

are slaves of an eastern European dictator.

Castro has made his arrogant May Day proclamation. His paraders flourished Soviet weapons. His picture was flanked by those of the Soviet's patrons—Marx and Lenin. Castro is a Communist. He says so himself. But the world, and our own American Republics have a way of forgetting these facts, as they too often in the past ignored the gradual communization of Cuba.

We must not let this advantage slip by, as we have let so many others slip by. Now is the time to rally the hemisphere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Brazil Alarmed by Castro's Stand," published in the New York Times of May 4, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

BRAZIL ALARMED BY CASTRO STAND: PROCLAMATION OF SOCIALIST CUBA LEADS TO CLAMOR FOR ACTION BY OAS

(By Juan de Onís)

RIO DE JANEIRO, May 3.—Premier Fidel Castro's dedication of Cuba as a Socialist republic and one without elections has swung Brazilian opinion strongly in favor of holding an American foreign ministers' conference to consider the Cuban problem.

The Cuban Premier's May Day speech was greeted today by a chorus of alarmed editorials, all striking the same chord. The substance of the editorials was summed up in one sentence by the editorial column of the influential *Correio da Manha*: "The continent must react."

President Janio Quadros called a cabinet meeting for Saturday and summoned Foreign Minister Afonso Arinos de Melo Franco to Brasilia Friday to analyze the Cuban situation. The Presidential Palace issued last night the latest in a series of telegrams exchanged between President Quadros and Cuban authorities, who have been appealing for Brazilian support.

In a message to President Osvaldo Dorticós Tornado of Cuba, President Quadros said:

"I take this opportunity * * * to reiterate the determination stated by Brazil on various occasions that the principle of self-determination of peoples and effective sovereignty of nations be respected in this continent. To this end my government will always be ready to promote any initiative that will be judged useful to maintain a climate of harmony between countries of our hemisphere for the sake of peace and prosperity in the Americas and in the world."

This noncommittal statement which added nothing to Brazil's position, since the Cuban crisis began, did not reflect the hardening view of all influential sectors of the Brazilian press and the mounting conviction in official circles that the time had come for collective action on Cuba.

The preponderant opinion in the Foreign Ministry now is not whether there should be a conference, but what kind of conference it should be and what should be its objectives. The dominant view is that the American Republics should agree on defensive measures to block any propagation of the now manifest Communist situation in Cuba.

Newspapers that were the most critical of the April 17 invasion of Cuba by anti-Castro rebels took the lead in condemning the Cuban policy outlined by Dr. Castro.

Jornal do Brazil, a Roman Catholic independent newspaper, declared editorially:

"Fidel Castro burned his bridges on the 1st of May. He took a stand against the inter-American system and not just the

United States * * * of course this does not justify armed intervention in Cuba. But democratic governments of the continent must take necessary precautions that the Cuban revolution does not spread and that the Andes * * * should not become the Sierra Maestra of the Americas."

Diario de Noticias, a nationalist newspaper that has strongly backed President Quadros' hands-off policy on Cuba, said that the May Day statements by Premier Castro "will require reformulation of the inter-American system based on doctrinary solidarity."

Correio de Manha declared that Dr. Castro, by refusing to invoke the 1947 Rio de Janeiro Inter-American Defense Treaty to air his invasion charges against the United States, had "virtually abandoned the Organization of American States." The newspaper added:

"He can no longer solicit mediation by American foreign offices or the help of American governments. The continent must react. But reaction against threats does not necessarily mean military intervention. The awaited and now inevitable foreign ministers' conference has other means at hand, the most effective of which will be that imposed by Fidel Castro himself: isolation."

Dr. Castro's assertion that Cuba did not need elections under her new system as a Socialist republic has had a sharply adverse effect on official and public opinion. Moreover, considerable enthusiasm has been expressed over Costa Rica's threat to break relations with Cuba if prisoners taken after the invasion are executed.

President Dorticós has promised Brazil that the prisoners will receive "serene justice, free of a spirit of vengeance." The promise was contained in a telegram to President Quadros in reply to an appeal by Senhor Quadros on behalf of the prisoners.

At the same time, Dr. Dorticós asked Senator Quadros to "take such actions and measures as you consider pertinent" to prevent the repetition of "similar or worse criminal aggressions" against Cuba by the United States, which Dr. Dorticós said had "assumed responsibility for the unsuccessful invasion."

UNITED STATES STUDIES POLICY ON CUBA

WASHINGTON, May 3.—Immediate and long-range U.S. policies toward Cuba and Latin America were reported tonight to be under review by the National Security Council.

Some indications of the trend of the U.S. thinking on hemisphere problems in the wake of the unsuccessful April 17 landing in Cuba by rebel forces and of the formal proclamation Monday by Premier Fidel Castro of a Socialist state may come Friday when the National Security Council meets with President Kennedy. It was believed that Cuba might be one of the main topics of the session.

Following statements on Cuba this afternoon by Secretary of State Dean Rusk to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the course of a general briefing on world affairs, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, the committee's chairman, declared that the Cuban situation was being closely examined.

"What to do next," he said, "is under very serious study. We are trying to develop long-range plans."

The immediate problem facing the administration was to decide what action to take in the face of the establishment by Premier Castro of what was described by the Department of State yesterday as a full-fledged Communist state in the Western Hemisphere.

Having ruled out armed intervention but being unwilling to allow the impression in Latin America that the United States was tacitly prepared to coexist with a Communist

regime 90 miles from its shores, the administration still appeared to be groping for a solution.

TELEVISION STATION WCKT, MIAMI, RECIPIENT OF PEABODY AWARD

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am pleased to learn that a Florida television station—station WCKT in Miami—has been named the recipient of the Peabody Award, a singularly high honor in the field of television news coverage and public affairs.

The awards are made to recognize distinguished achievements and the most meritorious service rendered each year by radio and television.

The judging is done by the Henry Grady School of Journalism of the University of Georgia.

Station WCKT received its award for responsible leadership in the prompt analysis and exposure of problems incident to the Cuban crisis through such programs as: "Compass Points South," "Cuba on the Move," and "Gitmo: Leave or Stay."

In addition to its coverage of many phases of the Cuban crisis, station WCKT also devoted much time and effort to programs pinpointing Communist subversion and penetration in the United States and the nations of Latin America.

I commend the staff of station WCKT, including News Director Gene Strul, for their enterprise and public service, and I congratulate them for winning the coveted Peabody Award.

AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, when the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and I left the floor of the Senate shortly after 5 o'clock last evening, we were under the impression that the debate on the nomination of Julius C. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran would not begin until today. However, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] each made a statement in opposition to the nomination of Mr. Holmes. I wish to comment on those statements before I give the Senate my own views as to the nomination of Mr. Holmes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield? I rise to a point of personal privilege.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from Missouri imply that the Senator from Ohio was a participant in the understanding that there would be no discussion of the nomination of Mr. Holmes on the floor of the Senate last night?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Missouri does not so imply.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I had no such understanding. If there had been such an understanding, I would not have spoken.

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

6825

are needed, and it is to be hoped that they will be forthcoming shortly.

Mr. President, I have translated the article published in *El Mundo*, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the *Record*.

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

I have read the recent discourse in the Venezuelan National Congress of my first cousin, Ignacio Luis Arcaya in which he supports Fidel Castro and his policies and censures those of the United States. Again our family name appears in support of the assassin of the Caribe.

We do not share the opinions of Ignacio Luis respecting Cuba and could not hold his views without going against the fundamental principles upon which our country was established and under which we live.

We maintain that Venezuela was founded upon the general principle of respect for human lives as well as for that of private property, freedom of expression, and freedom of worship. Castro, with his firing squads assassinates his countrymen; with his bands of spies he has eliminated freedom of speech; he persecutes the church and mocks humble priests and nuns dedicated to aiding the poor. Castro has confiscated private property and has in fact stolen the lifetime savings of many aged persons who cannot longer work.

Castro's system has not only hurt the middle class, but has in fact ruined the working class. In the Cuba of today the worker is a virtual slave of the state, forced to toil longer hours with a lesser real pay than before, without the right to strike, in fact practically without human rights at all.

Castro and his criminal accomplices, Russia and Red China seek not only to enslave Cuba—but also Venezuela as well. To support Castro is in fact to support an enemy of Venezuela. To back Castro is to accept the dissolution of our Armed Forces as has been done in Cuba and the establishment of an armed ruthless militia. To lend even moral support to Castro is to invite mercenary communistic intervention into Venezuela emulating that of the Argentine Communist Che Guevara and that of Chinese-Czecho-Russian pilots with their MIG's that strafed the patriotic Cuban invaders.

In our opinion the United States has been too benevolent in the treatment accorded the assassin Castro. Even today the United States is purchasing Cuban tobacco and other products and is sending food and medicine when in reality the United States should send a well trained and equipped group of marines to end once and for all that nest of foreign communists which is the Cuba of today.

CUBA: A SOVIET SATELLITE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, with the continuing successes of Fidel Castro and the open declaration by him that Cuba is a Soviet satellite—just as much as East Germany, Poland, Hungary, or any other Iron Curtain country—the efforts of Communists in Latin America have been redoubled.

They are making a particular effort to work their ends in Latin America behind the camouflage of Soviet-front groups.

The noted scholar on Latin American affairs, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, in a letter written to the *New York Times*, and published on April 17, pointed out the role of ex-President Lazaro Cárdenas of Mexico as a "sponsor of nu-

merous Soviet-front activities throughout the globe."

Dr. Thorning's letter says in part:

Despite a few superficial differences, the Marxist-Leninist planners are determined to get the maximum advantages available in the present partnership and collaboration between ex-President Cárdenas and Premier Castro.

The exposure of Soviet blueprints for Latin America can help defeat the security of the Western Hemisphere.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Thorning's letter be printed in the *Record*.

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

ROLE OF GENERAL CÁRDENAS—ASSOCIATION WITH SOVIET-FRONT GROUPS IS CHARGED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It would be comforting to be able to characterize ex-President Lazaro Cárdenas of Mexico, sponsor of numerous Soviet-front activities throughout the globe, as a person belonging "in the line of the humanistic, liberal traditions of Latin America." (*The Times*, March 11.)

The truth is that for the past 12 years General Cárdenas, although not a card-carrying Communist, has allowed his name, popularity and prestige to be exploited by forces that have been undermining or destroying free, God-loving peoples in Latin America, Asia and Africa.

In September 1949, Cárdenas was named one of several honorary presidents of the Continental Congress for Peace and Democracy, Mexico City. The next year he was elected a member of the Presidium of the World Peace Council, Warsaw, Soviet Poland. For the first 6 months of 1954 General Cárdenas was active in support of Col. Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán of Guatemala, the latter now in Cuba and an open advocate of the Marxist-Leninist dictatorship of the Castro brothers, Fidel and Raúl.

TOUR OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

Once more the World Peace Council listed Cárdenas as a vice president at its meeting in Helsinki, August 1955. After accepting the Stalin Peace Prize in 1956, the general was again elected as vice president of the World Peace Council, Stockholm, in 1958. His tour of many captive nations and praise of Soviet China followed in the winter of 1959-60.

In April 1960, the ex-president, with considerable fanfare in Mexico, received a World Peace Council delegation composed of Viktor Chkhikvadze (U.S.S.R.), Abelardo Adán (Spain), and Ivo Farge (France).

The recent Latin American Conference for National Sovereignty, Economic Emancipation, and Peace, Mexico City (March 5-8), demonstrably was the culmination of the aforementioned activities, although, as the conference title indicated, it was principally a propaganda show in favor of Fidel Castro and aimed at inciting hatred of the United States.

One of the proposals denounced by General Cárdenas and his adherents at this conference was the food-for-peace effort as an item in the broad program of cooperative, socioeconomic reconstruction described by President Kennedy as a fruitful alliance for progress.

Joining in the bitter attacks against the U.S. brotherly approach to a systematic, scientific solution of inter-American social problems was Vicente Lombardo Toledano. The latter, according to UPI dispatches, emphasizes that his new-style, Popular Socialist Party is Marxist-Leninist. This follows the pattern established by the Castro brothers in Cuba, where the one legal political organization is called "Popular Socialist."

CHANGE IN TACTICS

Possibly it was a mere coincidence that the change in tactics was noted after a tour of several South American countries by Vladimir Bulkin, Soviet Ambassador in Mexico, and a sudden visit to Mexico by Sergei Kudriavtzev, Soviet Ambassador to Cuba, on the first day of a 4-day convention of Lombardo Toledano's Popular Socialist Party.

Despite a few superficial differences, the Marxist-Leninist planners are determined to get the maximum advantages available in the present partnership and collaboration between ex-President Cárdenas and Premier Castro.

Fair consideration of these facts can safeguard the security of all the American Republics and promote genuine social reform.

REV. DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING,

U.S. Honorary Fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil; Professor of Latin American History, Marymount College, Arlington.

Castro
BRAZIL ALARMED BY CASTRO

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, today's *New York Times* carries a front-page story by Mr. Juan de Onis, one of the most respected American reporters of Latin American affairs.

The story is headlined "Brazil Alarmed by Castro Stand."

The first paragraph reads:

RIO DE JANEIRO.—Premier Fidel Castro's dedication of Cuba as a "Socialist Republic" and one without elections has swung Brazilian opinion strongly in favor of holding an American Foreign Ministers' Conference to consider the Cuban problem.

The story goes on to report that Brazil's leading newspapers, reflecting the opinion of the Brazilian people, have declared that "the continent must react."

According to the article, there is now general agreement in official Brazilian circles that a conference of American Republics must be held immediately to deal with the Castro-Communist menace.

To me it is heartening that Latin America's biggest nation has recognized that Castro is a hemispheric problem and a far greater threat to the Latin American nations than to the United States.

For 18 months I have unsuccessfully urged that the Department of State, through our representatives in the Organization of American States, call for a meeting of consultation of the foreign ministers of the OAS, to expose Castro as a Soviet stooge and to take steps to expel the Communist invaders from Cuba.

The Castro menace has long existed, the authority to convoke an OAS meeting to deal with that danger has been available in the Rio Treaty and the Caracas agreement, but nothing has been done.

I again urge that the Secretary of State take advantage of the opportunity offered by Brazil's strong stand against Castro and that he seek an immediate meeting of the OAS foreign ministers to resolve the Cuban crisis.

I think that our Voice of America must meet the challenge by pressing home to every person in Latin America the fact that Cuba is a Communist satellite and that Cuba's 6 million Latin Americans

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the President is requested to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the initiation of action for the exclusion of representatives of the present Government of Cuba from membership on the Inter-American Defense Board, or to support any such action heretofore or hereafter initiated by any other nation or its representatives.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it was the intention of the senior Senator from New Hampshire to supplement his earlier warnings and appeals with a plea to the administration on the floor of the Senate today. I am delighted, Mr. President, that this is not necessary. Apparently my previous entreaties, and those of others concerned about the presence of representatives from Cuba on the Inter-American Defense Board, have not gone unheeded.

The action of the IADB recently in excluding Cuban representatives from its secret Board meetings must be hailed by all peace-loving peoples of this hemisphere as a significant contribution to the future security of the Americas.

I am heartened by this decisive move because I feel that the Inter-American Defense Board can once again be an effective instrument in planning and promoting the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

TRAINING OF FREEDOM FIGHTERS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, with each day that passes, events in Cuba, Laos, and elsewhere in the world underscore the compelling need for America to devise new tools to counter the Communist cold war offensive.

The need is unquestioned. The hour is late.

America needs a total strategy for the total warfare the Communists are waging against us. For years, Communists have received indoctrination in the strategy and tactics of revolution in the Lenin Institute of Political Warfare—in the Academy of Red Professors—in the Sun Yat-sen University—in other training schools in Moscow, Leningrad, Prague, and other Communist cities. These institutions graduate Russian and foreign students as professional fighters in all forms of conflict—political, ideological, psychological, economic, cultural and technological.

We have nothing comparable in America.

On February 9 this year a bipartisan group of 12 Senators, including myself, joined in sponsoring a bill, Senate bill 822, to establish a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy to outthink, outsmart, and outmaneuver the Communists on cold war battlefronts all over the world.

The Freedom Commission would have the task of developing a systematic, integrated applied science of nonmilitary action appropriate to the cold war struggle. The Freedom Academy would offer courses in this applied science of nonmilitary warfare to persons from many walks of life: Government personnel, teachers, trade unionists, businessmen, clergymen, and others. For-

sign students also could receive instruction at the Academy.

Last August a similar bill passed the Senate without objection. President Kennedy was serving in the Senate at the time. Now I am hopeful that, as President, Mr. Kennedy will urge enactment this year by both Houses of Congress.

The Freedom Academy bill is pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which I hope will schedule early hearings.

There is growing support for a Freedom Academy, as evidenced by comments of independent writers and observers. There has just come to my attention an article entitled "West Point for Freedom Fighters," which makes a plea for the Freedom Academy. I ask unanimous consent that this article from the publication, *Life Lines*, dated May 5, 1961, be printed in the RECORD.

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

WEST POINT FOR FREEDOM FIGHTERS

A sort of West Point to train freedom fighters is the goal of those who back the proposal that the Federal Government establish a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy.

It is known that the Soviet Union operates an extensive system of political warfare training schools and development centers at Moscow, Leningrad, Tashkent, Prague, and elsewhere on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Some of these schools like the Lenin Institute of Political Warfare began operating in the mid-twenties. The center at Prague specializes in training Latin Americans and Africans, while the school at Tashkent trains Communists from the Islamic countries. The top schools in Russia, China, and Czechoslovakia are not narrow trade schools, but comprehensive training centers giving detailed instruction in the vast field of political warfare and supporting subjects with courses often running 2 or 3 years in length. Significantly, the training of Latin Americans was stepped up in 1956 and in that year Red China began operating a parallel system of schools for Latin American Communists.

Working in close cooperation with the political warfare schools are a number of centers where political scientists, linguists, anthropologists, psychologists, economists, sociologists, and others have been enlisted in the service of political warfare. They are engaged in practical research projects aimed at increasing communist operational capacities. In recent years these centers have greatly increased their special studies preparing for Soviet penetration of Africa and Latin America.

The increased activities at these political warfare schools and associated centers spell our future Soviet intentions in clear terms.

Two communists' expanding industrial base and scientific and technological advances give them not only a powerful new propaganda theme but also greatly increased means for economic subversions and missile blackmail. A weak Soviet Russia, capturing a third of mankind through superior power-seeking techniques, was a formidable enemy. Its increasing strength adds immeasurably to the threat to America. Our methods of meeting this threat have not worked. New methods will have to be developed and leaders systematically trained in their use.

There are grave deficiencies in America's preparation to defend itself in this total war to the finish. At the top of the list, and underlying our other failures, is our failure to

institute an adequate cold war development and training program.

As hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee brought out, no concentrated, systematic effort is being made to develop an operational science for our side which will meet the mistaken attack and work toward our national objectives in a coordinated manner. We have not been through all the methods and means which free men can use when faced with this kind of antifreedom challenge. We have not brought these methods and means together in a broad strategic plan. This is particularly true in the field of political and economic warfare. Bits and pieces of the problems are being worked on within the Government and at some educational institutions, but the total effort falls far short of what we need.

Nowhere today can Government personnel or private citizens receive broad training in cold war, especially in the large and highly complex field of political and economic warfare. Not only do we lack top level schools, we do not even have intermediate or lower level schools. There is no place where the bits and pieces are pulled together and taught in concentrated form.

The Freedom Commission proposal has two broad objectives:

1. To carry on research with a view to developing the necessary science to meet the political and economic attack against us;
2. To train Government personnel, private citizens, and foreign students in this science.

The Freedom Commission would be authorized to establish and administer an advanced cold war development and training center, the Freedom Academy. The Academy is seen as the principal instrument for achieving the two objectives listed. Properly staffed and financed, the Freedom Academy would stand as a symbol of our determination to win the cold war. It would instruct its students not only in the threat to freedom but also in positive, practical ways to meet that threat successfully.

Patriots will want to learn all they can about this proposal for a Freedom Academy. It may be the answer to a need that is great and immediate.

RHODE ISLAND INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today is the 185th anniversary of the General Assembly of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations formally renouncing their allegiance to Great Britain and King George III.

Since the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations passed this Act of Independence on May 4, 1776, 2 months before the signing of the Declaration of Independence of the 13 United States of America, Rhode Island was the first sovereign State of the United States. This Act of Independence was the culmination of many historical events that took place in my State.

In September of 1765, resolutions were adopted by the general assembly denying the right of any power but that body to levy taxes upon the colony. On February 14, 1766, a liberty tree was dedicated at Newport and on July 5, 1768, another liberty tree was dedicated at Providence. The first overt act of violence against the British Crown in America was committed on July 19, 1769, by the destruction of the British revenue sloop, the *Liberty*, at Newport, R.I. This

alarmed patriotism to one of apathy toward treason.

One recalls the statement made by President Kennedy nine days after his inauguration: "Today," he said, "we need a nation of minute men; citizens who are not only prepared to take up arms, but citizens who regard the preservation of freedom as a basic purpose of their daily life and who are willing to consciously work and sacrifice for that freedom. The cause of liberty, the cause of America, cannot succeed with any lesser effort."

Studied in the context of current events, the President's words are almost ominous.

SPACE-CIVILIAN CONTROL IN JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Veterans of Foreign Wars have long maintained a close and objective interest in national security. An organization born of the Nation's armed conflicts, the VFW, in common with our other great veteran's organizations, is keenly aware of the complex and pressing requirements of defense.

No aspect of defense has received closer scrutiny by the VFW than the problem of civilian control over the vast and powerful Defense Establishment. The VFW has shared with the Congress absolute faith in the fundamental constitutional principle of civilian control over the military forces of our Nation.

I find, therefore, of more than passing interest a brief but penetrating comment in the current issue of the VFW American Security Reporter entitled "Space-Civilian Control in the JCS." It is an analysis, distinguished by its clarity, of the delicate balance of civilian-military leadership and effort which must obtain at the highest level of our defense organization if we are to receive in full measure the best contributions of both. Just as the Congress must be ever alert to any erosion of firm civilian control of the military, so also must we insist that the JCS system be used to the fullest. The country needs the best of both its civilian and military leaders.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the comment to which I refer be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. It warrants the careful reading of all thoughtful Americans.

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

SPACE-CIVILIAN CONTROL IN THE JCS

The Pentagon is still reverberating over the recent decision giving the Air Force primacy in space development. The purpose here is not to go into the pros and cons of that order—although it must be recognized on the basis of congressional and Army and Navy reaction—that grave questions are raised by this edict.

The fundamental issue involved in the recent space directive by the Secretary of Defense is one of governmental procedure. In this case the emphasis focuses upon the role of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with respect to the development of defense policies and the relationship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as a corporate body, to the Secretary of Defense. By law the Joint Chiefs of Staff system is the central feature of defense planning at the seat of government. Vested with no plenary decisionmaking authority,

the JCS is the principal planning and advisory agency in defense matters.

It would be the logical expectation that the JCS would function in its advisory role in the formulation of any policy as broad and far reaching as the recent directive on space activity. Such an expectation, however, apparently is not justified in this instance. As the background of the events leading up to the space directive becomes more apparent, it appears that the JCS was excluded from participation in this vital policy determination. Whether or not the JCS was bypassed has resulted in one of the most delicate exercises in semantic hairsplitting in recent years.

As a result of queries from the press the Pentagon stated, "The report that General Lemnitzer has protested to Secretary McNamara that the Chiefs are being bypassed or edged out of crucial military decisions by the Kennedy administration is simply without foundation." Yet a Chicago Sun-Times article by its military affairs specialist, Thomas B. Ross, stated that the JCS was given 1 week to submit its views on the proposed space directive. Considering the magnitude of the proposal and its manifold ramifications, such a deadline could not help but raise questions as to the motive behind it. After all, there was no combat operational requirement for speed. Furthermore, precipitant action in an issue so vital to the long-range security of the United States could be extremely dangerous. The result of the time-squeeze on the JCS was that General Lemnitzer, as Chairman of the JCS, reportedly expressed the opinion that the deadline made it impossible for the JCS to develop its view, and that as a result he submitted his "personal opinion."

To assert that General Lemnitzer's memorandum to the Secretary of Defense is not a protest is questionable. But there is no question but what his carefully chosen words do express serious concern.

An administrative device which goes through the motions of referring a basic defense policy matter to the JCS, and yet sets a deadline which makes it impossible for the JCS to perform its role, could set a most serious precedent. Also, there is a question of just what is the status of the personal opinion of the JCS Chairman. The duties of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are set out specifically and with great deliberation in the National Security Act. The Chairman's duties, under law, do not involve the submission of personal opinions.

One byproduct of the time squeeze placed on the JCS in this instance is widespread resentment that the very able JCS Chairman, General Lemnitzer, who has gained the admiration and respect of uniformed and civilian officials for the circumspect manner in which he has exercised his duties and authority, should be maneuvered into having no practicable alternative to submitting a personal opinion on a major issue.

The submission by the Chairman of personal opinion could set a precedent for the Chairman being a de facto spokesman for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If such a procedure is repeated, it could constitute an important step toward the development of the JCS Chairman as a single Chief of Staff. Such an alteration of the status and functions of the JCS Chairman has long been recognized as the means by which supporters of the single Chief of Staff could eventually achieve their goal. General Lemnitzer's admirers, who are legion in the Pentagon and in Congress, are highly critical of the procedure by which he has been forced into this unenviable position.

There is no question, however, but what the Secretary of Defense is legally the top authority in the Pentagon. Recognition of this basic fact is essential to the continuation of the constitutional principle of

civilian control. His powers are limited only by a few basic stipulations in law, and, of course, by a sense of administrative discretion. The exercise of civilian authority over the military is the most profound, yet delicate problem confronting the high civilian defense officials. No detailed blueprint for the relationship which a Secretary of Defense establishes with his principal military subordinates can be devised. In the final analysis the efficacy of top civilian direction depends upon a sound—perhaps even an intuitive—understanding of the philosophy of civilian control of the military and a genuine desire to make the legally established organization work successfully.

As the old saying goes, there is more than one way to skin a cat; and there is more than one way to change a governmental organization. Any organization will fall if those to whose stewardship it is entrusted misuse it or don't use it. And the JCS is no exception.

Consequently, if the bypassing of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in connection with the space directive was intended to be an exceptional and isolated administrative procedure, then it can be viewed as a specific and extraordinary procedure—although a dubious one—within the authority of the Secretary of Defense. If, however, it is to be considered as a precedent, then continued use of such method would quickly assume the character of an extralegal procedure that could have the practical end result of destroying the Joint Chiefs of Staff system and creating, out of necessity to fill the resulting organizational vacuum, a single Chief of Staff.

This, of course, would be contrary to the intent, legislative history and specific provision of existing law. All of which once again illustrates how great is the obligation of those in authority to conduct government in accordance with both the letter and the spirit of the law.

SANCTIONS AGAINST CUBA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I had intended today to speak at some length about the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, which was introduced by the senior Senator from New Hampshire on March 13 of this year.

In recent weeks I have made a number of contacts with key members of the administration stressing the need for action by the executive branch in order to implement the intent of my resolution immediately. At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 be printed.

There being on objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 18

Whereas the Government of Cuba has established close diplomatic, economic, and military ties with the several Communist-dominated governments dedicated to the overthrow by violence of all nations governed by the republican or democratic processes; and

Whereas such diplomatic, economic, and military ties do in fact constitute a threat to the free nations of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the Inter-American Defense Board is a military planning body composed of army, navy, and air officers of the American Republics, who study and recommend measures for the defense of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas it is patently absurd to allow an enemy to sit in on our councils of defense: Now, therefore, be it