

fense Treaty in the protection of their freedom as a contribution to international peace. It pledges military action only to resist aggression against American forces in that area. Of course, the President has authority to respond to attacks upon American forces without any approval in advance by Congress. So the resolution means only a recommitment of the Nation to the policy it has been following—an almost unanimous recommitment in the face of the inexplicable North Vietnamese challenge.

This means of reasserting the national will, far short of a declaration of war, follows sound precedents set in other crises. President Johnson noted in his message to Congress that similar resolutions had been passed at the request of President Eisenhower in connection with the threat to Formosa in 1955 and the threat to the Middle East in 1957. The same course was followed in 1962 at the request of President Kennedy to meet the missile threat in Cuba. None of these emergencies led to war. Rather, the firm action that this country took interrupted Communist maneuvers that might otherwise have led to war.

Congress ought to be very pleased with the now firm establishment of this mechanism for meeting an emergency with a united front. Reliance solely upon the power of Congress to declare war as a last resort would not be appropriate in these days of repeated crises short of war. A resolution of support for the executive arm in meeting an emergency has all the virtue of rallying national strength behind a firm policy—without taking the calamitous step of war in this nuclear age. We surmise that the almost unanimous sentiment behind this resolution on Capitol Hill reflects appreciation for the President's sharing of responsibility as well as support for the tough punishment for aggression that he initiated.

Mr. MORSE. The Washington Post has demonstrated in editorial after editorial that it does not have a good constitutional lawyer on its editorial staff. The editorials published in the newspaper demonstrated that fact constantly. In an editorial which appeared in this morning's issue of the newspaper there appears the following statement:

There is no substance in Senator Morse's charge that the resolution amounts to a "predated declaration of war."

One wonders whether or not the editorial writer has ever read the joint resolution. No one can read the joint resolution and the authority proposed to be given the President in the joint resolution without recognizing that it would clearly authorize the President to proceed to follow whatever courses of action are necessary in his opinion; and such action would constitute authority to conduct war.

I should like to make an additional comment on a statement in the editorial in reference to resolutions passed by previous Congresses. In the body of the editorial the statement is made:

President Johnson noted in his message to Congress that similar resolutions had been passed at the request of President Eisenhower in connection with the threat to Formosa in 1955 and the threat to the Middle East in 1957. The same course was followed in 1962 at the request of President Kennedy to meet the missile threat in Cuba.

The editorial writer apparently had not read, or certainly had not read recently before he wrote that editorial, the Cuban resolution, for there is no simi-

larity between the Cuban resolution on the one hand and the Formosa, the Middle East, and the pending resolutions on the other hand.

But returning to the comment of the Washington Post that there is no substance in Senator Morse's charge that the resolution amounts to a "predated declaration of war," I should like to read for the benefit of that unenlightened editorial writer of the Washington Post page 2 of the joint resolution:

*Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President—*

*Not the Congress, but of the President—*

*as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.*

The joint resolution thus gives the President warmaking power.

I shall come to another section of the resolution same item in a moment. The Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, has the inherent constitutional power immediately to defend the United States in case of an attack, but he does not have the inherent power after that immediate defense to proceed to make war. That is the distinction which this unenlightened editorial writer of the Washington Post has never grasped.

Mr. President, the right of immediate defense is something quite different from the right to proceed to lay out a campaign of war. Under the joint resolution the President would be given the authority to go beyond immediate self-defense of the United States and proceed with a war campaign. That is why I say today, as I said in 1955, and as I said at the time of the Middle East resolution, that such resolutions constitute a predated declaration of war. The Washington Post editorial writers ought to consult with Senators who occupy high positions in the Senate on the other side of the issue in connection with the defense activities of the country. They might be surprised to learn that they are not quarreling with the Senator from Oregon in regard to the effect of the joint resolution. The joint resolution does propose to give to the President of the United States authority beyond the inherent authority that he already possesses to act immediately in national self-defense.

Mr. President, that is a very important distinction in constitutional law. The Senator from Oregon repeats that, under the Constitution, the President has no power to wage war until a declaration of war is passed by the Congress. The joint resolution is a contravention of article I, section 8, of the Constitution, just as the Formosa resolution and the Middle East resolution were contraventions of the Constitution and caused the senior Senator from Oregon in the debate on those two resolutions to take a stand in opposition. As one of the Armed Services Committee leaders of the Senate told me this morning,

"Wayne, there is no difference between the position that you are taking today and the position that you have taken consistently with regard to the other resolutions. No one can really quarrel with your conclusion that the joint resolution does go beyond the inherent authority of the President to act in the self-defense of our country and does vest in him authority to proceed to carry out a campaign that amounts in fact to the waging of war."

Mr. President, I do not believe we should do it. It is not necessary to do it. There is inherent power in the President as Commander in Chief under the Constitution to meet an attack immediately, and then come to the Congress of the United States asking for a declaration of war. We should require those steps, rather than give the President blanket authority under the joint resolution to proceed to wage war without a declaration of war.

Ah, but it may be said, and is said, by some in conversations with me, "But, WAYNE, a President would not do that for very long."

I do not care whether he does it for a short time or a long time. It is not necessary for him to do it, so long as he has the inherent authority to meet attack with immediate self-defense actions.

As I said in 1955, I believe it is important in these trying times that we not extend and expand the authority of the President of the United States beyond the limits of the Constitution.

It may be said that if the President should commit an unconstitutional act under the joint resolution, or if the joint resolution in effect, as argued by the Senator from Oregon, is an attempt to give to the President an unconstitutional power, he can be checked. I wish I could say that he could be. The difficulty in relation to these constitutional questions as they involve the Presidency of the United States is that we do not have a procedure for having them tested in the U.S. Supreme Court. That has been the subject of great discussion, concern, and debate among constitutional lawyers for many decades. It is difficult to bring the President of the United States before the U.S. Supreme Court. Our constitutional fathers provided for other procedural checks upon the President of the United States, one of which is impeachment, which, of course, is unthinkable when we have a President who seeks only in the exercise of his powers—though he may be mistaken in regard to having exceeded an inherent power—to protect the interest of the United States. But that is a check that is provided in the Constitution. Then, of course, we check the President in regard to the purse strings by way of appropriations.

We have the authority, of course, to check the President by way of appropriations, with his ancillary check on Congress of the veto. It is not impossible to eventually get a case before the Supreme Court involving the warmaking powers of the President, but the legal road could be long and tortuous. The time con-

sumed would make the question moot by the time it was decided as far as the emergency is concerned will give rise to the issue in the first instance.

When Congress passes a joint resolution such as this, it is practically impossible—in fact, I think it impracticable—procedurally to have the power checked, on constitutional grounds, before the U.S. Supreme Court. I do not know, and I know of no constitutional lawyer who has ever been able to point out, a procedure by which we could bring the President before the Court on the charge that he was making war unconstitutionally. I can hear the Court, in refusing jurisdiction, say, "Congress will have to follow the procedures set out in the Constitution for checking the President."

So I am concerned about the resolution in respect to its giving to the President what I honestly and sincerely believe is an unconstitutional power—that is, the power to make war without a declaration of war. It feeds a political trend in this country that needs to be checked. For some time past in this Republic we have been moving in the direction of a government by executive supremacy.

It is very interesting to listen to the arguments that one hears for extending and expanding the power of the White House. It is extremely important—and I speak soberly and out of a depth of great sincerity—that we never grant a single power to any President, I care not who he is, that in any way cannot be reconciled with that precious fundamental foundation of our Republic; namely, a system of three coordinate and coequal branches of Government.

It is dangerous to the freedoms and liberties of the American people to vest in any President, at any time, under any circumstances, power that exceeds the constitutional concept of three coordinate and coequal branches of Government.

The American people will quickly lose their liberty if you do not stop feeding the trend toward Government by executive supremacy. In my opinion, the joint resolution would do just exactly that. It would give to the President of the United States an authority which, in my judgment, he does not need, by any stretch of the imagination. He has inherent power to react, in the self-defense of this Republic, in the event of an immediate attack.

It is particularly essential that we continue to require a President of the United States to conform to article I, section 8, of the Constitution, in regard to making war, and that we continue to hold any President—I care not who he is—under the strictest restraint with regard to the making of war.

We have entered an era of civilization in which an unconstitutional act of war on the part of a President of the United States can lead to nuclear war and the end of this Republic, no matter how sincere a President may be in his intentions in respect to exercising the power to make war.

We need to be on guard in respect to vesting power in the White House. The White House has plenty of power under

the Constitution. I am for giving the White House no more power than the Constitution gives him.

I have heard sincere colleagues on the floor of the Senate—and I respect them—differ with me in regard to the effect of the joint resolution. There are also colleagues on the other side of the issue who have come to me and said, as did one who discussed it with me this morning, "Wayne, there is no doubt as to the effect of the resolution that you are pointing out, and that you pointed out in 1955. It bothered me in 1955; but we have every reason to count on the fact that the President of the United States will not abuse the power."

Mr. President, I do not think he would deliberately abuse the power, but he could most sincerely exercise the power in a manner that would result in great damage to this Republic.

There is an elementary rule of law which states that when we come to deal with procedural matters, if a procedure is subject to abuse we had better change the procedure.

My majority leader, who always is courteous to me and was exceedingly courteous to me in arranging the format for this debate, has heard me say many times as we have served together in this body that we should never forget that our substantive rights are never any better, and can never be any better, than our procedural rights. Our procedural rights determine our substantive rights. There are no substantive rights unless there are procedures for implementing them.

I have said many times—and the statement should be applied to this issue, because it is applicable—let me determine the procedure of any human institution or the administration of any law, and I will determine all the substantive rights anyone may have under that law, that tribunal, or that administrative body. Let me determine the procedure of any courtroom, and I will determine all the substantive rights that can be adjudicated in that courtroom."

Although some critics will say that this principle involves a legalistic abstraction, nevertheless the great principles of so-called legalistic abstraction are principles that determine, in the last analysis, whether one remains a free man or not. This is true because the procedures of our Government written into the Constitution and the laws of our country determine our substantive rights as freemen.

In my judgment, the pending joint resolution tinkers with and impairs the great procedural rights of the American people written in article I, section 8 of the Constitution—namely, that the power and the right to declare war is vested in the Congress, and not in the President of the United States.

War cannot be declared speculatively; war cannot be declared in futuro under article I, section 8 of the Constitution. War cannot be declared to meet hypothetical situations yet to arise on the horizons of the world. War is declared in relation to existing operative facts of the moment of the call for a declaration of war.

In the resolution before the Senate—and I shall read the section to which I have referred and another section momentarily—the President of the United States would be given power to make war in relation to operative facts not now in existence, but which may come into existence in futuro. That cannot be reconciled with article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

For the education of the unenlightened editor of the Washington Post who wrote the ignorant editorial in respect to this constitutional point, I hope he will reread article I, section 8 of the Constitution, and that he will read again—assuming that he ever read the resolution before he wrote the editorial—the section to which I have referred and read, and which I repeat. That part of the joint resolution reads:

The Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

Let us analyze that sentence for a moment. Let us analyze that part of the sentence that deals with the inherent power of any commander in chief, any President, to react immediately in the defense of this Republic. That part of the sentence is not needed. He has that power now. If there is to be read into that part of the sentence which starts on line 4—"to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States"—authority to commit an act of aggression, preventive in nature, it goes beyond the Constitution.

That was my argument in 1955. How well I remember it. In 1955 I participated in the same format of committee organization in which I took part yesterday; namely, a joint meeting of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee. I opposed the Formosa resolution. My recollection is that in committee in 1955 two of us took that position. When we came to the floor of the Senate, my recollection is that I was supported by a third member, as I said last night, the great Senator from New York, Herbert Lehman; and I believe we ended in 1955 with three Senators voting against the resolution. As I remember my opening speech in 1955—and the RECORD will speak for itself—I said, as I say now, that I was standing in a position on the floor of the Senate in which a few other liberals had stood throughout the history of this great parliamentary body. Like them I was confronted with the choice of telling the American people what I was satisfied they were entitled to know about their foreign policy, and run the risk of violating the rules of secrecy of the Senate, thereby risking the discipline of the Senate, or failing in my obligation to tell the American people things that I thought they were entitled to know in regard to the foreign policy of the country and avoid running the risk of being disciplined by the Senate.

If Senators will read that speech they will see that I said I thought I could give the American people what they should

be warned about within the rules of the Senate, without subjecting myself to Senate discipline. Senators will find that I said—I paraphrase the speech, but accurately:

I wish to tell the American people that this is a preventive war resolution; and if any Senator has any question about it, let him go to the Foreign Relations Committee on the floor below and read the testimony of the Secretary of State—

Who was then John Foster Dulles— and the testimony of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Military Establishment—

Who was then Admiral Radford.

I said:

If Senators will read that testimony, they will know that behind this resolution is the proposal that the Military Establishment and those in charge of American foreign policy are to be given the authority to make a strike against the mainland of China before China makes a strike against the United States. Such a strike would be an act of aggression. Such a strike would be an act of war. Authorization for such a strike in the Formosa resolution amounts to seeking to give to the Military Establishment, without a declaration of war, the power to make war. Senators will find that clear power in the resolution.

Senators will remember that in 1955 the senior Senator from Oregon took that position in the hearing before the committee. My position became known. After I took that position the chairman of the committees sitting jointly, Mr. Walter George, of Georgia, declared a recess, and announced that he would go to the White House for the purpose of discussing with the President the argument that I had made in committee. He went to the White House. Out of that conference came the famous White House pronouncement with respect to the Formosa resolution, in which President Eisenhower announced that he, and he alone, would make the decision under that resolution as to what course of action this Government would follow in implementing the Formosa resolution.

Senator George came back and had a conference with me. He thanked me for what he considered to be the service I had rendered. He said, "It was a very important service. I would not support the resolution in the absence of the White House announcement." He said, "WAYNE, I hope you will work with me now to help get the resolution through the Senate."

I said to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who served on that occasion as chairman of the committees sitting jointly, "That does not make it any better so far as I am concerned. You missed the point of my objection. Although the testimony in committee would have left the impression that the Secretary of State and the military officials could have made the decision, they will still be making the decision, because the President will follow their advice." I said, "I would not vote for it if they had no voice in it at all, because I will not vote to give to any President this power, because the Congress of the United States must jealously guard its prerogatives under article I, section 8 of

the Constitution. All that the President needs to do is to come before Congress and ask for a declaration of war. He has inherent authority to meet an emergency that requires national self-defense action prior to the time he gets to the Congress."

Senators will note in the Record that I used the beginning of the war with Japan as a precedent. I said, "After the strike at Pearl Harbor, Franklin Delano Roosevelt exercised the power as Commander in Chief to defend this country in national self defense, but he came to Congress for a declaration of war.

I made that argument in 1955. I repeated it in summary form at the time of the Middle East difficulty, and I am summarizing it again in this historic debate.

I have heard no answer in all the intervening years to the constitutional point that I now raise, and of which the editor of the Washington Post who wrote the editorial this morning is abysmally ignorant.

Mr. President, this joint resolution is not needed for the defense of the Republic. It should not be used to make an end run around article I, section 8, of the Constitution. So long as an attack is in progress, the President has the inherent power to protect the Republic in self-defense. But there is reserved to Congress, under the Constitution, the responsibility of passing judgment on whether or not even an attack calls for our declaring war. It may very well be that after a response to an attack, the attacking party may start diplomatic maneuvers into motion—to surrender, to capitulate, to ask for a negotiated settlement, or to resort to the rule of law—which might cause Congress, in exercising its authority under the Constitution, to check the President and cause him to decide not to make war at that time. It is an important procedural check.

It is easy, understandable, and natural in a time of high national emotion, in a time of strong patriotic fervor, to say, "Give 'em the works." It is also true that in such an hour of high national emotion and hysteria, we who sit in seats of responsibility, so far as the legislative process is concerned, can say, "Let us wait. Let us first analyze the situation on the facts, and then vote the authority that is needed to protect the country. Sincere and honest men can differ as to the procedural form that the grant of such authority shall take."

In 1955 and again in 1957 the senior Senator from Oregon took the position, as he does in the instance of this resolution, that the Middle East resolution and the Formosa resolution would be grants of authority to the President to exercise power which would amount to predated declarations of war. That should not be done. It is not necessary. All the world knows that any country that attacks the United States will be met immediately with the exercise of the inherent power of the President, under the Constitution, to defend the Republic. All the world knows that if any country continues an attack upon this country, the President will come before this body and quickly, as the great Roosevelt did

after Pearl Harbor, in 1941, obtain from Congress a declaration of war. What more is needed?

A constitutional principle is involved. It is dangerous to give to any President an unchecked power, after the passage of a joint resolution, to make war. Consider the procedural complications that could develop if Congress decided that the President was making serious mistakes in the conduct of a personal war—for it would be a Presidential war at that point, How would the President be stopped? He could not be stopped. Consider what would happen to this Republic if we got into that kind of conflict with the President in carrying out the joint resolution.

But, say some, see what the end of section 3 provides:

This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

That would create a nice mess, would it not? That would be a nice portrait of the United States to paint before the eyes of the world. What havoc of disunity that kind of procedure would encompass.

What is wrong with letting the Constitution operate as written by our constitutional fathers? Why this indirect amendment of the Constitution? There are Senators, for whom I have deep affection, who become a little shaken, in our private conversations, when I say, "What you are really seeking to do is to get around the amending process of the Constitution. In effect, you are trying to get around article I, section 8, by amending the Constitution by way of a joint resolution."

I do not believe we ought to establish any more precedents of this kind. I do not accept the argument that because we have made two mistakes in the past—we made no mistake in connection with the Cuban resolution; and I shall speak of that later—because we made mistakes in the Formosa and the Middle East joint resolutions, we can make another one. Even a repetition of mistakes does not create a legal right in the President. I do not believe it is good legislative process to repeat mistakes. We ought to stop making them.

In effect, this joint resolution constitutes an amendment of article I, section 8, of the Constitution, in that it would give the President, in practice and effect, the power to make war in the absence of a declaration of war. It is also important to demonstrate to the world, including the free nations, that the Constitution of the United States is not an instrument to be tinkered with; that the Constitution is a precious, sacred document, so far as our form of government is concerned, and is not subject to subversion in the legislative process. We should never miss an opportunity to demonstrate this principle to the totalitarian nations of the world. We should never forget that under Fascist or Communist regimes there are no rights and liberties of the person.

17860

It is proposed, by this joint resolution, to subvert the Constitution. We are engaging in a subterfuge, so far as article I, section 8, is concerned. We should not do that. We should not in any resolution tinker with the Constitution in respect to the powers and prerogatives of the President, and the limitations upon such powers and prerogatives.

Going back to section 1 of the resolution, I assert again that in the language "to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States," there is no question about the inherent power of the President to do so without a resolution.

I have stated that if this proposed grant of power implies that the right of the President of the United States to take all the necessary measures to "repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States"—which former Secretary of State Dulles and Admiral Radford asked for in 1954—includes the authority to commit an act of aggression before an act of aggression is committed against the United States, on the basis of the theory of a preventive war, that is a dangerous doctrine. It cannot possibly be reconciled with the Constitution; nor can it be reconciled with sound national policy.

I remember that in 1955 former Secretary of State Dulles said to me, "Would you wait for the Red Chinese to strike?"

My reply was that when I thought of the billions of dollars I had joined in voting for the defense of my country, including great sums of money for intelligence service, if there were particular concern about a Red Chinese air base closest to the coast of Alaska and our intelligence agency had given us reports as to what it had found in regard to the size of that Communist air armada, I would wish to believe that when the first Red Chinese plane left the ground and started for Alaska, our alerting stations and our intelligence would be such that our planes would meet it before it ever reached Alaska.

At that time, I also made perfectly clear to former Secretary of State Dulles and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Radford, that under international law we could not possibly justify our being an aggressor in the first instance. I frankly stated that it was a risk which we must run in order to remain in a sound constitutional framework under our system of government.

Why should we give arbitrary discretion to mere men who happen to hold office at a given time, when the American people and their lives are at the mercy of the discretion of those mere men?

One of the great protections that the American people have in constitutional theory, under our form of government, is that we are a government of laws and not of men. Granted, we are a government of laws, it is also true that those laws must be administered by men. Human failings being what they are, we must always keep a check on the exercise of the discretion of mere men who administer government, or we shall constantly run the risk of being victimized by arbitrary and capricious discretion.

In 1955, I made clear that I had observed too frequently the psychology of trigger-happy military men, and the psychology of diplomats who convince themselves that it is necessary to pull the trigger before an act of war has been committed against us.

Mr. President, we like to boast—and for the most part our glorious history sustains the boast—that we are not an aggressor nation. Resolutions such as the pending joint resolution, as well as the Formosa resolution and the Middle East resolution, frequently raise grave doubts among our friends in the free world as to whether there are not great differences between our theory and our practice.

So, then as now, on the constitutional grounds to which I objected in the Formosa resolution, I voted against it—as I shall vote against the pending joint resolution today.

I repeat this, so that there can be no misunderstanding of my position: So far as the inherent right of the President to meet an aggression in the self-defense of the Republic is concerned, the pending resolution is not needed. The President has that inherent right now, under the Constitution. But, so far as having any right to commit an act of war in the absence of an aggression, he does not have that right under the Constitution. The pending resolution cannot give it to him under the Constitution.

Of course, we can sanction his exercise of that unconstitutional right. That is what the Senate will be doing today in adopting the pending resolution.

In constitutional effect, the Congress is saying to the President, "You can go ahead and act unconstitutionally and we will look the other way," because it is known that there is no existing procedure which would be effective by which we can check the President. Once the pending resolution is adopted, the Senate thereby will sanction such conduct. There is no way to check it by taking the case before the U.S. Supreme Court for final determination of the constitutionality of this course of action in time to be effective.

I am asked, "Should we not amend the Constitution in this respect?"

I believe that we should amend it by clearly denying to the Congress the power to pass such a resolution as this one. Because the past situations such as are present in this case are such rarities, so extraordinary and so novel, I am enough of a political realist to know that we shall never get anywhere with that kind of constitutional amendment. The only time we become interested in it is when a crisis such as this exists. When a crisis exists, it is so serious that people are not going to become interested in a very important constitutional abstraction, even though it is a constitutional abstraction which after all, is determinative, in the last analysis, of their rights as free men.

In times of hysteria and high national emotionalism, it is only human for most people, particularly those not sitting in the seats of legislative responsibility, to be willing to look the other way on such questions as I raise in this debate again this year. But I believe it is so dangerous to establish another precedent to-

ward the creation of a government by Executive supremacy in the United States, that I am willing to stand up and oppose the overwhelming majority against me, and take all the castigation and criticism which is bound to be heaped upon my head, for a constitutional principle that I am sincerely convinced is vital to the very preservation of this Republic.

I am satisfied that if we continue to build up a wall, brick by brick, precedent by precedent, which separates the executive branch of the Government from the people resulting in making the executive branch of the Government more and more inaccessible to direct control, we shall endanger the very survival and preservation of the Republic and our constitutional system upon which it is based.

Mr. President, if it is self-defense we are concerned about, we do not need this resolution. If it is to empower the President to commit an act of aggression before an act of aggression is committed upon us, as was the program in 1955, and as was openly testified to, let me say—I can say it now—as the transcript will show, by the Secretary of State and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the time, it is a dangerous precedent, a power that never should be given, never should have been granted by the Congress, and should not be granted now under the pending resolution.

Turning to the language I have read, "to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States," does that mean that the attack must have started, or does it mean that all the President and his advisers have to conclude is that in all probability an attack may be made.

That is preventive war. There is no power in the Constitution for the President of the United States to wage a preventive war. I cannot imagine a set of hypothetical facts which would cause the President of the United States, the Congress, the Department of State, and those in the Pentagon Building to become alarmed about the danger of an attack against the United States that cannot be taken immediately to existing channels of international law. The right of national self-defense would still vest in the inherent constitutional power of the President.

The fact that we are not doing very much about using those channels of international law does not excuse us. And as we use those channels of international law, the inherent power of the President to defend this country continues. With all the military might of this country at the present time, the world knows that that power of self-defense is adequate to protect the security interests of this country until the processes of international law can run their course.

There is no question about the meaning of the next four words on line 6 of page 2 clearly authorize—"to prevent further aggression."

That is when the whole realm of judgment upon the part of the President of the United States comes into play. That is when we substitute the President for article I, section 8 of the Constitution.



That is when we say to the President, "You can go beyond acts of immediate self-defense of the Republic. You do not have to come to the Congress, as Franklin Roosevelt did after Pearl Harbor, and ask for a declaration of war. You can proceed in the exercise of your judgment to prevent further aggression."

The uninformed, unenlightened editor of the Washington Post who wrote that stupid editorial in this morning's paper has not the slightest conception of the meaning of those words. If he had, he would not have written in his editorial:

There is no substance in Senator Morse's charge that the resolution amounts to a "predated declaration of war."

That is exactly what those words mean. It is incontrovertible. The President would not have to come and ask for a declaration of war. He would be given sanction by Congress to make war without a declaration of war. It will be noted that I do not say "the authority," for the authority cannot be granted by Congress. Congress cannot amend the Constitution in this way. This does not conform to the amendment processes of the Constitution. It is proposed that Congress sanction the action of the President in making war if, in his judgment, he thinks making war is necessary to prevent further aggression. I shall come to that point later. But that is why I said last night that so many want to turn away from the most delicate question involved in the debate. That is why I said last night—and shall discuss it at greater length today—that the President and our country were quite right in meeting the attack on the destroyers last Tuesday night. But, in my judgment, that did not empower him, under the right of self-defense, to try to proceed beyond protecting those ships, and strike the mainland of North Vietnam. In my judgment, that constituted an act of war—not an act of self-defense.

Mr. President, at that point, under our treaty commitments, our allegations in regard to the absolutely inexcusable and illegal attack on our ships on the high seas by the North Vietnamese forces should have been taken immediately to the United Nations. As to that attack we had an unassailable case. They attacked us on the high seas and we responded in self-defense.

We were clearly within our international law rights. Unfortunately we did not stop there. We then went beyond our rights of self-defense and proceeded to bomb the mainland of North Vietnam.

We either support a rule of law procedure or we ignore it. We ignored it. We had an irrefutable case of violation of international law by North Vietnam in connection with their attack on our ships. We would have a hard time, under international law, supporting our subsequent attack on North Vietnam in the absence of a declaration of war. There will be those who will say that that is cutting the line pretty fine. Nevertheless, the difference is between acting within the Constitution and acting outside of it. It is the difference between staying within our rights of self-defense

and proceeding to turn ourselves into an aggressive warmaking power.

No one despises, hates, and repudiates more than does the senior Senator from Oregon, communism, Communist regimes, including North Vietnam, Red China, Cuba, Red Russia, and all of the rest. But I do not propose to allow my hatred, my detestation, my complete disgust with the police state methods of a Communist regime to cause me to give support to a proposal to go outside the constitutional guarantees of our system of government. I want to keep my Government in an impregnable position, so that we can go before any international tribunal and establish our case, and not have thrown back in our teeth a showing to establish a series of allegations in regard to the exercise of power and military might on the part of the United States that takes us outside the framework of international law.

There is no doubt that the language, "to prevent further aggression," rouses all the objections that I made in 1955 to the Formosa resolution. This proposal seeks to vest in the President of the United States the power to carry on a so-called preventive war. By preventive war, we mean making a war against another country because it is assumed that that country is about to make war, or contemplates making war, against the United States. Such authority is not to be found in the Constitution. The Congress cannot give such authority to the President of the United States as far as the Constitution is concerned. It can sanction the exercise of the authority, but the exercise of the authority would still be just as much outside the Constitution as though the President acted without the joint resolution. The joint resolution could never make legal the exercise of such authority by the President of the United States.

That is not the only place in the resolution in which we would give to the President a preventive war authority. I refer the Senate to section 2, line 7, which provides—

SEC. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution—

It has been agreed, by way of an amendment to the joint resolution, that that means the Constitution of the United States—

and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

Mr. President, that is an awful power to give to a President. If the Washington Post does not think that that is a predated declaration of war, the editor ought to start asking himself some questions about certain hypothetical situations.

Shall we allow any President of the United States to decide, with no check—that is, no check for immediate applica-

tion—to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom?

We had better pause long enough to take a look at the nature of some of the countries involved, because many of the countries are not free countries. Many of those countries are totalitarian countries. Many of those countries are dictatorships. It is wishful thinking to assume that it would be safe to give the President of the United States unchecked authority to proceed to use American boys in defense of those countries on the basis of claims that acts of aggression are being committed against them by some other country, without a congressional check. Have we reached the point in American foreign policy where we are going to permit the President to send American boys to their death in the defense of military dictatorships, monarchies, and fascist regimes around the world with which we have entered into treaty obligations involving mutual security, no matter what the provocation and no matter what wrongs they may have committed that cause an attack upon them? Are we going to do that without a check of Congress by way of a declaration of war? What are we thinking of? What time factor would justify such precipitate action?

Mr. President, this Senator will never vote to send an American boy to his death anywhere in the world under any such language as is contained in that part of the joint resolution. It is of utmost importance that we surround that language with a congressional check. And there is none.

One could say, as I said a few moments ago, "But, Mr. Senator, the Congress can terminate this authority by a concurrent resolution."

I have already pointed out the kind of hassle that such a situation would create, and the kind of disunity that such action would produce. The American people should be protected from a possible abuse of the authority. So long as abuse of a procedure is possible, the procedure should be modified to prevent the possibility of the abuse.

Mr. President, that is why it is so important that we hold any President—I care not who he is—to Article I, section 8, of the Constitution in the carrying out of mutual security agreements. We should hold him to the approval of the Congress before the fact and not after the fact.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish the Senator would discuss what seems to me the obvious escalation of the war by the authority granted in section 2 of the joint resolution—

To assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty.

Mr. MORSE. I was about to do so.

Mr. GRUENING. Hitherto we have been dealing wholly with South Vietnam.

August 7

The President has stated his purpose, which is quite evident—not to extend the war.

In the section to which I referred we are including a number of additional nations into which we could send our Armed Forces. The joint resolution would extend the prospective war all over southeast Asia, would it not?

Mr. MORSE. It certainly would, with no check on it.

Mr. GRUENING. In other words, in effect, the Congress would authorize an escalation of the war to Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, North Vietnam, South Vietnam—and what else?

Mr. MORSE. Pakistan.

Mr. GRUENING. I have in my possession, which I intend to present when the foreign aid bill comes before the Senate, a statement from a high official of Pakistan indicating that his government has no intention of using the nearly \$1 billion in military aid that we have given to Pakistan to help out our cause because it is needed in their prospective difficulties with India.

Mr. MORSE. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan in effect made that statement in Washington, D.C., when he addressed the Press Club not so many weeks ago. He was asked by a newspaperman at the meeting to state whether or not Pakistan could be counted upon to be of assistance in southeast Asia. He said, "No."

He gave his reason. His reason was Pakistan's involvement with India. Pakistan has no intention of responding to any calls to SEATO members.

I yield further.

Mr. GRUENING. It seems to me that the joint resolution presents an unlimited authorization for war anywhere in southeast Asia, including Pakistan, which is really not in southeast Asia, but which is in south central Asia, and it seems to me a very dangerous, unwarranted, and unprecedented action.

Mr. MORSE. Do not forget, Pakistan is a member of SEATO; its obligations to South Vietnam are the same as ours.

Mr. GRUENING. Yes; but it has shown no disposition whatever to carry out its obligations under that treaty.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct; but, she being a SEATO member, we would be obligated to go to her assistance.

Mr. GRUENING. This resolution, in effect, is an authorization which would be the equivalent of a declaration of war by the Congress. Would it not be?

Mr. MORSE. I think so.

Mr. GRUENING. That is one thing I am very apprehensive about. If we should get into an all-out war, which I fear may happen, this resolution would be considered the authorization by the Congress to so proceed. Would it not?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. I expressed my views on it yesterday. I do not at all criticize the President—in fact, I think the President was correct—for repelling the assault, whatever may be the background, on American vessels and destroying the attackers. I approve of that action, but the resolution goes far beyond such action, which apparently precipitated the request by the President for such a resolution, and covers the whole

of southeast Asia area. I distinctly disagree with the administration policy.

As I have stated repeatedly, this was a policy which the President inherited, and from which I hoped he would disengage himself. He inherited it from the Eisenhower administration, from John Foster Dulles, when we picked up the fiasco the French had engaged in with the loss of over 100,000 young lives. We contributed vast sums of money to that operation. It was obviously a failure.

Now we have escalated it, as could be foreseen, and as I in fact did foretell, and as the Senator from Oregon foretold, into an all-out war in southeast Asia. Regrettably, the end is not yet. I am extremely fearful about the situation.

This is a moment when patriotic passions are aroused, and it seems indicated that we should do whatever the President asks.

It is very painful for those of us who disagree with the policy. I felt it was wrong in the beginning and have repeatedly stated for 5 months that I thought it was wrong, and that we should continue to try to find a peaceful solution; that we should take the issue to the United Nations, and seek a cease fire. It is, as I have said, painful not to support the President, but I cannot do so in good conscience under the blanket terms of this resolution.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator knows, last night it was impossible for him, because of a previous appointment, to be present when I paid my high respects to him for his courage, statesmanship, and leadership in this matter for many months past. I said last night that the Senator from Alaska had put the issue squarely.

Now, in a very few moments, the Senator from Alaska has summarized succinctly the major points of the address I have been making on the floor of the Senate the last hour and 15 minutes. I wish to formalize those points before I come to the next major issue which I shall discuss in my speech.

What I have said expresses my views as to the power that would be granted to the President in the resolution. It is what I have called an undated declaration of war. I summarize the points as follows:

First, the unlimited language of the resolution would authorize acts of war without specifying countries, places, or times. That language cannot be reconciled with article I, section 8 of the Constitution. It amounts, in fact as well as in law, to a predated declaration of war.

Next, as I said last night, we have armed forces in South Vietnam, some 20,000, or more, apparently, with the number increasing by plane load after plane load.

Senators can bemoan and warn against a land war in Asia, but the resolution would put the United States in the middle of the Vietnam civil war, which is basically a land war.

Under the resolution Congress would give to the President of the United States great authority, without coming to the Congress and obtaining approval by way of a declaration of war, to carry on a land

war in South Vietnam. The choice is left up to him.

As I said last night, the interesting thing is that South Vietnam, with a population of 15 million, and an armed force of 400,000 to 450,000 men, has been unable, through all the years of the holocaust in South Vietnam, to put down a Vietcong force of a maximum of 35,000 men. The Pentagon and the State Department, in testifying before the committee, say the number probably does not exceed 25,000. We have to have more than 20,000 American boys over there, to die in whatever numbers they are killed, in an attempt to win that war. And for whom?

Mr. President, the leaders of this Government keep talking about freedom in South Vietnam. There is not one iota of freedom in South Vietnam, for the South Vietnamese people, by and large, do not know what the word means. I quoted, in a speech the day before yesterday, a letter I received from a Republican Member of Congress, in full support of the position I have taken on this issue. I paraphrase it, although the quotation is already in the Record. He said that the average man of North or South Vietnam would not know what democracy looked like if he met it on the main street of Saigon. The difference between their governments is like the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. But both are interested in the next bowl of rice.

That is why this Senator has been pleading for years, in connection with foreign policy, that the great need of the United States in the field of foreign policy is to export economic freedom, and to stop exporting military aid, for our military aid makes Communists. Prepare the seedbeds of economic freedom for the masses of the people of any country and we prepare for the growth of freedom. Unless the people are first economically free, they cannot be politically free; and, what is more important, they will never understand political freedom until they are first economically free.

There is great danger now that Congress will give to the President of the United States power to carry on whatever type of war he wishes to wage in southeast Asia. That is why I said, in answer to an argument that was made on the floor of the Senate yesterday, apparently some colleagues are laboring under the illusion that perhaps the resolution would reduce the danger of fighting a land war in Asia. There is not a word in the resolution that has any bearing on the subject. To the contrary, the broad, sweeping, sanction of power—note my language, because it cannot be done legally—the broad, arbitrary, sweeping power Congress is sanctioning for the President would in no way stop him from sending as many American boys as he wants to send into South Vietnam to make war.

As the Senator from Alaska has said over and over again, and as I have joined him in saying, all South Vietnam is not worth the life of a single American boy; and the killing of a single American boy in South Vietnam is an unjustified kill-

ing. It ought to stop. It is not going to stop until we turn our warmaking policy into a peacekeeping policy. It is not going to stop until we insist that our alleged allies in SEATO come in with as many divisions of peacekeeping units as are necessary to keep the belligerents apart. It is not going to stop until the United Nations, under the procedures of international law, can come in and keep the peace and set up whatever controls are needed, by way of United Nations trusteeships if necessary, to bring that war to an end.

This result will not be achieved by unilateral military action. It makes me sad to have to say it, but I am satisfied that history will record this horrendous mistake of the United States in its false assumption in the year 1964 that it could supplant in South Vietnam military control by Asiatics with military control by the United States.

We could never win such a war. We might win military victory after military victory. If we did not stop the escalation, we would kill millions of people, because the escalation, step by step, would lead to all-out bombing of North Vietnam and Red Chinese cities. When we were through, we should have killed millions, and won military victory after military victory, but we should still have lost the war.

The United States can never dominate and control Asia, with 800 million people in China alone. That kind of war would create a hatred for the United States and for the white man generally that would persist for centuries. Dominating Asia, after destroying her cities and killing her millions by bombings—that is the danger that we are walking into—would not make the white man supreme in Asia, but only hated.

We know what the floods of human history do. Eventually the white man will be engulfed in that Asiatic flood and drowned.

I do not know why we should be so shortsighted. It is difficult to follow the processes of international law. I suppose the saddest announcement that has been made recently is that of the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant, from Burma, who is not even a shadow of the great world statesman who preceded him, Dag Hammarskjold. He announced in Washington yesterday his grave doubts as to whether the Security Council could help resolve the matter.

Mr. President, we will never know until such procedures are tried. The Secretary General should have been using his voice and his influence to persuade the Security Council to carry out its obligations under the charter. Not a word has been heard from the Secretary General in regard to the power and authority of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The Secretary General knows the power of the General Assembly if the Security Council is incapacitated by a Russian veto. I repeat what I have said for many months past on the floor of the Senate. I wish to put Russia on the spot.

Let her exercise her veto, if she dares. The rest of the world will be her judge. We did not find her following that course in the Middle East, or in Cyprus, or in the Congo.

I was highly disappointed by what I considered to be the abdication of leadership and responsibility on the part of the Secretary General of the United Nations in the unfortunate statement he made in Washington yesterday.

The next point I wish to make, by way of summary, is that the fear expressed by some Senators in this debate against involvement in a land war means no more than the reservation expressed in 1954, that we should not become militarily involved in South Vietnam. We did not intend then to do any of the things we are now doing in South Vietnam, but we have done them. That pious expression of intention in 1954 came to naught. This policy is sucking us into military involvement deeper and deeper, and will continue to suck us in, under this resolution, deeper and deeper.

Mr. President, you and I will be gone in a few years; but I am satisfied that the end of the road that we are traveling today will be the engulfment and drowning in world history of the influence of the white man in Asia, if we follow this course of action.

I despair frequently at the fact that so often people in positions of responsibility are inclined to think only of the present, and not a century hence. Yet, when we are dealing with matters of foreign policy and the roots of peace or war, we need to remember that the seed we plant today, be it a seed of peace or seed of war, is the seed that will finally come to fruition in a blossoming plant, perhaps a 100 years hence.

I say most respectfully and sadly that in my judgment, in this resolution, we are planting seeds not of peace, but of war. Those who will follow us in the years to come will cry out in anguish and despair in criticism over the mistake that was made in 1964 when the joint resolution was passed.

Why do we do it? I do not know. We are dealing here basically with a civil war between conflicting forces in South Vietnam. So many in this debate have overlooked the geographic problem. Let us not forget that prior to the Geneva accord of 1954 North Vietnam and South Vietnam were one people. One could go into North Vietnam today, after he had been in Saigon, and think that he was still in South Vietnam. He would feel the same way if he first went to North Vietnam and then to Saigon. They are the same people. Unfortunately, as a result of the partition under the Geneva accord in 1954, they were divided into two countries, North Vietnam and South Vietnam.

Many of the people in South Vietnam who are involved in this civil war have close relatives in North Vietnam. One reason why the military dictator-puppet whom we are supporting in South Vietnam, Khanh, is having so much difficulty with the mass of the people—and he is having a serious difficulty—is his insist-

ence that he must stage a blood bath in North Vietnam. He will never get the support of the people, because a blood bath would kill the relatives of hundreds of thousands of people in South Vietnam; and vice versa.

It is a tragedy that the Vietcongs try to subvert South Vietnam, but that is a reality. The solution is not the exercise of military might. As a critic of De Gaulle on many points, I say that the sad fact is that the De Gaulle solution is far superior to the American solution. The solution is a political and economic solution, not a military solution. De Gaulle is right. We should go to the conference table. We should not take the American position that we will go to the conference table only after we dominate the battlefield.

If we ever establish that principle, we shall have assassinated the rule of law as an instrumentality for settling disputes among nations. If we ever take the position that we must first dominate the battlefield, that we must be in control, that our orders must be carried out, then going to a conference table will mean only that the dominating authority tells the others at the conference table what, in effect, Adlai Stevenson unfortunately said in the sad speech he made some weeks ago before the Security Council—that, in effect, we are going to do what we think is necessary, and the others can like it or not. When he did that, as I said, he extinguished his lamp of world statesmanship.

We cannot follow the theory that underlies the present policy of our Government; namely, that until we first dominate the battlefield, we will not follow De Gaulle's suggestion to settle this dispute at the conference table. De Gaulle is right. This problem will never be settled except by a political and economic settlement. It can never be settled by the imposition of the military might of the United States upon Asia.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. As I have said on previous occasions, my mail has been running several hundred to one in favor of withdrawal; in favor of the policies I have urged. Only this morning, I am in receipt of a number of telegrams which relate to the pending joint resolution. I shall read one of them into the RECORD. It comes from Oakland, Calif.:

OAKLAND, CALIF., August 6, 1964.  
Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Washington, D.C.:

The statement of policy of Oakland's Women for Peace representing 400 women in regard to Vietnam. Because U.S. military involvement in Vietnam endangers world peace and because the American people have not been properly informed about the magnitude and significance of our involvement, therefore we urge full public discussion and congressional debate to explore nonmilitary alternatives to the problems. We urge that the United Nations be employed to negotiate settlement and we urge that the 14-nation committee set up by the Geneva conference be reconvened to implement the United Nations settlement.

OAKLAND WOMEN FOR PEACE.

August 7

Mr. President, I have a number of other messages, which if time permits, should be in the RECORD. They are from Palo Alto, Calif., Van Nuys, Calif., from a professor at Denison University, from New York City, from Cambridge, Mass., from Fresno, Calif., from Richmond, Calif., several from Washington, D.C., from South Kortright, N.Y., from Framingham, Mass., from Berkeley, Calif., from Kemberton, Pa., from Baltimore, Md., from Fairlawn, N.J., from South Laguna Beach, Calif., from Null Valley, Calif., from Flushing, N.Y., from Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield, to enable me to clarify the procedural situation?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to yield the floor and save the remaining time for the Senator from Alaska to use for the final rebuttal, after the proponents of the joint resolution have used their hour. We have only 8 minutes left.

The telegrams are important. Senators will find in the RECORD 10 pages of telegrams that I received yesterday in response to the speech I delivered the night before last in opposition to the joint resolution.

I am satisfied that at the grassroots of America the people are overwhelmingly with the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Oregon. My mail is running more than 100 to 1 in support of our position.

I shall yield the floor; and later, at the close of the debate, the Senator from Alaska will make the final statement.

Senators who are pleading for the passage of the joint resolution are thinking of President Johnson. I yield to no one in that respect. I have complete confidence in and high regard for President Johnson, and shall campaign with all my heart for his reelection next November. I merely think he is dead wrong on this issue. The most loyal service I can render any President is to disagree with him when I think he is wrong and to try to correct his mistaken course of action.

Mr. President, on yesterday I asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a cross section of the messages that I had received in connection with the position I had taken on the predated declaration of war resolution in respect to Asia which passed just a few minutes ago.

I said that they were all favorable except two. Two of them had questioned the human source of my paternity. I did not think that under those circumstances they would be very fitting messages to insert in the RECORD.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a cross-section sampling of part of the messages that I have received today in respect to my position in opposition to the predated declaration of war resolution that the Senate, in my judgment, unfortunately passed today. All the messages I have received today are favorable. I received no messages in opposition to my position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now yield the floor, with the understanding that the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] will close the debate after the proponents of the joint resolution have spoken.

## EXHIBIT 1

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,  
August 2, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

You may be speaking to an empty house but the people are listening. Keep talking.  
J. H. FRANCO.

EUGENE, OREG., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue as national conscience. Job needs someone with guts.

Mr. and Mrs. D. M. MORFORD.  
Mr. and Mrs. G. D. SLAWSON.  
Mr. and Mrs. R. M. WIRFF.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

Support your effort while requesting practicality and moderation.

JAMES A. HUNT.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

I commend your courageous and forthright vote against U.S. military action in Vietnam.

ROBERT MORRIS SMITH.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

You are the only sane American leader who can save us from certain disaster. Help.

Mrs. SELMA R. REYN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

CADA admires greatly the courage you displayed yesterday when making the statement on Vietnam. Although we are divided on the solutions of the problems in Vietnam we stand united with support of you as a positive force in the Senate campus. Americans for Democratic Action urges you not to surrender your very high conviction.

ALBERT REINER,

Member, National Executive Committee Campus, Americans for Democratic Action.

DETROIT, MICH.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

My admiration to you for your courageous statesmanship in this national crisis.

Dr. SIDNEY LETTSON.

DENVER, COLO.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for courageous stand against Asian war. Persuade President to let United Nations settle conflict.

NATHAN L. BEATTY.

ARLINGTON, VA.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Support your determined stand on policy in southeast Asia.

THELMA DUVINAGE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for your brilliant exposition of true conditions in South Vietnam.

KATHLEEN MALLOY.

DETROIT, MICH.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud your courageous stand South Vietnam representing best interest of American people.

MARY DAVIS.

HUNTSVILLE, ALA.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senator From Oregon,  
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily endorse your stand against the proposed aggressive foreign policy of the United States.

WILLA FRANKE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for Vietnam speech. Keep it up.

GWEN REYES.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for saying in your speech what had to be said.

ALFRED COX.

DETROIT, MICH.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Support your steadfast stand for Vietnam peace. America needs your voice.

Mr. and Mrs. EMANUEL GRAFF.

BURLINGTON, MASS.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand against war. We are not always right. God bless you.

JAMES and MARY BEAUDRY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

More power to you. Hope you win more support.

M. MENDELL.

NORTHBRIDGE, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

You are right. International dispute should be settled by discussion and action in the United Nations rather than by war and bombs in this age of massive nuclear weaponry.

A carte blanche declaration of war now might unleash trigger happy GOLDWATER in



the unhappy event that he should become President.

Mrs. T. M. STOUT.

GREAT NECK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We support your position and your courage. Please keep up the fight.

Mr. and Mrs. CALVIN GOOD.

BASKINGRIDGE, N.J., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

I approve of your stand on Vietnam.

WINIFRED J. HEARN.

FRAMINGHAM, MASS., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulate and support your courageous stand against military madness in southeast Asia.

MARGARET WELCH.  
PENELOPE TURTON.

NEW YORK, N.Y., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Stand firm. Oppose any further action in Vietnam. Congratulations your independence.

ANNA V. COLLOMS.

BETHESDA, MD., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

America fortunate in having benefit of your voice in Congress on Vietnam. Confident public supports your despite Congress.

LOUISE GREENWOOD.

WASHINGTON, D.C., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

My most esteemed Senator, may the stars and stripes wave forever while such splendid and honest folks like you and Senator GRUENING. Both of your statements about recent U.S. action in North Vietnam gives me reassurance that not all America has gone completely nuts with arrogance and immorality. May the Lord bless you both for your courage and integrity.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. TAHER.

DETROIT, MICH., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your speech on Vietnam. Best wishes.

ROBERT BRYCE.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Support your position on southeast Asia crisis. Urge negotiate immediately to prevent world conflict.

Mrs. ROSE BOIN.

DETROIT, MICH., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

The following is copy of wire sent to Senator PHILIP HART: "We urge you to support Senator MORSE's proposal to place the Vietnam situation before the U.N. We have studied the wisdom of this in previous situa-

tions. We are convinced it is wise on this occasion."

Reverend and Mrs. ESTEL I. ODLE.

LA JOLLA, CALIF., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for taking a stand on another escalation of war in North Vietnam. Thank God for at least one man of reason and courage in the Senate.

Dr. and Mrs. JOHN H. TAYLOR.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your loyalty to the U.S. democratic form of Government and to its people. Keep the good work up.

OLGA SELKE.

YORBA LINDA, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Yours is only voice of sanity in Washington. Keep talking.

Mr. and Mrs. JOSEPH L. MCNICHOLS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Commend you for courageous Vietnam stand. Exert all influence to prevent escalation. Urge negotiated peace.

STEPHEN SLANER.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Complete support for your courageous stand. Democratic alternative to war and communism must be found.

Mr. and Mrs. RICHARD ROMAN.

COSTA MESA, CALIF., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations your courage and moral stand during this crisis. Good luck with your speech.

STANLEY GOTTLIEV.

NEW YORK, N.Y., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Grateful for your courageous stand in Vietnam crisis. You are a brave honest man.

EUGENIE S. INTERMANN.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Urge immediate submission of entire Vietnam situation to United Nations.

EMMERSON and CAROLYN SIMONDS.

BERKELEY, CALIF., August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I thank you for your stand on the Vietnam incident and your suggestions to cut foreign aid. Thank you for your courage and effort.

Sincerely,

Mrs. A. P. ALLEN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand regarding Johnson's air raid. I pray your speech to-

morrow will prove persuasive. More power to you.

ARNOLD R. POST.

NEW YORK, N.Y., August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Your heroic and outspoken stand on Vietnam merits vigorous support. We support your action.

PHILIP SHUGAR.

SKOKIE, ILL., August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I commend you highly for your courage in virtually standing alone on the resolution of the Vietnam crisis. I only wish my own Senators DOUGLAS and DIRKSEN would have equal stature.

HUGH EDWARDS AND FAMILY.

ENCINO, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Few persons have courage enough to appear as good as they really are. Congratulations and good luck on your position concerning North Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. FREDERICK ARNOLD.

HOUSTON, TEX.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up your great fight for sane foreign policy.

Mr. and Mrs. MARTIN ELFANT.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations and thank you for your stand against war in Asia. Please continue your efforts.

W. G. POVEY, M.D.

STONYPPOINT, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate House,  
Washington, D.C.:

We support your Vietnam stand and encourage you to continue.

PAUL and VERA WILLIAMS.

GREATNECK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request continuation of your efforts for peaceful negotiations in Vietnam.

NORMA YARVIN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Keep the message going on Vietnam, we are behind you.

HOWARD and LEAH FRITZ.

DOWNERS GROVE, ILL.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

I laud you on your courageous stand on the crisis on Vietnam.

Mrs. DOTTIE SHERLOCK.

NASHVILLE, TENN., August 7, 1964.

Senators WAYNE MORSE and

ERNEST GRUENING,  
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on being the only two Senators and courageous Members of the

August 7

whole U.S. Senate and House of Representatives who have not surrendered their souls and consciences to an unprincipled order that will lead to the ultimate destruction of this Nation and the world.

Mrs. WALTER CURRY.

BELAIR, Md.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Heartfelt thanks and strong support for your wise courageous decision regarding Vietnam.

ADELAIDE NOTES.

WATERVILLE, MAINE,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Admire your courageous stand. Am sure many level head Americans are with you.

HENRY VARNUM POOR.

SEATTLE, WASH.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Thankful for your stand on Vietnam. You speak for many citizens who oppose brutal cruelties.

ROBERT and JOSEPHINE STEPENS.

MILWAUKEE, Wis.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Support your stand and vote against resolution reinforcing outrageous action of bombing North Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN S. WILLIAMSON, Jr.

ELLSLEY, MASS., August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Courage. Keep true facts on Vietnam before public.

KATHARINE KIRK STERN.

BELL, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Our deepest gratitude to you for presenting the truth about Vietnam. You have illustrious precedence for your views and courage, notably Lincoln's on the Mexican War. Please continue your wonderful work.

Mr. and Mrs. FRANK LYMAN.

NEWPORT BEACH, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

We are grateful for your sanity stand fast.

NELL LEICHPFESS.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your stand on Vietnam.

HERBERT and ELEANOR FOSTER.

SILVER SPRING, Md.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Wholeheartedly support your endeavors to have Vietnam problem negotiated.

Mrs. J. WEICHBROD.

JACKSON, MICH.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your South Vietnam stand. Many Americans agree please continue your courageous fight.

Mr. and Mrs. DOULASS BENNETT and JOHN BENNETT.

TORRANCE, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

I support your "no" vote against military retaliation against North Vietnam.

Mrs. VICTOR M. COLTON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations your patriotic stand for peace in southeast Asia.

W. C. KELLY.

DOWNERS GROVE, ILL.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Your stand of Vietnam crisis is courageous. Congress must fully investigate in prior Vietnam conflict.

KATHRYN PARNELL.

SILVER SPRING, Md.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your courageous stand in Vietnam crisis.

BERNICE STEELE.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

With you is our hope for the future. Continue your wonderful work and stand on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. J. SOLOMAN.

EAST HAVEN, CONN., August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

I heartily support your position on Vietnam. Please continue as sole voices of American conscience.

Dr. Y. FILBY.

NEW YORK, N.Y., August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Chambers,  
Washington, D.C.:

Have wired Senators, Congressmen, urging they support your splendid stand.

JACOB EPSTEIN.

CHEVY CHASE, Md., August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your wonderful work in Senate and especially your stand on Vietnam.

RUTH BENDER.

SCARSDALE, N.Y., August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

We agree with your statement that war should not be declared by resolution. We

enthusiastically applaud your lone stand against the Johnson resolution. It was the sole act of sanity in the national news today. You have spoken for peace-thinking Americans. Our very deep appreciation.

Mr. and Mrs. PAUL BRENNER.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., August 6, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on courageous speech August 5. Please send a copy.

Prof. EDWARD PESSEN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Want to express our appreciation for your forthright statement of August 5 on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN A. DUDMAN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Your stand on Vietnam makes good sense to us. Yours is voice in the dark, but not a weak one. Use it and God bless you.

Mrs. EDWARD POTTER and Mrs. STANLEY HOCHMAN.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Approve your stand against Vietnam action.

JOHN D. WILLIAMSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo.

JANICE R. STEVENS.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We agree with your South Vietnam stand. Insist it go to U.N. for settlement.

Mr. and Mrs. IVAN ICKES.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We wish to assure you of our support of your position on Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. LAIRD C. BRODIE.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 7, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We support your position on Vietnam. Your courageous stand will hasten negotiation.

Mr. and Mrs. GEORGE JOHANSON.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly approve your position in Vietnam involvement. Urge efforts for nonmilitary solution of crisis.

ROBERT J. RUMSEY.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Wish to express appreciation of your courageous stand against our involvement in Vietnam.

Mrs. WILLIARD J. SMITH.

MEDFORD, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Commend efforts against Vietnam war. U.N. discussions including China best assurance southeast Asia neutrality.

MARIE M. BOSWORTH.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your no vote on Vietnam resolution. You make reality instead of ritual. WALLY PRIESTLEY, Democratic Nominee, State Representative.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud your courageous stand on Vietnam. Please continue trying to get problem to U.N.

JAMES and FRANCES GOODWIN.

LOWER MERION, PA.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

You're the only right one in the Vietnam vote. Please don't stop.

Mrs. WILLIAM TAYLOR.

SEATTLE, WASH.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations Senator MORSE on the stand of truth you take pertaining Vietnam. Keep it up.

Mrs. CHARLES KOPPEL.

DETROIT, MICH.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Thousands know WAYNE MORSE's stand on Vietnam is right we need. Expect your support.

RHEA MILLER.

BELLEVUE, WASH.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Wish Senators JACKSON and MAGNUSON thoughtful as you on Vietnam. Talk, not force, only solution.

Mr. and Mrs. E. C. McINTOSH.

PRAIRIE VILLAGE, KANS.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Glad someone had nerve enough. Thanks. TOM WAGNER.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We who value liberty and justice for all applaud your efforts.

P. A. POWERS.

SANTA PAULA, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your position against Vietnam war. Keep up your defense of welfare all mankind.

Mr. and Mrs. D. G. MALM.

OAK PARK, ILL.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your stand regarding resolution.

E. W. BARBOUR.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I hope you continue your courageous and gallant fight in exposing the fakery and double involvement in the North and South Vietnam war. You have the well wishes and prayers of many here in Los Angeles.

HARRY J. SILVER, M.D.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Our entire family supports your admirable and heroic stand against the Vietnam resolution.

HUBERT W. LECKIE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
The Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

Good luck on Vietnam. With you all the way.

JUDITH WOOD.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., August 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand today opposing blank check resolution; wish there was some way of widely publicizing your position.

ROZ and BERT KLEINBERG.

FLORENCE and ALEX FREUND.

DETROIT, MICH., August 6, 1964.

Hon. Senators MORSE and HART,  
Washington, D.C.:

Do everything possible to stop escalation of war in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. KEN DRUCKMAN.

TAKOMA PARK, MD., August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Our family of five supports your heroic position on Vietnam.

SAM ABBOTT.

TAKOMA PARK, MD., August 6, 1964.

Senator MORSE, of Oregon,  
Washington, D.C.:

Support your position regarding American activities southeast Asia. Keep up the fight. GEORGE ABBOTT.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington D.C.:

In the heart of the crisis you have the courage to tell the truth and for that you hold our deepest gratitude. Those who can

still recognize the importance of life will honor your decision to stand on honesty in this dark hour.

JOSEPH and JO ROBERTS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington D.C.:

I believe your speech is in the best interest of our country.

GEORGE ENGLEHARDT.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your courageous stand against this vicious war in Vietnam.

Mrs. ROSE BURGER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,  
August 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for courageous words about southeast Asia.

GREGORY W. HARRISON.

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We endorse completely your stand on Vietnam and congratulate you for your courage. JUNE and LLOYD ENGELBRECHT.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR: We and many other citizens appreciate your courageous stand on preventing an irresponsible fruitless war in Asia. We hope you can win the support of your Senate colleagues.

Dr. MARTIN GOLDBERG,  
University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. DONALD RASMUSSEN,  
The Miquon School.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud your courageous stand against this vicious war in Vietnam.

Mrs. RHODA TANGER.

FLOURTOWN, PA.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Grateful for your wisdom and courage in voting "no."

PHOEBE CROSBY.

RYE, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

I commend your brave and correct stand as majority of one on Vietnam resolution.

BARBARA WATSON.

BOSTON, MASS.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Support your courageous stand on North Vietnam crisis. Hope you will vote against resolution.

LEONARD FEINSTEIN.

CROTON FALLS, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Warmest gratitude for sane and courageous  
condemnation of U.S. provocative action to-  
ward North Vietnam.

TRACT D. MYGATT.

DEARBORN, MICH.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:  
World opinion with you. Admiring your  
courage.

Mr. and Mrs. EDMUND KEEFER.

FLUSHING, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Your stand on Vietnam reflects our deep-  
est convictions. Thank you.

BESS HORNE.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,  
August 6, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Please accept the thanks of a conservative  
Republican for speaking as you did today on  
Vietnam. You are 100 percent right. Do not  
let your voice subside or we may all be en-  
gulfed by bipartisan stupidity.

DONALD C. WARNER.

WEST HARTFORD, CONN.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Please accept prayerful thanks for pub-  
licly expressing your protest to our recent  
action in Vietnam. Many thinking Ameri-  
cans hold your sentiments, we are weary of  
wars, hypocrisy, deceit, and maneuvering by  
cynical minds and hearts. You are a beacon  
in the dark.

SONIA A. GERENT.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
God bless you for your stand on Vietnam.  
We're with you.

ELAINE and RICHARD KUNTZ.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
New Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
We support your courageous stand at this  
sensitive moment.

JOHN DORFMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Many thanks for your stand on Vietnam  
would that there were more like you.

B. BERMAN.

YELLOW SPRINGS, OHIO,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Strongly support your stand on Vietnam  
situation in addresses and articles and on  
Senate floor.

GRISCOM MORGAN.

DETROIT, MICH.,  
August 7, 1964.  
U.S. Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
I strongly approve your courageous stand  
on Vietnam.

LAWRENCE ROSINGER.

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Support your efforts for peace for our Na-  
tion and humanity. Accept my thanks.

SARA SIMONS GAARD.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Thank you for your courageous stand on  
U.S. actions and policy in southeast Asia.  
The U.S. Government is taking us needlessly  
toward war. President Johnson should  
not have a "free hand" as states in bipartisan  
resolution. United States should withdraw,  
allow Vietnam self-determination.

JEFF MARCHANT,  
MARY HAAN.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
I heartily approve your stand on Vietnam  
and deplore Johnson's action.

Dr. BERNICE BAUMAN.

SCARBOROUGH, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
God bless you for your lonely and cour-  
ageous fight for truth and peace gratefully.

Mr. and Mrs. LESLIE BALASSA.

NEW YORK, N.Y., August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:  
We applaud and approve your action  
in the North Vietnam debate. Your fight is  
courageous and in the highest tradition of  
American democracy. We wish you godspeed.

Mr. and Mrs. LAWRENCE EISENBERG.

NEW YORK, N.Y., August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:  
We congratulate you for your courageous  
stand on Vietnam. Keep fighting.

Dr. and Mrs. SAMUEL SIEGEL.

NEW YORK, N.Y., August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:  
You truly stand for peace. Congratula-  
tions.

Mr. and Mrs. MARTIN ABZUG.

MENLO PARK, CALIF., August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:  
We congratulate you on your courageous  
humanitarian stand on Vietnam et al.

ELSIE and LOUIS RENNE.

CHICAGO, ILL., August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Strongly support your position on Viet-  
nam. Geneva conference should immedi-  
ately be convened.

Mr. and Mrs. JOSEPH ENGEL.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Please give them heck in your remarks to-  
day before the Senate. Maybe some of the  
Senators will have the guts to stand up too  
and tell the American public the truth about  
Vietnam. You are a credit and a real public  
servant to our country.

RAYMOND E. DRAPEKIN.

DETROIT, MICH.,  
August 6, 1964.

Hon. Senators MORSE and HART,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Do everything possible to stop escalation  
of war in Vietnam.

FRANK LIEDERMAN.

PENN VALLEY, PA.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Your devotion to principle and conscience,  
your courageous campaign to expose and halt  
the drift to war, exemplifies the highest tra-  
dition of American patriotism and statesman-  
ship. If nuclear war is somehow avoided  
and historians continue to record the past,  
you will be ranked high among American  
leaders who fought the hardest fight, keeping  
their country always right.

LEE BENSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Congratulations on your stand on Vietnam.  
I believe you alone represent the thinking  
informed American in the Senate. I strongly  
urge the adoption of De Gaulle's proposals on  
southeast Asia. We should pull out of Viet-  
nam and let the U.N. in. WAYNE MORSE for  
President.

JOHN S. BURTON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
We commend you for your courageous posi-  
tion on Vietnam. We hope you do all you  
can to prevent further involvement in south-  
east Asia.

WEST PICO DEMOCRATIC CLUB,  
D. RABINOFF, Vice President.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Congratulations on your stand on Viet-  
nam, your integrity, and honesty commend-  
able. Stand for America.

ALBERT OLIVER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
We applaud your courageous stand against  
this vicious war in Vietnam.

Mrs. ROSE NASSOF.

SYRACUSE, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
We and our friends fully support you in  
your stand on Vietnam especially in present  
crisis. We applaud your courageous action in

speaking out defense of morality. We urge you maintain your position.

Mr. and Mrs. SAM FELD.  
PULLMAN, WASH.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

"There was truth, there was untruth, and if you cling to the truth even against the whole world, you were not mad."

We support your truthful stand on Vietnam.

Joseph Morrow, Marian Morrow, Ben Seals, William Wilson, Nicholas Sofios, Jon Miller, Richard Frucht, Vernon Davies, Department of Sociology and Psychology, Washington State University.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous speech against our foolhardy and vicious war in Vietnam was wonderful.

ROBERT GROSSMAN.  
NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

In my opinion your courageous stand on Vietnam must be accepted by our Government.

SHALOM SPERBER.  
LAGUNA BEACH, CALIF.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

We agree wholeheartedly with your views on Vietnam. May your speech today convince others.

VIRGINIA RICE.  
NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
The Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

Bravo for your brave but lonely stand on Vietnam. We support your position wholly.

PHILIP and ELEANOR GERMAN.

LAGUNA BEACH, CALIF., August 6, 1964.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

We are in full accord with your stand on the situation in Vietnam.

Dr. and Mrs. LEWIS G. PYNE.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., August 6, 1964.  
Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the good work. You are not alone.

BARRY GOLDENSOHN.  
SANDWICH, MASS., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Again you speak sense on Vietnam. Full support from your constituent on vacation in Massachusetts.

BARBARA CROWLEY.  
WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for you determined efforts to save the peace in Vietnam. America is

fortunate in having at least one Congressman willing to speak out for sanity and reason. Don't be browbeaten into silence—for without your courageous voice the sham will be all too apparent. If I can be of any help in the fight for peace, please call on me.

AL A. MARCHIONE.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud your courageous stand on Vietnam.

GERALD ROSENFIELD, M.D.  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand on Vietnam situation.

Prof. DAVID EAKINS.  
SEATTLE, WASH.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Continue outspoken. Following message sent to President Lyndon Johnson: "Take military out of Vietnam. Mere presence is provocation for nation which depends on force and intimidation. Right military action is wrong moral action. Retaliatory strike constitutes wider war. Our responsibility and the imperative of our day is to effect positive nonviolent means for solution of international problems."

IRWIN R. HOGENAUER.  
AUSTIN, TEX.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

There is one sane voice in the Senate on Vietnam. From loyal liberal Democrats.

CHESTER A. BRIGGS.  
EL PASO, TEX.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Your courageous resistance to Vietnam resolution historical. Wiring Senator YARBOROUGH to support you.

SAMUEL Z. WINTROUB.  
CLEVELAND, OHIO,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Agree with and thank you for speaking out on facts about South Vietnam situation.

KATHERINE MARSHALL.  
NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for your courageous stand. United Nations should handle Vietnam problem.

SUZANNE SCHMIDT.  
CHAMPAIGN, ILL.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on your lonely and courageous defense of intelligent, realistic foreign policy in a dangerous age. Yours is not a profile but a soaring monument of courage.

F. STEVEN SIMON.

GARDEN GROVE, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Deeply appreciate your honesty and courage. Keep talking.

BRUCE CHURCH.  
PALO ALTO, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:

We support your struggle for peace in Vietnam. American intervention must end, not increase.

Mr. and Mrs. W. B. HOUSTON, Jr.  
RICHMOND, CALIF., August 7, 1964.

Senator MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Wish to express my disapproval of increased military action in Vietnam.

ELSIE FARROW.  
SANTA ROSA, CALIF., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily indorse your rational stand against escalation of hostilities without congressional debate.

MAY SCHWARTZ.  
NEWTON, MASS., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly support your stand opposing military action in Vietnam. We urge you to fight against the President's resolution on the Senate floor.

SAUL ALICE VICTOR,  
FRED ARONOW.  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

We salute your courage in being the truthful conscience of our country. We are reaching the point of no return in southeast Asia and involvement in a situation that will be far worse than Korea with a tragic and fruitless outcome in death and destruction. We pray for peace.

TOM SIEGEL and family.  
CHICAGO, ILL.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

We applaud and support your stand on Vietnam policy.

Dr. and Mrs. ROBERT C. BUSCH.  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Thanks for speaking out. We violate peace and own freedom by waging undeclared war.

IRVING FROMER.  
NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Grateful for your sane voice. Following telegram sent President Johnson, Senators KEATING and JAVITS: "Alarmed escalation war, agree with Senator MORSE, terrible mistake, urge immediate cease fire and negotiations."

BETTY MILLARD.



BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Congratulations on your position on  
President's Vietnam resolution.  
Mr. and Mrs. R. KARSHMER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Yours is a lone voice in the wilderness but  
thank God for that voice.  
Sincerely,

RUTH R. PECK.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Congratulations on your wonderful stand  
on Vietnam. Yours seems to be the only  
voice of reason. Please continue all efforts  
for cease fire and peace in Vietnam.  
ROBERT PHILLIPPOFF.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Congratulations on your courageous stand  
against those who seem only too eager to  
stampede us into disaster. You will go down  
in history as a truly great American. We  
are behind you a hundred percent.  
EDWARD and FLORENCE SHAFFER.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:  
DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We applaud your  
courage in speaking out against the provoca-  
tive and suicidal course our Government is  
taking in Vietnam. You can be assured that  
there are millions of Americans who support  
your voice of sanity which speaks out against  
a policy which is both unjust and dangerous.  
ROBERT and PAMELA HONCHELL.

NEWPORT BEACH, CALIF.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Your discerning appraisal of Vietnam prob-  
lem gives hope.  
Thank you.

RICHARD STEWART.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE: Our gratitude and  
support in your sane declarations on Viet-  
nam. We need you.  
Dr. and Mrs. HAROLD N. ZEMELMAN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:  
We are proud of you, keep trying to drive  
some dignity and sense and commitment to  
humanity into policies on southeast Asia.  
Mr. and Mrs. E. T. HIRSCHMAN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
August 7, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.:  
If Lot had found one honest man God  
would have saved Sodom and Gomorrah.  
Please keep telling the truth about war and  
peace in Vietnam. There may be hope for  
Washington.  
Warmest regards.

ROBERT M. PECK.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
August 6, 1964.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:  
Strongly support your brave stand on Viet-  
nam.  
Best wishes.

MICHELE IUSSO.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I  
yield myself 1 minute.

I ask unanimous consent that the  
Committee on Public Works, the Sub-  
committee on Internal Security of the  
Committee on the Judiciary, and the  
Subcommittee on Banking and Cur-  
rency be authorized to meet during the  
session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With-  
out objection, it is so ordered.

#### MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY IN SOUTH- EAST ASIA

The Senate resumed the consideration  
of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 189) to  
promote the maintenance of interna-  
tional peace and security in southeast  
Asia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I  
yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Sen-  
ator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the un-  
provoked attacks on U.S. vessels in inter-  
national waters by armed PT boats from  
North Vietnam rightly led to a strong  
reaction on the part of the United States.  
Although there had been some sugges-  
tion from the Department of State that  
the first attack might be an isolated in-  
cident, there was no doubt whatsoever  
that the second attack 2 days later by  
an undetermined number of North Viet-  
namese PT boats in the early evening  
signaled a new course of action by Viet-  
nam Communists, perhaps a calculated  
effort to escalate the conflict in Asia or  
perhaps a probing operation to test the  
strength of the U.S. reaction.

President Johnson's strong and un-  
equivocal statement followed by the ac-  
tion now taken should answer some of  
the questions that may be asked by our  
friends and enemies around the world  
as to what the United States will do.  
Even more specifically the retaliation  
against coastal facilities in North Viet-  
nam which supported the raiding PT  
boats should make clear to them that  
Communist forces in Asia are embarked  
upon a collision course in which, if nec-  
essary, the full strength of the U.S. mili-  
tary will be brought to bear. This resolu-  
tion confirms the support of Congress for  
a firm policy of resistance to Communist  
aggression in southeast Asia.

It is curious, and perhaps something  
more than a coincidence, that in recent  
years the greatest cold war crises have  
come in the months immediately preced-  
ing an American election. The process  
of free elections and political campaigns  
is alien to Communist experience, and it  
may be that the Communists misinter-

pret the sharp revival of partisan po-  
litical activity as a sign of division and  
mistrust on the part of the American  
people. In my judgment, the members  
of the Republican Party have a particu-  
larly heavy responsibility to make clear  
at this time their full support and bi-  
partisan backing for the action under-  
taken by the President of the United  
States in defense of free world interests.  
This the leaders of the Republican Party  
have done. For my part, I should like to  
make perfectly clear that I stand 100 per-  
cent behind the President. He has my  
prayers for the heavy responsibility he  
bears at this time and my assistance and  
support in whatever way can be most  
useful to our Nation's security.

Mr. President, there are and will al-  
ways be differences of opinion as to the  
wisdom of the policies which have  
brought us to the present impasse.  
There are, and always will be, differences  
as to the future direction and detail of  
American policy in southeast Asia. But  
when the moment arrives that it is  
necessary to order the Armed Forces of  
the United States into action, the Presi-  
dent is Commander in Chief. The al-  
legiances of the Nation is to him. And  
the entire Nation joins in mourning the  
American airmen lost in action during  
this crisis.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt  
that these actions pose the threat of ex-  
panded military operations in Asia.  
What should the long-term policy of the  
United States be if we should be faced  
with the prospect of conflict with Red  
China? I do not believe this conflict is  
upon us today, but undoubtedly the situ-  
ation today is more explosive and more  
dangerous than it was a week ago. The  
guns of August have again resounded  
through the world and none can tell the  
final result. Prompt retaliation was nec-  
essary.

But in the long run, American poli-  
cies toward Asia, both the free nations  
of Asia and the Communist aggressors,  
must not be determined merely by  
speedy reaction to Communist offen-  
sives. For the future, the United States  
must determine whether we will defend  
the independence of the nations of  
southeast Asia at any cost and with any  
force, or whether our military and politi-  
cal policies will be strictly limited. This  
will be a major international issue for  
years to come. It should be thoroughly  
explored not only within the executive  
branch of the Government but in full  
coordination and consultation with  
Members of Congress and with the full  
knowledge and understanding of the peo-  
ple of the United States.

Mr. President, I have complete con-  
fidence in the ability of our Govern-  
ment to handle any immediate crisis in  
southeast Asia, but the long-term crisis  
must be settled only after long-term and  
penetrating analysis in which all of the  
factors are thoroughly weighed by all of  
those who bear a part of the responsi-  
bility for the defense of freedom and  
the future of our Nation.

Through this resolution the Congress  
is making clear its present support for  
our Commander in Chief at the moment