

1961

Approved For Release 2000/04/13 : CIA-RDP70-00058R000200140123-8

By Mr. THURMOND:

Remarks by him in regard to inspection of the Combined Arms School of the 7th Army Training Center recently.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Address entitled "Deterrents to Economic Growth," delivered recently by A. L. M. Wiggins, chairman of the boards, Atlantic Coast Line and Louisville & Nashville Railroads, Hartsville, S.C., which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. BEALL:

Article entitled "How Much Longer Will the Navy Ignore the Facts?" published in the Maritime Reporter of April 15, 1961, dealing with the advantages of routing more naval work to commercial shipyards.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Article entitled "Crisis in the Hospitals," written by Selig Greenberg and published in the Progressive for May 1961, dealing with the problem of high hospital costs, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Article entitled "Democracy Under the Guns of Cold War," written by Roy Roberts, editor of the Kansas City Star, and published in the May 7, 1961, issue of that publication.

By Mr. PROXMIER:

Article entitled "Radio-TV: Collins Enters NAB Lists," dealing with an address delivered by Leroy Collins, former Governor of Florida, and president of the National Association of Broadcasters, to the membership of that organization.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Articles dealing with the proposed establishment of a Cape Cod National Seashore Park.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Article entitled "Expense Accounts and Taxes," published in the New York Times of May 5, 1961.

Article entitled "Dunes Against Dollars," published in the New York Times of May 4, 1961, dealing with the preservation of the Indiana Dunes area.

By Mr. WILEY:

Letter dated March 15, 1961, from Leslie H. Finkel, director of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, proposing that a commemorative postage stamp be issued in honor of Frederick Jackson Turner, a preeminent American historian.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "Reporting at Large with Bob Murphy," commemorating Cedric Adams, and published in the Minneapolis (Minn.) Sunday Tribune of February 26, 1961.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Article entitled "Public Schools Died Here," written by Irv Goodman and published in the Saturday Evening Post recently, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

## "ISSUES AND ANSWERS"—RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on last Sunday the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I appeared on the American Broadcasting Co.'s television program "Issues and Answers."

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the interview conducted by Robert Fleming, director of the ABC Washington News Bureau, and Peter Clapper, Capitol Hill correspondent, be incorporated in the Record.

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

ISSUES AND ANSWERS—SUNDAY, MAY 7, 1961

Guests: Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, from Montana, and Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, from Vermont.

Panel: Robert Fleming, director, ABC Washington News Bureau and Peter Clapper, Capitol Hill correspondent.

The ANNOUNCER. From Washington, D.C., the American Broadcasting Co. brings you "Issues and Answers."

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, what are the issues?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, there are so many issues in the field of domestic and foreign policy that it is almost impossible to delineate them. I am sure though that our interrogators during the course of this broadcast will bring many of those issues to the attention of the American people.

The ANNOUNCER. Senator GEORGE B. AIKEN?

Senator AIKEN. I would say that the principal issues or challenges of today are to recognize the dangers, the responsibilities and the opportunities that confront our Nation in these days of stress and strain.

The ANNOUNCER. You have heard the issues, and now, for the answers. Here to explore the issues are Bob Fleming, chief of ABC's Washington News Bureau and Peter Clapper, ABC's Capitol Hill correspondent. To give us the answers, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, and Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, both ranking members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Now with the first question, Mr. Fleming.

Mr. FLEMING. Senator MANSFIELD, certainly one of the major issues today is the situation in Laos. Must we write off Laos as another victory for the Communists or if not, where can we save something?

Senator MANSFIELD. I am afraid that events look very discouraging in Laos at the present time. It does appear as if the Communists in gaining the upper hand have control of approximately two-thirds of the country at the present time and their control seems to be increasing. It would appear to me that in view of the circumstances that the best place where a stand could and perhaps should be made would be in the Thailand or the Vietnam area.

Mr. FLEMING. Does this mean a writeoff of Laos?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not necessarily. It all depends on the type of neutralist government, if any, which comes out of the meeting to be held in Geneva on Friday of this coming week.

Mr. FLEMING. Senator AIKEN, you, too, have watched a lot of these cease fires. Haven't they generally led to partition of the country? This time Senator MANSFIELD suggests that the country seems to be hoping for some kind of a coalition government.

Would this go into a Communist victory do you think?

Senator AIKEN. Well, I think Laos would be about the worst place in the world for us to undertake a showdown with the Communist forces, either in a cold war or in a hot war, and it seems to me that it would be folly to send armed forces into Laos at this time.

The question is, How do the Lao themselves feel about it? It is true they have had what they call a civil war, but at the same time it has been, as I understand it, almost a bloodless war; their hearts haven't been in it and it doesn't seem to me that we should send our forces in to support a government that hardly makes any effort to defend itself.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator MANSFIELD, where do we draw the line in southeast Asia, then?

Senator MANSFIELD. May I say, Pete, that is up to the President of the United States. We are, of course, in the so-called Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, under which, for example, if Thailand is attacked we automatically come to its assistance.

As far as Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia are all concerned, we would come to the

assistance of those nations only if they were attacked by Communists from the outside and if they requested assistance.

Mr. FLEMING. Are we a prisoner, to a certain extent, of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, Senator? There has been reluctance on the part of some members, apparently even Britain and France, to participate in activities in these areas.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, it is not the strongest treaty organization in the world. I would have preferred, for example, to have seen a strictly Asian, Southeast Asia Treaty Organization setup.

Mr. FLEMING. Without us, too?

Senator MANSFIELD. Without us. But as long as they would not do so on their own, I think the only thing that could have been done was what was done in 1954, I believe, when the treaty was consummated, and that was to bring in other powers interested in that area, in addition to Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, now, you say there would be great question what the President would do. Do you think the Congress would approve of sending troops to any of those countries?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, I am quite certain that the President would confer with the necessary individuals in the Congress before any action was undertaken, but we must remember that under the Constitution, the President is charged with the conduct of our foreign policy, and he is the Commander in Chief of our armed services, and furthermore, we do have this treaty which we are obligated to adhere to.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator AIKEN, Thailand professed to support the Allies in World War II, and yet when it came to a showdown they sided with the Japanese. I believe.

Now, is it possible that in a showdown this time Thailand might side with the Communists?

Senator AIKEN. No. I would expect that Thailand would side with us in the showdown this time because now the crucial area is much nearer Thailand than it was back in the days of World War II, and the very existence of Thailand itself would be threatened should the Communists succeed in taking over Laos and then taking over South Vietnam.

Thailand would be left very much exposed. So I would say if they do make a serious effort to take over South Vietnam or any of the other south Asian countries, that the U.S. security would be heavily involved and that we would have to take some steps to assist them, very vigorous steps, perhaps.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, George, I think we ought to bring out, too, that as far as the Thai are concerned, they did not abjectly surrender to the Japanese because they fought as long as they could—it wasn't very long, but they did try to put up a struggle to maintain their independence.

Senator AIKEN. That is true; they did. And last fall I was at the United Nations and during the debates that came up and the votes that came up, Thailand stayed very solidly with the West and with the democratic governments of the world.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator MANSFIELD, you have mentioned SEATO. I was wondering, sir, if SEATO isn't strictly organized according to overt military necessities and that it has no paramilitary capability and if so, should it not be stressed that this is the next move for SEATO?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, your interpretation, Pete, is correct, it is set up for the purpose of meeting overt threats from Communist countries against the members of the SEATO organization.

As far as paramilitary organizations or concepts are concerned, I wouldn't know how to answer that at this time.