

He went to the NASA Manned Space Flight Center at Houston, Tex., more than 3 years ago, before any civilians had been selected for flight crews. He told officials then that the day was coming when they would need scientists to explore the moon.

A few scientists were selected last year but Dr. Lind was a few days too old to qualify on the initial selections.

This year, when a new call was put out, he got in touch with NASA's Houston staff immediately. The man who answered laughed, saying "we wondered how soon you'd call, Dr. Lind."

This time, he made it. He'll soon move his wife—and the former Kathleen Maughn of Logan—and five children to Texas to begin his lunar training.

The dreams that Utah's Don Lind had more than 20 years ago of flying to the moon will soon come true. This scientist-pilot certainly has the right qualifications.

**DEDICATION OF NEW OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH FACILITY ON POINT LOMA, CALIF.**

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly of a most fitting dedication that has come to my attention.

On March 25, 1966, the University of California's Board of Regents named a new oceanographic research facility on Point Loma, off San Diego, after the late Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz.

This 6-acre, \$1 million facility is considered to be one of the most advanced installations in the world for the study of the sea and the distribution of plant and aquatic animal life.

The new facility, which will be operated by the Scripps Institute of Oceanography, will include a 320-foot floating pier, a 150-foot wharf, and administration and staging building, maintenance and electronic shops, and a warehouse. It will be the home port for many research and training vessels, which already include the *Alpha-Helix*, an ocean going biological laboratory, and the *Thomas Washington*, a research vessel.

Mr. President, I can think of no more appropriate than the late Admiral Nimitz, a former regent of the University of California and a great naval officer, to be honored by the operation of this new advancement in the exploration of the sea, which we all know to possess vast treasures of unknown wealth.

Also, Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to a column which appeared in the Navy Times concerning what I feel is an excellent and timely proposal by Congressman Bob Wilson, of San Diego to name a nuclear carrier for Fleet Admiral Nimitz. This certainly deserves the consideration of the Congress and would be a fitting and appropriate tribute to this distinguished naval officer. I ask unanimous consent that the attached article be inserted in my remarks at this point.

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

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Mar. 28, 1966]

**CARRIER FOR NIMITZ**

(NOTE.—The Navy Times comments on the proposal to name a nuclear carrier for Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz.)

There is no question that the name a ship for Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz.

itz. The other fleet admirals and the deceased four-star fleet commanders of World War II have already been so honored.

Representative Bob Wilson, of California, wants to name the nuclear carrier in the 1967 budget before Congress for Admiral Nimitz—"the man who made the aircraft carrier a potent and formidable element in sea warfare."

Certainly, so far as carrier names go, there is no reason why this should not be done. Though carriers used to be named for great battles or historic ships, such names as "Kitty Hawk" and "Shangri-La" also have crept in and three already have been named for people: Roosevelt, Forrestal, and Kennedy. And to stretch a point, so has *Bon Homme Richard*.

And, though by hitting the history books, one might come up with some names as illustrious as that of Nimitz, we ourselves can't think of any persons who are more outstanding.

So Congress and the Navy should give careful consideration to Mr. Wilson's proposal.

**CIA INVOLVEMENT WITH A MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY PROJECT IN VIETNAM FROM 1955 TO 1959**

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, my statement concerning reported CIA involvement with a Michigan State University project in Vietnam from 1955 to 1959, which I made in a speech in Oklahoma last Saturday noon, followed a refusal of CIA to discuss this matter with me in private.

After my Saturday statement, I was contacted by Adm. William F. Raborn, CIA Director, with whom I conversed about it, and who, thereafter, sent CIA officials to discuss it with me privately in my office this afternoon.

I expressed to them my strong conviction that university research projects abroad should in no wise have any connection with CIA activities, so that there could be no misunderstanding that research in the social and behavioral science fields, particularly, is unpressured and unconnected with political ends.

I was given the explanation of the Michigan State University situation substantially as was stated today by Senator LEVERETT SALMONSTALL, of Massachusetts, in the Senate.

I will continue to be very much interested in the future in the freedom of university research from political or other extraneous entanglements.

**SUPPORT IN BRITAIN FOR THE AMERICAN COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM**

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, demonstrations in foreign capitals have often left the impression that intellectuals, students, and other leaders of opinion in Europe and Asia do not support the American commitment in Vietnam.

Likewise, demonstrations in this country have led observers abroad to believe that opinion here is sharply divided and, in the long run, might stimulate a weakening of determination to maintain a firm position.

Neither view is valid, for informed opinion abroad is no more represented by demonstrations and teach-ins than is informed opinion in this country.

versity, points out that British opinion over the past year has changed significantly. In a recent article in the National Review, he wrote:

The consensus in British intellectual circles has changed. A year ago the attitude of the British academic or clergyman or lawyer was likely to be one of despairing disapproval of American intervention in what was thought to be a civil war. Today many of the same people grudgingly acknowledge that the fight has to be made and that civil war is a term that cannot be applied to the externally directed Vietcong subversion.

In his article Mr. Fletcher quotes extensively from such British observers as Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart, P. J. Honey, reader in Vietnamese affairs at the University of London, and Michael Wall of the Manchester Guardian.

Mr. Wall has, states the author of this article, significantly changed the approach taken by the Guardian, which had previously been critical of American efforts in Vietnam.

In the Guardian of January 25, 1966, Wall wrote the following:

If indeed the struggle is for liberation why has there been no uprising on a national scale by a proud and highly intelligent people? Why have all attempts to paralyze Saigon by strike action dismally failed? Why has the Vietnamese Army continued the struggle after appalling losses and moreover still manages to attract volunteers? \* \* \* Those people who understand what communism is are not attracted by its ideology and are repelled by its methods. They do not believe the lot of those in North Vietnam is better than their own.

I wish to share this interesting and important analysis with my colleagues, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the RECORD.

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

**BRITISH SUPPORT ON VIETNAM?**

(By James Fletcher)

(NOTE.—In 3 months' time British opinion on what is going on in Vietnam has changed. Today, they buy the American thesis of Communist aggression.)

One of the tasks sometimes assigned to U.S. citizens living abroad by their Embassy is defending American foreign policy. In England, the organizing body is the U.S. Information Service, situated in the eagle-topped Embassy in Grosvenor Square. Because the USIS is particularly eager to keep relations between Britain and the United States as close as possible, the number of speakers sent out from London in any one week may be quite large. Most of them receive no pay, being recruited for training to fill engagements which cannot be filled by Embassy officials for reasons of manpower or of discretion. A Rhodes scholar may address an organization of retired civil servants on "The Structure of American Government." Or a Fulbright lecturer may discuss the race problem before a women's club in Durham. The operation is a large one and the results cannot be estimated because so many variables are involved.

My own initiation into the role of unofficial spokesman came in late January. The topic was Vietnam and the program a BBC-TV educational venture called "Spotlight." Two or three of my colleagues on the list from which the BBC eventually got my name specialized in foreign affairs, but with the reticence displayed by most American academics they refused to be involved in any-thing. I was the only one of the American foreign policy. By the time I had to do.