraqi Premier of Iraq, Arif has contacted Chief of State Dr. Nur ad-Din al-Atasi by telephone. During the conversation the two leaders affirmed the two countries' determination to fight the battle of the Arab nation until victory is achieved."

17. Damascus Radio, Syria, 1405 GMT, June 5: "A direct telephone conversation took place last night between Algerian President Boumediene and Chief of State Dr. Nur ad-Din al-Atasi. The Algerian President affirmed support of the Algerian Arab people, army, and revolution for the Syrian revolution in the fateful battle of the Arab nation, the battle for the liberation of Palestine."

18. Jidda Radio, Saudi Arabia, 2140 GMT, June 5: King Saud: "The Soviet Arabian Kingdom considers Israel's presence in the heart of the Arab world a war against all Arab Arab. The Soviet Arabian Kingdom is a permanent state of war against the existence of Israel until occupation and entrance into fraternal Jordan, the honorable battle they are now waging together with the other Arabs in Singapore and our employment of all our resources for this battle are but a confirmation of our declaration of war against the Zionists gang."
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Air Safety Article by Associated Press
Writer Blaine Powles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. Speaker, I have been stated to this Congress and the American people need to know more, much more, about ideas, attitudes, and development in the field of air safety. Recently a seminar was conducted as part of the program of the inaugural convention of the International Society of Barristers. I feel that the ideas expressed by the panel of experienced men and women of various backgrounds should be included in the Record as the Associated Press account of their views:

AIR SAFETY

Chicago—A panel of aviation law specialists met today to score a criticism that airplanes are far more frequently than generally known and that development of air safety improvements lag “far behind the development of the industry.”

They said that while air travel still is “acceptable,” it is nowhere near as safe as the airlines’ “admirable job of publicity” has led the public to believe.

The seminar was part of the program of the inaugural convention of the International Society of Barristers, an organization of lawyers whose membership is by invitation only.

The first session of the two-day seminar was devoted to discussion of air safety. Later sessions will develop recommendations for legislation, procedures and equipment which, it is said, will be sent to affected public agencies and legislators.

Hindick E. McDermott, with 22 years experience with government agencies, primarily in air traffic control, told of the frequency of near collisions. He said such reports by pilots “dried up” after the FAA announced each report would be investigated. McDermott, of McLean, Va., said pilots feared they would be ground poging such investigations.

Donald W. Madole, a pilot, former FAA attorney and later attorney for American Airlines, predicted the air conglomeration would worsen. He cited reports that airline flights will increase by 76 per cent to 3,500 planes and general aviation by 100 per cent to 47,000 aircraft by 1977. Madole also quoted a Swedish air safety expert, Capt. Bo Lundberg, as predicting that in the near future a major air disaster somewhere in the world will be a daily occurrence.

Madole said the air traffic control system has “the same hardware as we had 10 years ago,” yet we have 400 million passengers. The only thing different is that the operator has a little better headset.”

Lee S. Krendler, a New York City, a lawyer who specialized in air crew cases, said the coming jumbo jets and supersonic transports will create “a new existing problem—a problem complicated by the greater range of speeds.” Krendler said develop...
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United States Condemns Use of Poison Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 27, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, less than a month ago I expressed to my colleagues my deep concern over the use of poison gas by the United Arab Republic against the people of Yemen.

Because of my interest in this problem I wrote to Ambassador Arthur Goldberg and asked him to instigate an investigation of the charges against the United Arab Republic and to determine if appropriate action might be necessary.

I have received a reply from Ambassador Goldberg, and so that my colleagues may be aware of the U.S. policy in this regard I will circulate the letter from Ambassador Goldberg in the Record at this point:

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS,

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Wolff: Thank you for your letter of July 10 concerning the use of poison gas in Egypt in the Yemen. I can assure you that we share your concern over the growing number of indications that gas is once again being used by the UAR Air Force against the local population in Yemen. As you may be aware, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has confirmed that the “U.S. News and World Report” article which you entered in the Congressional Record of June 29 was indeed a valid Red Cross report. The ICRC also announced that copies of the report were sent to the Governments of the United Arab Republic and Saudi Arabia as well as to both the United States and Yemen. The Red Cross issued a statement on June 24 calling on the Yemeni combatants to give a solemn pledge not to use poison gas.

The United States position on this matter is quite clear and corresponds to the stated policy of almost all other governments throughout the world as reflected in the voting (91 in favor and 4 abstentions) on UNGA Resolution 2102B of 1965 which condemned the use of poison gas in warfare. The use of poison gas is clearly contrary to international law and we would hope the authorities concerned in Yemen heed the request of the ICRC not to resort in any circumstances whatsoever to their use.

In addition to the ICRC’s findings, the U.S. Government has given attention to detailed information on the January gas bombing report involving Kifat, which the Arabian Government has submitted to the UN and which was published as a UN document on April 6th. This report contains a number of indications that poison gas was used on that occasion. We are deeply disturbed at press reports that the agent used may have been some type of nerve gas as this would introduce an entirely new weapon, not previously employed by any nation of the world.

While thus indicating its strong concern over reports on the use of gas in Yemen, the United States has not taken the lead in the handling of this matter at the UN. Saudi
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While Cities Burn

The nation has cause for deep concern if the leaders of both political parties are unable to forget political questions when murder, arson and looting are sweeping some of its major cities. This grave domestic crisis demands a level of maturity and leadership that has been shocking in their absence.

Because he holds the highest office and therefore bears the highest responsibility both to set and to see an example, President Johnson offended many in his pussyfooting response to the debacle in Detroit. He shilly-shallyed for several hours in ordering the Army units into action in the city, despite the pleas that troops were urgently needed. And when he did act, Mr. Johnson issued a proclamation and a personal statement both of which were clearly designed to place the entire political responsibility on Governor Romney.

It is no disgrace to either the Governor, a Republican, or to Mayor Cavanagh, a Democrat, that the situation in Detroit slipped out of local and state control. The fact that Governor Romney may be the Republican Presidential candidate next year may explain but cannot excuse President Johnson's nervous political posturing at this critical time.

But if the President's conduct was hesitant and vacillating, the neglect by the Department of Justice to use the available powers of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Federal Trade Commission, the Civil Rights Act of 1968, the Consumer Protection Act of 1967, and other Federal laws to check the powerful forces of discrimination and bigotry for which he is responsible is inexcusable. The President's failure to use the powers of the Federal Government is inexcusable because the Federal Government is the sole instrument of government that can bring to bear all the resources of law enforcement and public and private leadership to tackle the crack problem in the United States.

For Total Mobilization To Solve Urban Crisis

The urgency of our present crisis clearly demands something far better than this of us. Any attempt to fix the blame, now, for what is happening around us reminds me, for all the world, of two words: "Who do you think it was who was at fault for the accident they have just had while their critically injured passengers lie unattended and uncared for."

The "plague on both your houses" editorial as carried in yesterday's edition of the New York Times, was probably called for and, under leave granted to do so, I now include it as part of these remarks:

"The root causes of discontent," the statement declares, "are of immediate and continuing concern to all of us. The Republican leadership, nowhere state what they "root causes" are. There is not a single word about jobs, housing, health, care, education or other urban problems. The statement is replete with demagogic talk about unspecified factories manufacturing Mole-..."
and we ought to be preparing to get at our task in as objective, constructive, and cooperative fashion as possible.

But there was another reason beyond that of publicly admitting we have both been “taken to the woodshed,” that prompted me to insert the above editorial. That reason is because I believe the Times is wrong in doing so, detracted from the force and effect of its appropriate criticism—when it felt impelled to add that sentence to its final paragraph, it was referred to the sort that would have been accomplished if the conserva-
tives in both parties would (now) re-examine their consciences and their voting records on the model cities bill, the rent-subsidy program, the rat-control bill, and (the) many other measures before Congress.

This is a line I have also heard some of my colleagues adopt elsewhere, but not in this week—but it does constitute a very valid argument if what we are searching for is the primary, first, the restoration of law and order in our rhot- tinos—long-range solutions gets at the causes—the root causes—of the riots themselves. The reason it does not is that we are looking at a crisis gimmick—programs approved—primarily—to quiet and contain the ghettos.

Now those last 11 words are not mine—and that is why I have put quotation marks around them. I found them, as did all of us, on the same editorial page of the Times in a published letter to its editor from Prof. Kenneth B. Clark, of New York City, whose remarks make more sense to me right now than anything I have heard or read elsewhere the past few days. That letter was entitled “For Total Mobilization To Solve Urban Crisis,” which I have added as the title of these remarks and, under leave again to do so, Professor Clark’s letter is now set forth:

For Total Mobilization To Solve Urban Crisis

To the Editor:

The reputation of The New York Times for incisive and distinguished editorial is enhanced by the series of editorials (July 19, 17 and 18) concerning the difficult and complex problems inherent in the tragedy of Newark. These editorials are significant contributions to public education and should be required reading for public officials responsible for the future of American cities.

If it is possible to salvage any positives from the tragic consequences of past neglect—discrimination and pervasive insensitivities which made Newark inevitable, old postures and explanatory cliches must give way to a serious and dispassionate search for solutions to critical urban problems.

In seeking the solutions to the problems of our cities and ghettos, the choices before us are limited. First, we can increase the number of state police, National Guard or Federal troops...We can put down "insurrections" within the ghettos and thereby turn them into compounds of frustration and discontent. Second, we can continue a crisis gimmick-programs approach designed to quiet and contain the ghettos. Or third, we can seek serious long-term solutions to longstanding problems.

KENNETH B. CLARK, President, Metropolitan Applied Research, Inc., and Professor of Psychology, the City College.


As you will note, Mr. Speaker, Professor Clark states we have three general choices concerning what is to be done about our developing crisis. The first of these, as some here are already suggesting, is to pour Federal monies into "beefing up" State and local police forces. Even dragooned in order of bringing order out of chaos, this is, at best, clearly no solution.

Professor Clark’s suggestion for a second choice is that we already have something ed—the continuation of that "crisis gimmick-programs approach designed to quiet and contain the ghettos." I know I will get into an argument if I should attempt to critique the programs and pending bills the Times was talking about all into this category—so I will not even try that being content, instead, to point out that the same, again at best, offers only very distant and very partial "solutions." Certainly, this is true about the model city program which may prove to be the best of all foolishness. The Congress has indicated a willingness to try. However, even if that program were fully funded it would be well for the credit of those of us who supported it...But the additional money that Secretary Weaver has even not made up his mind as to which American cities are going to be favored with model cities funds.

The rent-subsidy program has already been amply debated here, so suffice it to point out that there are existing alternatives to it that are funded and that are working. And, of course, none of us, at least—there are also pending proposed alternatives, such as the Percy homeownership plan of which I am a cosponsor, and which, if we had it now, might obviate some of the worst and most devastating of the devastated ghetto areas that we are undoubtedly going to be asked to help rebuild.

And, finally, as to that pesky rat-control bill, perhaps was a mistake from the standpoint of images for the House to have turned it down. But what the liberal press has failed to realize, in its criticism of this action, is that the House Members who so voted were voting not for rat-, for "economyGovernment, as has been suggested, but against the burgeoning categoricanral programs Congress has been indulging in lately to the serious detriment of local flexibility in trying to meet local problems. And I do not know if it matters now but, with如此 much on all our minds, who can the critics of this House action—including the Times—mind too much taking public note of the fact that Detroit, well prior to that incident, took care of its own, had practically cleaned up its own rat problem, reducing the incidence of rat-infested building by a whopping 60 percent.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, what the Detroit situation now demands of us is not passage of a rat-control bill but a thorough reexamination of the whole governmental and social structures on which we may too long have relied. For, as Charles Orlebeke, executive assistant to Michigan’s Gov. George Romney, said about that city’s tragedy:

We’ve got to try to see what went wrong. This is more a tragedy of a city. It is a tragedy of our cities, and that means a lot of things that the sociologists talk about.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think Professor Clark had a real point in suggesting to us, as our remaining third choice now, that we stop thinking in terms of “gimmick-programs.” In fact, we cannot resist overselling in our desire for votes or in our hope that they will somehow help “keep the lid on,” and that instead we get down to work—mobilizing our undeniable scientific and industrial genius just as we did before in matching the Russian space challenge and in unlocking the secret to nuclear power—to these various, long-term solutions to the longstanding and vastly complex human problems that, unsolved, will continue to tear at the very fabric of our society.

I confess I do not know how to get such an effort going. It would not be easy—ennamored of these old cliches and so trapped in our own refutation as we are; but perhaps if one or another kind of congressional investigations into the ghettos as now proposed started it might point us in that ultimate direction.

But I deeply believe that such an all-out effort must be made—and that on the basis of some of the studies of the future of what Professor Clark calls the American experiment in democracy.
Navy would use the 400-mile-range Spartan missile for SABRIS and also the Nike X radar. The ships would be built with special armor against nuclear blast and fallout.

Building a Nike X missile defense around the United States is gaining Johnson administration support in the wake of Red Chinese nuclear test in October 1962.

Congressional demands for a $38-billion to $10-billion version of Nike X will intensify this week if the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee releases as planned, its report on Chinese nuclear progress.

**INDIA CITIZENS OPPOSE STAND AGAINST ISRAEL**
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Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the writer, Mr. Gobind Behari Lal, of the following article, which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner, July 6, 1967, has excellent credentials. He is a member of the staff of the San Francisco Examiner, science writer for the Hearst Newspapers, since 1925. He taught physics at a college of the University of the Punjab, before coming to Berkeley, for research at the University of California, before the First World War.

Mr. Lal was born in Delhi, India, and was active in the Indian independence movement, in India and in the United States, until 1947. He received a Pulitzer Prize for science writing for the Hearst Newspapers in 1937, a Guggenheim Fellowship for history of science research in 1955, a special citation for “Distinguished Services to Medicine” from the American Medical Association in 1966.

He knew Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and many other makers of independent India and has maintained close relations with Indian affairs. Mr. Lal's article follows:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, July 6, 1967]

**INDIA CITIZENS OPPOSE STAND AGAINST ISRAEL**

The majority of the people of India are opposed to the apparent pro-Arab attitude of the Indian Government.

The leading Indian newspapers and political and cultural leaders have openly condemned the Indian Foreign Office’s pro-Egyptian statement, just before the outbreak of the Israel-Arab war.

People are asking the government: “When there was a war between India and Pakistan, what help did any of the Moslem countries give India? They supplied Iran and Indonesia and the rest showed their partnership with Pakistan, a fellow Moslem country?”

**OFFSET**

The continued hostility between India and Pakistan is the key to most of India's foreign policies. It is to offset the influence of Pakistan with Moslem nations that India deals less and less out of its way to be friendly with these nations.

With cordiality with China, support of America, and of so many Moslem states, Pakistan presents to India a dangerous challenge. Indian diplomatic moves are largely determined by this phenomenon.

Following her own election as the Prime Minister, Madame Indira Gandhi, genuinely loved and admired by the Indian people for her courage, hard work, idealism, patriotism, education, and statesmanship, made a Nizam. Made a Moslem, Indian the president of India. This despite the fact that only 10 to 15 percent of India's population follow the Moslem faith.

**MOSELM**

India's foreign minister, an internationally noted jurist, Dr. M. A. Chagla, is also a Moslem by faith. Both are superb dignitaries, but their positions are due to their faith.

The principle of excluding religion from political positions in a state of law as usually observed in India; but it is also lost sight of in some crises.

What was the need of the Indian Foreign Office to make a statement favoring Egypt against Israel?

Leaving aside the present Israel-Arab conflict, it is important to understand the general historical background of the relations between the Indian and the Jews.

**ASYLUM**

In history, when the Jews were persecuted by Europeans, they found welcome and generous asylum in India. About 2500 years ago, several thousand Jews were persecuted by Romans, fled to South India.

Here the Hindu king gave them land and made their leader a maharaja, and granted to them fullest liberties allowed to Hindus.

Never was a Jew persecuted in Hindu India. Under British rule Englishmen of Jewish faith began to come for office or trade. In the British-established Indian colleges, Indian students were taught that "Shylock was a Jew," and Shylock was heartless.

**IMPRESS**

However, it was Madame Diarsael, Queen Victoria's prime minister of Jewish parents, who first made this queen "The Empress of India," at a lavish coronation ceremony in Delhi, in 1877.

After World War I, Lloyd George sent Lord Reading, a professing Jew, as the British viceroy of India, to show that many British conservatives condemned. So English statesmanship tried to use Jewish brains to thwart Indian independence.

However, a number of Jews prominent in the Labour Party and even in the Liberal Party of England were sympathetic to the cause of Indian independence.

**AMERICA**

But it was in the United States that the Jews, Americans, showed their most active and helpful sympathy with the Independent movement.

Many distinguished Jews aided the Indian cause, for example: Prof. Albert Einstein, U.S. Congressman Emanuel Celler, writers John Gunther and Mrs. Francis Gunther, Louis Fischer, biographer of Mahatma Gandhi, Rabbi Stephen Wise and so on.

Some of the most enthusiastic and effective Indian leaders are Dr. Taraknath Das of Columbia University, urged India, after her independence, to make an alliance with Israel.

**Jim Robinson Played It Rugged**
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Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the heroic exploits on the battlefield of a former neighbor, Sgt. James Robinson. Last week, Mr. Robinson, who is the recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor at ceremonies in the Pentagon recently. He was given the medal posthumously.

Jim, as I knew him, was killed on April 11, 1966, while he charged and destroyed a Vietcong machinegun nest during Operation Abilene. But I knew of his valor and worth long before his exploits in Vietnam.

Jim was a rugged, 210-pound tackle on our high school football team in the late 1950's, less than a decade ago. In 1958, he was named all-league tackle in a tough Chicago suburban conference. Even then he stood out. Even then he was rugged. Even then he displayed the courage which later was to claim his life. Robinson had always wanted to play professional football. He played in a far tougher game, war, which is not a game at all. But he proved his worth.

Speaking of the Congressional Medal of Honor winner, his spirit as a marine and as a soldier can be typified by the words of his high school football coach, who said: "Jim was always in condition, ready for a tough game—a little rugged on physical fitness. He always contributed a host of tackles, even in defeat, and always played it rugged."

He knew what he was fighting for, too. Jim was deeply interested in foreign affairs and strongly in favor of the war. His father quoted young Jim as saying: "All you have to do is get out a map and look at Vietnam and you'll see that it is the key to the Far East and worth any price to keep it."

Yes, Jim Robinson proved his worth and in so doing proved, too, the worth of thousands of former athletes who are now in the armed forces.

We owe much to young men such as Jim Robinson and to the parents who nurtured and loved them. We salute them all.

**Needed: A War on War in the Streets**
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Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the riots which have been raging throughout the metropolitan centers of our Nation, are tragic evidence that a new approach to the racial problem is drastically needed.

Paul Hope, writing for the Washington Evening Star, has analyzed the situation and suggested some changes to help prevent these same events from occurring in the future.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues Mr. Hope's article which appeared in the July 24, 1967, edition of the Star.

The article follows: 

**NEEDED: A War on War in Streets**

(By Paul Hope)

If the United States ever gets done in, it won't be because there's a Communist be-
What Price a Soldier's Life?
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Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced H.R. 5724 which provides some reasonable benefit for the survivors of retired military personnel who have devoted their entire lives to the service of the United States of America. Without going into the details of what benefits are presently available, let me summarize by simply saying that no class of Americans is as neglected as the survivors of a military retiree. In civil service, private industry, local government, the provisions for the survivors of retirees are much more generous.

Mr. GUBSER. Let me be hopeful. What I hope is that the Department of Defense will recognize its inequity and see that it must be corrected if we are to be able to offer the incentive which attracts men to a career of military service. I believe that to do such things, we have no hope of eliminating the draft and creating a truly professional military service.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in the San Francisco Chronicle- Examiner, Mr. Jerry Belcher, staff writer, wrote a fine article which gives a real insight into the disparity of treatment between military retirees and their survivors and civil service retirees. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the article which appeared in the July 16 issue of the Chronicle- Examiner:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle- Examiner, July 16, 1967]

WHAT PRICE A SOLDIER’S LIFE?

(By Jerry Belcher)

A hero is dead, killed in action in Vietnam. It happened last week when it happened to 282 Americans, since 1961 it has happened to more than 11,000.

There was no money to put a price on a hero—and any man killed in action is a hero. He must be, according to the government, if he is a soldier. In cold, economic terms, what does the death of a soldier mean to a soldier’s family?

To put the question into human perspective, what did it mean to one of the 282 men killed last week—First Lt. Gatin (Jerry) Howel of Alameda?

Lt. Howell was 31. He had served his time, fought for his legs, earned his country, as an enlisted Marine before the war in Vietnam started.

In his school in San Francisco after that hitch he and married Nancy Ebert. But, as he said a few days before his death, he felt a further responsibility.

The firebomb and the sniper’s guns must be tied in for a responsible place in society. The nation cannot afford to let lawlessness become a way of life in its industrial heartland.

On July 4, he volunteered to lead a rescue mission to bring back the bodies of fallen Marines in a bloody battle for Con Thien. He lived through that. But on July 7, he was killed by enemy artillery fire.

Nancy Howell, in a final word of her husband’s death on July 10. Her two sons were too young to understand what the telegram meant.

By comparison, the widow of a San Francisco policeman of Howell’s age and time in service (16 years) would receive his full pay of $770 a month until the time of his retirement age of 55, after which she would get $330 a month for the rest of her life.

MORE THAN $200,000

For a man of Howell’s age at death, in 25 years, that would amount to more than $200,000. The VA benefits to a soldier’s widow are less than $65,000. And if the soldier’s widow remarries, she loses her benefit.

But that’s not the whole fiscal story. There is Social Security and there is California State Workmen’s Compensation to consider.

A serviceman’s widow with two children will receive between $200 and $300 a month from Social Security. (Mrs. Howell probably will get between $250 and $300.) When the children reach 18, their benefits will end. If the widow remarries, her benefit will be cut off.

NOT ELIGIBLE

A policeman’s widow, however, is not eligible for the Social Security benefits.

As for State Workmen’s Compensation: A policeman is not eligible, and neither is a soldier. But a street sweeper or a longshoreman is. The longshoreman is. The longshoreman or a street sweeper who dies in the line of duty will receive from the state up to $21,000 paid in 60-month installments of $140.

A serviceman’s widow will receive $10,000 from GI Insurance, but that, like Social Security, is paid for over the years by the individual.