

18114

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 8

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I am familiar enough with the bill and the work which the Senator from Florida has done so that I can testify to the work as outstanding. The Senator is to be highly commended as well as thanked by the Senate for his very fine services.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate those gracious words. I accept them on behalf of the entire subcommittee and the full committee, of which the Senator from Mississippi is one of the most useful members.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I should like to add a word to what the Senator from Mississippi has so ably said. Not only the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee, but also the entire staff have rendered distinguished service. This is a tremendous job, requiring days and nights of work. The chairman has worked diligently at it, and has come forth with a bill which the Senate has passed.

I have spent a great deal of time talking about tobacco. But I also commend the committee chairman on his treatment of all agriculture products. Cotton received a great deal of attention by the committee, as did peanuts and other commodities. It was an excellent job. I wish the Senator to know that we appreciate it very much.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I desire to join in the expressions which have just been made. Additionally, I wish to say that when the full committee met to mark up the bill, I marveled at the ability of the Senator from Florida to handle the intricate technical questions concerning it—and it is a large and detailed bill—without reference to a single note. He did an excellent piece of work.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I pass on much of that compliment to my excellent staff on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1057. An act to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the court of the United States;

S. 1642. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, to extend disclosure requirements to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities, to provide for improved qualifications and disciplinary procedures for registered brokers and dealers, and for other purposes; and

S. 1991. An act to charter by act of Congress the Pacific Tropical Botanical Garden.

TRUST STATUS OF CERTAIN LANDS ON ROSEBUD SIOUX RESERVATION, S. DAK.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 136, a bill to place in trust certain lands on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 136) to place in trust status certain lands on the Rosebud Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, which was, on page 4, after line 2, strike out "1,075.01" and insert "1,375.01".

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Senate passed this measure on October 22, 1963. At the time the bill was reprinted, the figure in section 2 showing the total acreage covered by that section was misprinted. The House has amended S. 136 to make the necessary correction. It is simply a technical amendment that does not change the bill at all. The total acreage was printed as 1075.01, whereas it should be 1375.01.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to S. 136.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is absent on official business, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2881) to amend the Alaska Omnibus Act to provide assistance to the State of Alaska for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the earthquake of March 1964 and subsequent seismic waves, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 6, 1964, pp. 17747-17748).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the conference report was unanimously agreed to by the conferees on behalf of the Senate and the conferees on behalf of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of today's RECORD an August 2, 1964, telegram from Gov. William A. Egan to Senator JACKSON expressing his support for the conference version of this, the major Alaska earthquake relief bill.

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

JUNEAU, ALASKA,
August 2, 1964.

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HENRY: I fully support your Alaska omnibus bill amendment as adopted by House and Senate conferees providing for joint Federal and Alaska State governments financial support designed to alleviate effect of mortgages that existed on homes destroyed or severely damaged in Alaska as result of earthquake and seismic sea waves of March 27, 1964. Alaska Department of Law has cleared State constitutionality for State participation. Please accept my appreciation.

Kindest regards.

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11380) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the role.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18115

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1164, offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak from the desk of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to congratulate the Senator from South Carolina for strictly adhering to the rules of the Senate, which are too often noted by their avoidance than observance. I congratulate the Senator on his meticulous adherence to the rules.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the able Senator from Iowa.

The purpose of this amendment can be very simply stated. The first section of this amendment insures that there will be no discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin in any U.S. aid program. The second section of this amendment directs the Agency for International Development, and any other department or agency providing foreign aid funds, to issue rules, regulations, and orders of general applicability assuring the achievement of the objectives stated in the first section of the amendment.

This amendment was drawn to conform, as nearly as practicable, to the provisions of title VI of the recently enacted civil rights bill.

Mr. President, on July 10, 1963, Secretary of State Dean Rusk testified before the Senate Commerce Committee in support of S. 1732, the separately introduced so-called public accommodations provision. In his statement to the committee, Secretary Rusk laid particular stress upon the foreign policy implications of discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin. He emphasized with particularity the position which such discrimination in this country placed the United States in the eyes of the entire world. However, he, at the same time, made note of the fact that discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin was not limited to the United States when he said "discrimination on account of race, color, religion, national or tribal origin may be found in other countries."

In this same prepared statement, Secretary Rusk stated:

We must try to eliminate discrimination due to race, color, religion, not to make others think better of us, but because it is incompatible with the great ideals to which our democratic society is dedicated.

In saying this, I assume that Secretary Rusk meant that the United States should exert its considerable influence, through every means possible, with other countries of the world toward the end of abolishing such discrimination wherever it may exist.

A majority of the Congress of the United States has now determined that such a system of withholding Federal funds from certain segments of their own people is in our best interest. Will there be anyone who will say that even if it is good for the United States, it is not good for a foreign country which receives money taken from a U.S. citizen?

At the conclusion of Mr. Rusk's testimony, I questioned him concerning this matter. Secretary Rusk expressed his support for the entire package of so-called civil rights proposals which were then pending before the Congress, including the fund withholding provision, title VI, of the bill. I then asked him the following question:

I suppose, then, since you support this provision as to areas of your own country, you would support a similar provision in the foreign aid legislation to withhold funds from countries which practice discrimination?

Secretary Rusk's answer is at some length, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Mr. Rusk. Not necessarily, Senator, because here we are talking about a constitutional system in which we have control over our own affairs. When we are dealing with the rest of the world we are dealing with a world which we can influence, but cannot control. It is not our constitutional responsibility to do so.

In the rest of the world we are waging a struggle for freedom, from which we cannot withdraw by the type of abandonment which is suggested to me in your question. We must stay with that struggle, use our influence to the best of our ability to sustain and strengthen the cause of freedom; and that would mean we would work at it, use our influence, even though we can't necessarily control the result.

Our influence in these situations can be very strong. I think there are differences between situations where governmental laws and constitutional practices are responsible for the discrimination, and where you run into discriminatory situations simply because of the existence of religious or racial groups next to each other, with the social problems that have historically been associated with those situations.

Our influence has been in the direction of removing these discriminations abroad as well as at home.

I think our advice in this respect would be more powerful if we could move forward at home more rapidly.

But I do not think we should abandon the great struggle for freedom throughout the world by such a restrictive interpretation of our role abroad.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, briefly stated, he responded that he would not necessarily support such a provision, but he did not say that he would oppose such a provision either. I am sure that now that such a provision has been enacted into law as to our own people and Secretary Rusk has had an opportunity to think over this problem at greater length, he would now support my amendment. In further answer to my question, Secretary Rusk said:

I think there is a big difference in what we can do within our limits of constitutional ability here at home and what we cannot do, through lack of authority and responsibility, abroad.

Mr. President, I would agree that the United States has no authority or responsibility to meddle into the internal affairs of another country. However, I do believe that the United States has both the authority and responsibility to dictate the terms under which our money can be spent in any foreign country. Since Congress has the responsibility both to authorize and to appropriate money, the primary obligation in this field falls upon the Members of Congress. Simply stated, it is my belief that, while the United States cannot control other nations, we have both the authority and obligation to control the money which we are entrusted to spend.

Mr. President, I believe there is little doubt of the fact that forms of discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, and national origin exist in all of the countries of the world.

In this connection, one statement made by Secretary Rusk to the Senate Commerce Committee is significant. He said:

I think there have been tensions where different groups that are different in any important respect live side by side. I think that has been a general experience of mankind.

One of the most comprehensive articles which I have seen on this subject appeared in the July 1, 1963, edition of U.S. News & World Report. I ask unanimous consent that this article in its entirety be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in this article, it is pointed out that in Britain, Negroes are discriminated against; in Africa, whites are discriminated against; in Asia, the different nationalities discriminate against one another, depending upon which is in the majority; in Peru and other Latin American countries, Indians are discriminated against; in British Guiana, the Indians and Negroes discriminate against each other. Perhaps the most blatantly unjustified discrimination in the world exists in India, where the infamous caste system still thrives, dooming millions of people to second and lower class citizenship.

Mr. President, several newspapers have published articles discussing worldwide patterns of discrimination. Two

18116

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 8

which have come to my attention are from the Wall Street Journal of August 15, 1963, and the Washington Sunday Star of June 23, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Tulsa Tribune, of Tulsa, Okla., for July 11, 1963, contains a most perceptive editorial entitled "The Blacker Pots." This editorial discusses some of the more obvious examples of worldwide discrimination. I ask unanimous consent that it also be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is little need to continue citing proof of this worldwide discrimination, for I know that every Member of the Senate is well aware of and willing to admit its existence. The question now remains: What are we in the Senate—what is Congress—going to do to correct it on a worldwide basis now that a start has been made in our own country?

The Congress and the executive branch of the Government, in their infinite wisdom, have declared that one way to prevent this form of discrimination which is said to be so detrimental to the United States, is to provide a system whereby Federal funds will be withheld from any program in which such discrimination is found. This way, we are told, the United States of America will not be placed in the untenable position of subsidizing discriminatory practices. This is said to be good and beneficial for our own people, who, after all, provide a part of the funds which may subsequently be withheld from them or from programs from which they are entitled to benefit. These are the same people whose tax money provides the funds which we are now authorizing to be spent in foreign countries. Unless the Congress performs equal justice by adopting an amendment such as I have offered to this bill, it will seem to many that we have set a double standard: One for our own people, and another for people of foreign countries.

If it is untenable for the United States to subsidize discrimination in our own country, it is equally untenable for the United States to subsidize discrimination in any foreign country. Perhaps there will be those who are sincerely worried lest we appear to be seeking to control the internal affairs of a foreign country. I believe that they need have no fear in this regard concerning my amendment. By adopting this amendment, we are not seeking to control the foreign affairs of any country; we are merely seeking to control the expenditure of U.S. money. I want to emphasize that Congress not only has the authority to do this, but it has the clear responsibility to do so.

EXHIBIT 1

[From U.S. News & World Report, July 1, 1963]

RACE TROUBLE—IS IT THE SAME THE WORLD OVER?

(Race conflicts in the United States are drawing a wave of criticism from abroad. White treatment of Negroes is widely denounced as a horrible example to mankind.)

(But is this primarily an American problem? A check around the world shows that oppression, segregation, color bars are common in most countries. In many, racial antagonism is far worse than anything in America—and it's still growing.)

Look the world over and you quickly discover that race is a problem in almost every place where color differences exist.

Africa's blacks have the whites on the run in the Congo and Kenya—at a time of outcry against white rule in South Africa and Portuguese Angola.

Chinese are seeking to rally colored races of the world to their side in their battle with Russia for leadership of the world Communist movement.

Russia, on her part, is holding down the yellow races in her population. Negro students from Africa have been attacked by whites in the Soviet bloc.

Great Britain, after race riots, has cut down drastically on immigration of black and brown people.

Mulattoes, the propertied people of Haiti, are being oppressed by a Negro-supported dictatorship. In British Guiana, British troops are trying to prevent civil war between Negroes and persons whose ancestors came from India.

India, itself, is deeply divided by caste in which differing color often plays a role.

Many countries practice discrimination on other grounds besides race.

Ceylon has denied citizenship to hundreds of thousands of persons whose ancestors came from India within the last century. Christians, in Egypt, find themselves at a disadvantage in getting jobs. Arabs, in Israel, feel left out.

Yet the world, moralizing, tends whenever possible to point the finger of blame at the United States and its race problem.

To find whether other nations, too, have trouble in integrating, U.S. News & World Report asked its correspondents abroad for on-the-ground reports.

BRITAIN: RACE FEELING RUNS HIGH

London

The British are using Commonwealth segregation to avert explosive race problems.

Race riots in British cities caused Parliament to end free entry of people from other Commonwealth countries.

What had become a flood of black people from the Caribbean is reduced to a trickle. Negroes who had been coming in at the rate of 5,000 a month are permitted to enter now at a rate below 500.

Only 50 Pakistanis are coming monthly, compared with more than 4,000 before the gates were closed. Immigration from India is down from 3,000 a month to about 600.

In Britain, the ratio of colored to white is about 1 in 100—compared with 1 in 9 in the United States. In all of Britain there are about 500,000 Negroes. Yet race feelings run high.

Negroes are discriminated against in housing, jobs, restaurants, and in pubs. Upper class Negroes making hotel reservations often find no rooms available when they show up. Newspaper advertisements offering apartments frequently stipulate "Europeans only" or "no coloreds."

Mixed marriages are increasing, though. White girls with black men are a fairly com-

mon sight in London. Racial mixing, socially, is widespread in universities and does not seem to be frowned upon. There is no segregation in state-run schools, where the Negro proportion usually is not large.

Segregation, however, is extensive in industry.

Government-operated employment exchanges frequently are instructed by employers to send "no coloreds, Irish or Jews." In factories that do not ban colored workers, there is usually an unofficial "quota" for nonwhites. A majority of colored persons take the jobs that whites don't want.

Legislation to outlaw racial discrimination—similar to that President Kennedy is submitting to Congress—has been introduced in Parliament in each of the past 5 years but has been defeated repeatedly.

AFRICA: INTENSE HATRED OF WHITES

Leopoldville

Race feeling is strong here in the Congo and elsewhere in black Africa where hatred of whites is intense.

As a result, the white man's future on this continent appears to be anything but promising.

Travel through many of the newly independent countries of Africa and you find that, where the African once was treated as inferior to the white "colonialist," the situation to day is reversed. It is the black man who is becoming entitled to jobs and property, to the exclusion of the white man. Furthermore, one tribe discriminates against another—in fact, slavery is not unknown.

Kenya offers an example of the new twist to the race problem in Africa.

Kenya is to achieve full independence at the end of this year. Among the 7 million Africans is a white minority of 60,000—largely landowners—and an Indian minority of 165,000.

Kenya's black leaders say there will be no discrimination on the basis of race. Yet discrimination actually has begun. A white civil servant, who may have been born in Kenya and spent his entire life there, is likely as not to find his job taken over by an African of black skin. Idea is to "Africanize" the Government.

Thousands of white settlers, fearing what lies ahead, already have left. Value of rich farms, built up by whites, has been in a drastic decline.

Indians in Kenya live completely apart from both whites and blacks. There is little, if any, social mixing.

There is, moreover, little mixing among Kenya's 50 or more black tribes. Many fear domination by the Kikuyu tribe with its 1.5 million members. One tribe, the Masai, is of Nilo-Hamitic origin rather than Negro. It completely disdains association with other tribes and believes races should be kept completely separate. The Somalis of northern Kenya want to secede and join their brethren in Somalia.

The Sudan, biggest country in Africa, practices both religious and racial segregation. The African tribes of the southern Sudan, many of them Christian or pagan, are regarded as inferior by Arabs, who are Moslem. Few blacks, especially if they are Christians, can get jobs in the civil service. Inter-marriage is infrequent.

In the Congo, the Lulua and Baluba Tribes wage continual war. Around Leopoldville, the Bakongo Tribe dreams of setting up a Bakongo nation. Many whites, since the end of Belgian rule, have been subjected to abuse, injury, and even death by armed blacks.

The haughty desert tribe of Nigeria called the Fulani will not mix with the Hausas, who are of different stock. Fulanis consider themselves a superior race who ought naturally to be served by others.

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18117

Even in Liberia, discrimination is prevalent. "Americo-Liberians," descendants of U.S. slaves, run the country and do not mix easily with backward tribesmen. "Integration" is not something that gets any real attention in black Africa.

ASIA: "GHETTOS" AND "UNTOUCHABLES"
Tokyo

Nowhere in the great arc of east Asia, from Japan to India, is there a country free of racial antagonism or of discrimination against minorities.

Segregation is not sanctioned by law in any area. Yet "separateness" of minorities is enforced by popular attitudes far more severe than segregation in the United States.

In Japan, for instance, Koreans who have spent all their lives in Japan live in "ghettos" because of economic and social pressures. They are scorned by the Japanese and are "second-class citizens" by any definition.

Another skeleton in Japan's closet consists of the Eta, the "untouchables" of Japan, who number an estimated 3 million. They are descendants of executioners, butchers, leatherworkers, potters, undertakers, and umbrella makers.

In feudal times they could go outside their own villages only between sundown and sunrise. The class and segregated villages were abolished in 1871. Yet today there are at least 6,000 Japanese communities that are almost exclusively Eta, among the poorest in Japan.

Many firms unofficially discriminate against workers of Eta birth. Even now it is almost impossible for an Eta to marry outside the class. Each year, young couples commit suicide because one is Eta and parents refuse permission to marry. Vast increases in spending by the Government to upgrade the Eta have not changed popular attitudes.

Discrimination confronts Chinese living in practically every country of southeast Asia.

In Indonesia, a presidential decree in 1959 prohibited alien traders—almost exclusively Chinese—from trading outside the main towns. An estimated 300,000 village shops closed their doors. Forty thousand Chinese, "encouraged" by the Government and unwilling to become Indonesian citizens, left the country for Red China.

Indonesia's remaining Chinese are subjected to periodic rioting by Indonesian students. Chinese homes and shops in many towns have been burned and looted recently.

Thailand, in the 1940's, declared 10 provinces and four urban areas "out of bounds" to Chinese. Twenty-seven occupations previously dominated by Chinese were reserved for Thai nationals. Chinese were forbidden to own land. The nationality law was amended in 1953 to provide that children born of Chinese mothers should not become Thai citizens.

South Vietnam, in 1956, ordered 500,000 locally born Chinese males to adopt Vietnamese names, pay taxes and register for military service. All other Chinese males were automatically classified as foreigners, barred from 11 trades and lines of business in which most were engaged at the time.

The Philippines, in 1954, forbade Chinese to start new retail enterprises or to pass along retail businesses to their heirs. Since then, the number of Chinese trade outlets in the Philippines has declined from 18,000 to 12,000. Last year, Chinese were banned from rice and corn processing industries. They cannot own agricultural land.

Even in Malaya, where Chinese make up 43 percent of the population, they are heavily discriminated against. State constitutions make certain types and areas of land available only to Malaysians. Quotas maintain a 4-to-1 ratio of Malaysians in government service and the armed forces. University scholarships generally go to Malaysians.

Red China, in its foreign propaganda, calls

upon Africans and Asians to throw off "the white man's yoke." Recently, in its quarrel with the Soviet leadership over Red doctrine, it has claimed to speak for the colored races—and has identified Moscow, more and more, with the white race.

At home, however, China's Reds are intent on wiping out the identity of minorities in the thinly populated plains of Mongolia and the mountains of Tibet and southwest China.

Inner Mongolia was given "autonomy," but the area was expanded to include large chunks of territory inhabited by Chinese. In Tibet and Sinkiang, Chinese settlers were brought in from the outside. Chinese got most of the government posts and Chinese was made a compulsory second language in the schools. Land reform and a succession of purges stripped minorities of jobs, animals, and land.

Racial, tribal, and religious hostilities abound in Asia. Indonesia's Javanese majority has troubles with the Sumatrans, and South Vietnam's Catholic-dominated Government takes time off from its war of survival against the Reds to crack down on Buddhist priests representing the religious views of a large majority of the people. In Laos, as well as South Vietnam, discrimination is practiced against mountain tribesmen.

Yet everywhere in Asia, one hears biting criticism of racial discrimination in the United States. Nowhere is that criticism stronger than in India—itsself plagued by the world's most spectacular example of segregation.

This segregation is based on caste, an integral part of orthodox Hinduism. It divides Hindus into four main castes ranging downward from Brahmins, who provide the core of Indian cultural and political leadership.

Each caste, in turn, has hundreds of sub-castes based on clan, religion, or occupation. Outside the caste system are perhaps 60 million untouchables.

From ancient times on, untouchables have been condemned to menial tasks such as cleaning latrines. They were forbidden use of certain temples, and could use only a special entrance of their own into the house of a caste Hindu where they were employed. In some extreme instances they could not let their shadow fall across a Brahman.

Race plays a role in the caste system. History indicates that caste was imposed by light-skinned Aryan invaders against dark-skinned inhabitants of India thousands of years ago. Color lines, since, have blurred. Even today, however, a light-skinned Brahman from the north is considered socially above a dark-skinned Brahman of southern India.

Modern India has abolished untouchability by law. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru and others decry segregation by caste. But thousands of untouchable villages still exist in India near villages reserved for caste Hindus. In the Gujarat area near Bombay, a survey not long ago showed 1,732 villages where untouchables still could not draw water from public wells.

Despite some breakdown of caste barriers among educated Hindus, marriage advertisements still specify caste in most cases—and often mention a fair complexion.

Even Christians and Moslems of "untouchable" ancestry still find themselves cleaning latrines of caste Hindus. Some Christian churches in south India seat persons according to caste origins. It will be generations, informed Indians admit, before the world's harshest segregation is abolished in fact as well as law.

LATIN AMERICA: INDIANS ARE "CATTLE"
Mexico City

Latin America, in the past, often has been pictured as having little racial trouble. But Latin Americans, more and more, are becoming aware of race.

Bitter racial conflict is developing in British Guiana, on the northeast corner of South America. Guiana shows that it doesn't take a white man to make a race problem.

There, whites account for only 13,000 out of 560,000, as the country approaches independence. Negroes, and descendants of laborers brought from India, are almost equal in numbers—and racial trouble centers on them.

East Indians dominate the ruling party, and an East Indian, Cheddi Jagan, is Prime Minister. Since he came to power in 1961, however, there have been two serious riots involving Government and Negro-dominated labor unions.

A general strike, which began in late April, has heightened ill feeling between the two races and the situation now is considered explosive.

Elsewhere, it is the American Indian who often is discriminated against. In Peru, for example, millions of Indians are almost serfs and referred to by whites as "cattle."

Mexico and Brazil are held up as examples of countries where racial tolerance is the rule. Yet even in those countries, persons of lighter skins tend to dominate the ruling classes. In El Salvador, the social secretary of the country's leading hotel was fired when she allowed her skin to become too suntanned. Costa Rica, where 85 to 90 percent of the population is white, looks dubiously on integration with other Central American countries which are predominantly Indian and of mixed blood.

In Haiti, the story is somewhat different. There, mulatto aristocrats who once were the country's coffee dealers and merchants have been imprisoned and killed, and their property has been stolen. President François Duvalier bases his power on the country's 90-percent Negro majority, and employs street gangs and militia with a black-racist ideology.

RUSSIA: NEGROES BEATEN UP
Vienna

In the Soviet Empire, segregation is not officially practiced. Communist doctrine preaches brotherhood of races and condemns racism as a capitalist product.

The actual picture, however, is rather different.

Largest nonwhite group in Russia is that of yellow-skinned Moslems, constituting 10 percent of the total population. They are found in Soviet central Asia and along the Volga River. Large numbers of Russians have been brought into those areas to reduce the predominance of Moslems. Most important positions in government, business, and the armed forces are held by Russians.

Since 1957, there has not been a Jew on the Communist Party's ruling Presidium. Only one Jew is found in a leading Government post.

Friction between white and black now is developing.

Negro students from Africa have complained that they were beaten up by Russian youths after dancing with Russian girls. Africans also complain of harassment on trolley cars, on streets and elsewhere.

Similar trouble is developing in satellite nations.

Last February, most of the 350 African students in Bulgaria decided to leave the country when authorities banned the Pan-African Students Union. Bulgarian students, the Africans said, "were not even willing to sit next to us, and they called us 'black apes'."

In Czechoslovakia, reports told of a spring-time brawl in Prague during which a crowd of 300 young Czechs beat an African student for 15 minutes. That evening, two African students were beaten up, and an African diplomat found all four of the tires slashed on his automobile.

18118

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 8

These and similar stories are disillusioning to Africans who once saw the promise of racial equality under communism.

CANADA: "INTOLERANCE IS WIDESPREAD"

Ottawa

In Canada, the "wrong" color, race or religion can be a severe handicap. By law there is no discrimination based upon either race or color. But a leading newspaper in Toronto recently noted that "intolerance is already widespread in Canada—directed not only at the Jews but at many other racial and religious groups."

French Canadians complain bitterly that they are "second-class citizens" dominated by Canadians of English background.

In Quebec Province, French Canadians have unleashed a campaign of terror to back up demands for secession from the other nine provinces.

Rigid quotas limit immigration of colored races from the West Indies and Asia. Canada's 32,000 Negroes often encounter discrimination in seeking jobs, meals in restaurants, or living accommodations.

A Negro couple in Halifax answered 60 advertisements of apartments without success. Negro tourists from the United States are sometimes turned away from resorts despite advance reservations and deposits.

Officially, Canada's 210,000 Indians are equal in every respect to other Canadians. Unofficially, they are often treated as pariahs, avoided whenever possible, and stereotyped as "dirty, drunken, shiftless Indians."

For example, an attempt to establish an Indian hostel in Winnipeg sparked emotional protests—even though the site was in a slum area.

In another Manitoba city, a survey revealed almost two-thirds of the residents were prejudiced against Indians and half-breeds.

Three out of four Canadian Indians still live on reservations—unable or unwilling to overcome prejudice and compete for jobs, housing and social acceptance on the "outside." One angry chief complained his band was suffering from lack of education, drastic unemployment, no medical care, unfair labor practices and indifferent federal officials. Here, as in the United States, the problem of Indians—who once owned the country—tends to be overshadowed by that of Negroes and other minority groups.

Eskimos, numbering only a few thousand and seldom seen in urban centers, stir more curiosity than hostility. Even so, a Canadian white recently lost his job because he married an airline stewardess who is an Eskimo.

What turns up in Canada is just another version of the same story to be found in any part of the world which has differing races.

Mass murder on the scale practiced by Adolf Hitler in Germany against the Jews in the 1930's and 1940's is not countenanced by any government in the world today. But segregation or discrimination on a wide variety of grounds is being practiced wherever large minorities exist.

Even in countries where racial minorities are relatively small, you learn, there is racial antagonism. Often that antagonism is most violent in those countries which now profess horror at America's handling of its racial problem.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 15, 1963]

PREJUDICE ABROAD: DISCRIMINATION GROWS IN A EUROPE CRITICAL OF U.S. RACE RELATIONS—"NO COLORED" ADS ABOUND IN BRITAIN; FRENCH BOYS CALL NEGRO PLAYMATE "CHOCOLAT"—BIAS IN ANOTHER BIRMINGHAM

(By Robert E. Dallos)

BIRMINGHAM, England.—Dr. C. J. K. Pilliso of this city took care to book a room before

he set out on a recent jaunt to the seaside resort of Bournemouth. Nevertheless he spent the first night of his vacation sleeping in his car. The inn at which he planned to stay refused to honor his reservation because he is a Negro.

Now Dr. Pilliso fumes: "I'd rather live in the Deep South of the United States than here in Britain. At least an American Negro knows exactly where he can go and where he won't be admitted. In this country there is constant color discrimination, but the Negro never knows where or when he'll meet humiliation and rejection."

The doctor's experience points up a strong international irony. Americans have often been stung by loud European criticism of race discrimination in the United States, and this summer's American race crisis is giving the critics much new ammunition. But at the same time, a growing number of nonwhites living in Europe complain they're being discriminated against, too.

In some ways this discrimination is milder than in the United States. Unlike many American Negroes, colored Europeans usually attend school with whites. Proportionately more of them have white neighbors, too.

BRITAIN'S BIRMINGHAM

But in other ways discrimination in Britain gets quite blatant at times. Readers of the London Weekly Advertiser see dozens of ads like this: "Manor Road, two unfurnished flats, ground floor, three rooms and kitchen. No colored." In Birmingham, England, as in Birmingham, Ala., several large manufacturing firms maintain separate toilet facilities for white and colored employees. Indeed a recent survey of companies which employ about 30 percent of the labor force in Britain's Birmingham—England's second largest city and center of the auto industry—turned up only 318 companies that will hire colored help at all, against 365 that won't.

On the continent, discrimination rarely takes such an overt form—perhaps because the nonwhite percentage of the population is much smaller than in England. But in various subtle ways bias exists there, too.

In France a reputation for tolerance has drawn some American Negro intellectuals, such as the late novelist Richard Wright, to seek bias-free homes in Paris. But Ezekiel Mphahlele, an African now living in the French metropolis, says his 10-year-old son recently lost a white playmate when the white boy's father ordered him "not to play with black boys." Other white children, says Mr. Mphahlele, call his own "chocolat." Even in West Germany, where nonwhites make up an extremely small proportion of the population, the national government admits African students have trouble renting rooms.

LESSON FOR UNITED STATES?

To some sociologists, all this suggests a melancholy lesson for the United States: Overcoming race prejudice may be much harder than some integration leaders now anticipate. In no European country, these students point out, does the nonwhite proportion of the population come anywhere near America's 10 percent; even in Britain it's only about 1 percent. So, these sociologists say, the existence of discrimination in places where there are so few nonwhites to discriminate against indicates the tendency to bias among whites is extremely deep seated.

But bias does seem to rise with the number of nonwhites around. In Britain, nonwhites and discrimination alike were rare 10 years ago. But then immigrants—mostly nonwhites—dissatisfied with economic conditions in other British Commonwealth countries began to pour in; the annual immigration rose from 42,700 in 1955 to 136,400 in 1961, and the cumulative total from 1955 through the first half of 1962 reached 450,000. These immigrants, who included West Indian Negroes and dark-skinned Indians and Pakis-

tanis, make up the bulk of Britain's current nonwhite population of about 500,000.

The bias the immigrants encountered is not a legal problem. Britain has no laws compelling segregation. But its laws don't forbid discrimination either, so whites can subject colored Britons to a variety of private pressures.

FACTORY BIAS

One such pressure is described by L. G. Wilson, a Jamaican who supervises 30 white and 10 colored linotype operators in a London print shop. "Recently my company has been receiving complaints from white workers who say they don't want to work for a Negro," he claims. "Their complaints have turned to resignations, and now my bosses are trying to push me out by making me work all sorts of unfair and odd hours. I'm going back to Jamaica soon." In other factories, white unionists have struck to prevent the hiring of nonwhites who would work alongside them.

Social barriers are common, too. In the Birmingham suburb of Smethwick, a white barber cries "no colored hair cut here" as an Indian worker approaches his shop. And a white touring Smethwick pubs with three well-dressed colored friends finds his party admitted only to the shirt-sleeved workingmen's section and banned from the more formal lounge of the Soho Tavern. "I hate to do this," said the bartender "but I'm only the vacation employee and the owner left strict orders not to admit colored folk in the lounge."

These restrictions now are inspiring the beginnings of a U.S.-style protest movement among colored Britons. Last month a group of Indians began staging sit-downs on the sidewalk before the Bermuda Tavern in Wolhampton, an industrial town near Birmingham. Leaders of the demonstration vow to sit on the pavement every Saturday night until the pub owner agrees to serve them, and colored spokesmen promise similar demonstrations elsewhere soon.

Bias is also causing political controversy in Britain as in the United States. Last year the Conservative Party government pushed through legislation restricting immigration from the Commonwealth. In the 10 months through April 30, the new law cut the flow of immigrants to about 20,000, from 94,900 in the last 6 months before it went into effect.

Though the law does not mention race as such, Conservatives say it was necessary because "uncontrolled immigration" was contributing to racial tension. But Shirley Fosstick, campaign secretary of the Coordinating Committee Against Racial Discrimination in Birmingham, says the law has "increased discrimination in Britain." She says it "influenced the person who had no feelings one way or the other (to think) that colored people are not suitable citizens of this country."

LABORITES' VIEWS

Some Labor Party leaders now are promising to repeal the immigration law if their party wins the next general election. And Laborite Fenner Brockway has eight times introduced legislation in Parliament to ban some acts of bias; it has been defeated each time by legislators who cherish the tradition that British laws do not recognize that race exists. The Brockway bill is somewhat similar to the civil rights bill now before the U.S. Congress; it would outlaw discrimination in ads, such as those for apartments, and in public places such as dancehalls, movie houses, and pubs.

Finally, Patrick Gordon Walker, Labor's chief spokesman on foreign affairs, charged in a recent speech that some local Conservative parties in recent local elections "attempted, with deliberate calculation, to stir up racial strife in an effort to obtain votes."

In some districts, he says, children were organized to parade round the streets, singing: "If you want a nigger neighbor, vote Labor."

In France, where 100,000 Negroes make up two-tenths of 1 percent of the population, open bias is rare. Indeed many voters want a Negro to succeed General de Gaulle as President. In a recent poll to see whom Frenchmen would favor if the general does not run for reelection Gaston Monnerville, Negro head of the French Senate, led all others, being the choice of 28 percent of those polled.

Still French Negroes complain that taxi drivers often ignore them, and clerks in small shops wait on them only after whites are served. Jean-Pierre N'Diaye, a Senegalese sociologist, says some French professors are reluctant to give good grades to African university students. And 13 percent of the Frenchmen queried in a recent poll were opposed to having daily professional relationships with Negroes.

BLUNTER BIAS

Blunter bias pops up sometimes, too. Last month police were called when a Negro from Martinique objected to his expulsion from the New York City Bar in Lyon; they beat the Negro so severely that he required hospitalization. The Paris newspaper *Le Monde* then surveyed the bars in Lyon and found that 11 refused to serve Negroes.

Unhappily and perhaps unjustly, some French bias is blamed on the influence of visiting Americans. Albert Levy, secretary of an antidiscrimination group, says his organization has investigated several complaints that Negroes were refused rooms in Paris hotels. "The hotel owners told us they were forced to bar Negroes because they had a large American clientele which objected to them," Mr. Levy reports.

Negroes charge a somewhat similar situation exists in Germany. The Negro magazine *Flamingo*, published in London, recently described the city of Mainz as "Germany's Little Rock"; it said American Negro and white GI's frequent different off-base bars there and African students might have trouble being served in the white's favorite bars. This "prejudice did not come from the burghers of Mainz," the magazine claims. "Most of the blame can be put at the feet of American servicemen in the town."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, June 23, 1963]

DISCRIMINATION IN SOME FORM IS WORLDWIDE

With the exception of Antarctica, where there are no people, few large areas of the world have been immune to the virus of prejudice.

Thus, discrimination, racial or religious, ethnic or economic, leaves little room for self-righteousness in most of the globe's heavily populated regions. It varies in kind and degree around the earth. But one striking fact that emerges from an Associated Press survey is that neither the age nor the type nor the background nor the intention of a given government makes it necessarily immune.

As far as can be determined, only one country practices internal segregation as a matter of national policy or law. That is the Union of South Africa. Few countries enforce or justify it by law on any level and one of the few, of course, is the United States, where segregation is still a matter of State statute in parts of the South.

WRAPPED IN IRONY

But it occurs in many other places around the world even where it is forbidden by law and wrapped in irony.

Thus, India found that the mere process of independence from the white man did not cleanse it of discrimination by Indians.

No. 154—11

Thus, England, whose intellectuals used to criticize American race relations while the British had no minority problem of their own at home, now finds its own people not immune to the ugly sores of racial stress.

The emerging black man in Equatorial Africa and the emerging Arab in North Africa begin to rule themselves under constitutions proclaiming racial freedom for all. Meanwhile, they practice some discrimination against whites and Asians in an effort to redress old imbalances in government and trade. And only time will prove once the imbalance is balanced, whether such discrimination can be ended.

None of this is to say that discrimination, as Americans understand it, occurs everywhere or in major proportions in most places. It is relatively rare, for example, in Scandinavia, New Zealand, Australia and, from most points of view, France.

AS A STATE OF MIND

But discrimination is also a state of mind, sometimes lost in semantics, frequently difficult to label as such. In France, for example, the President of the Senate is a Negro. Negroes and persons of North African origin who can afford it circulate freely in hotels, restaurants and night clubs. But most of the 500,000 Algerians in France are uneducated and unskilled and hold the lowest paying jobs.

Is this discrimination or a simple fact of economic life? The free and easy Australians, who show an enlightened attitude toward their one small minority, the aborigines, enforce an immigration policy which keeps colored races out. This is done in the hope of building a homogeneous, frictionless society. Is this effort to avert racial strife discriminatory? In many places in South America, Indians make up the most depressed classes, poor and uneducated. Is this discrimination or another raw fact of economics?

In India and other parts of Asia, where America has often been concerned about its own image, neither semantics nor rationalization can hide the fact of discrimination.

In a total population of 461 million, nearly 100 million in India are listed by the census as untouchables. The untouchables rank below the Hindu caste system, which has four main castes and more than 3,000 local subcastes. Many Indians who are now Moslems and Christians are descendants of untouchables who were converted to escape the Hindu caste system. But even among the Moslems and Christians distinctions frequently remain between high and low castes.

CONDITIONS IN CEYLON

In Ceylon it is the Hindu who complains of discrimination although here, too, there are constitutional provisions against it. The ruling majority group are the Buddhists whose tongue, singhalese, is now the official state language. The 1 million Tamil speaking Hindus complain the language barrier and their difficulty in getting government jobs has forced them into second-class citizenship.

The Catholics, too, say they are targets of discrimination in public service appointments. Thus, a situation is reversed. Under British rule, which ended in 1956, the singhalese complained the Christians and Tamils were favored.

In 1958 an estimated 1,000 Tamils were killed in widespread rioting led by the singhalese.

While they complain of discrimination at the hands of the majority, the Tamils themselves discriminate against each other. The Vellala or high class Tamils do not allow low caste people to drink at public wells except in segregated areas. Low caste women are not permitted to cover their upper body or sit on chairs in the presence of the higher caste.

MOSLEM PAKISTAN

In Moslem Pakistan, where the Hindus are a 12-percent minority, no non-Moslem could ever become president, according to the constitution. Otherwise, there are no legal bars but in fact no Hindu occupies any high government job, none get into the military services, few get governmental jobs of any kind, and many have difficulty getting private jobs.

In southeast Asia, where many Chinese have migrated over the years and won commanding positions in trade and finance, antagonism toward them is common. It is particularly strong in Indonesia, where President Sukarno's government has tried to limit Chinese activity in business.

Still, the 3 million people of Chinese descent in a total population of 100 million control a great deal of Indonesia's economic life. Indonesia recognizes the Peiping government but that did not stop recent rioting and destruction of Chinese property in the wake of a visit by the President of Communist China.

RUSSIAN DISCRIMINATION

On the other side of the world, in Moscow, where Russian propaganda factories rarely miss a chance to exploit America's racial troubles, the picture is difficult to delineate. The Russian constitution espouses protection for all classes and forbids discrimination. The Government denies there is any discrimination against Russian Jews or visiting African students.

But the Jews claim they suffer unequal difficulty in getting important jobs or getting into universities. A disproportionate number of Jews have been executed for economic crimes, which the Soviets say indicates no discrimination.

But Western observers point out that the presence of so many Jews in illegal business may be explained by their difficulty in getting jobs in normal areas. And the Jews themselves point out that of all national or racial groups in the Soviet Union they alone are required to have the word "Jew" printed on their passports.

There is, of course, active discrimination against Christians, whose belief in God makes them ideologically unacceptable for posts of importance in the Soviet Union.

Elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain, there are legal prohibitions against discrimination but visiting correspondents hear murmurs. In Hungary, for example, they hear traditional anti-Semitic and anti-Gypsy sentiments.

PREJUDICE AGAINST STUDENTS

In Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria there is clearly a growing popular feeling against visiting colored students. In Czechoslovakia, many people blamed the depressed economy on large-scale exports to Africa and Asia during the Communist political offensive there.

In Poland, where Hitler left fewer than 50,000 Jews out of a prewar population of 3½ million, discrimination is illegal. Jews appear to have no problem in housing, education, or employment except that there is an undercurrent of resentment over the number of posts they occupy in government, party, publishing, news media, literature, and finance.

In turbulent Africa, where the complexion of power is changing rapidly, it is still too early to tell whether the black man or the dusky-skinned man will prove less discriminatory than the white man who ruled before him.

The new rulers endorse laws which seek to outlaw prejudicial treatment of any one group. But they also, understandably, seek to increase the affluence and influence denied many of their people under former white masters.

In Kenya, where the African has begun to rule himself, the government openly gives

wide preference to African applicants for civil service jobs. European and Asian civil servants are being prematurely retired. Most Europeans forced out this way receive generous financial allowances. The Asians do less well and are complaining.

NEGRO MILLIONS IN KENYA

Africans or Negroes total 8 million in Kenya as compared to 180,000 Asians, 66,000 Europeans, and 39,000 Arabs. Small though their group is, most of the country's commerce is still controlled by Asians. This may prove temporary.

While they have not suffered as badly as their compatriots in Uganda from trade boycotts imposed by African nationalists many Asian shopkeepers in Kenya fear the future. They say they will return to India if, after complete independence, their shops are boycotted or the government imposes high discriminatory taxes on them and Europeans.

The three independent Moslem states in formerly French north Africa—Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco—officially do not sanction discrimination. Yet it occurs in some forms, mainly against the remaining European settlers and Jews.

ARABS IN ISRAEL

Ten percent of Israel's 2½ million people are Arabs. Are they targets of discrimination? The tangible evidence indicates they are not, but still many Arabs feel an unease, a psychological disadvantage. Probably this feeling will never be erased while Israel is surrounded by hostile Arab nations.

But within the country, the Israeli Arabs are protected by laws against unequal treatment of any group. They get equal pay for equal work in industry, most of their farmers own their own land, they enjoy the same benefits of government road building and irrigation projects, they can and do enter any public place, and they vote. The parliament has seven Arab deputies.

The one legal difference between Arabs and Jews is that the Arabs are not subject to compulsory military training.

Elsewhere in the Middle East, in Lebanon, Syria, and Iraq, for example, the Moslems predominate but the remaining Jews appear to have few complaints. Hatred of Jews is confined to Israelis or Zionists. Jews there who engage in no pro-Israel activity are free to worship and work peacefully. The Jewish community in Lebanon retains considerable financial influence.

The Sudan, however, has its racial and religious troubles. Negro pagan and Christian tribes in the south are kept under strict controls by the Arab Moslems of the north. Rioting was reported in 1962 to protest the enforced "Arabization" of the Negro south.

South Africa, of course, remains the world's clearest example of racial separation and discrimination, the only country where it is national policy imposed by law and enforced rigorously in everyday life.

ENVISIONS SEPARATE CAREER

The government, in pursuing its policy of apartheid, speaks of the day when whites and blacks will live in separate areas, each governing themselves, in some kind of national federation.

Meanwhile, though, the 3 million whites rule themselves and the 11 million blacks, and there is no doubt in anyone's mind which complexion runs the country. The black man has no vote, no political rights, little freedom of movement, and is segregated in virtually every phase of his life—living quarters, transportation, churches, post offices, movies, libraries, restaurants, and separate counters in all government offices.

Much of Western Europe appears free of discrimination. Overt anti-Semitism is now rare in West Germany and Austria, where Hitler's massacres probably left those countries acutely self-conscious about the subject for years to come.

HIDDEN ANTI-SEMITISM

Some observers, however, feel that hidden anti-Semitism is still very strong in Germany, particularly among middle-aged and older people. But authorities treat the surviving German Jews (20,000 out of 500,000) with such consideration that some see the danger of a new anti-Semitism resulting from the current self-conscious pro-Semitism.

Italy has no legal discrimination. However, the German-speaking residents of the south Tyrol and the Slav groups in Trieste complain of unequal treatment in jobs and housing. The feeling has erupted into bombings and other violence which Italian authorities attribute to nationalist groups.

England has about 500,000 nonwhites, roughly 1 percent of the population. Most of these are West Indians who came looking for work. The rest are Indians, Pakistanis, and Africans.

So far in 1963, the country has escaped major race conflict for the first time in 10 years. The penalties for street rioting, such as the violence which lasted a week in London's Notting Hill district in 1958, are now more severe. Immigration of nonwhites has been sharply curtailed. Still, police and social workers believe more eruptions are inevitable.

The conclusions one can draw from this word survey of discrimination are few. For a broad variety of reasons, economic, social, political, religious or physical, historic or new, real or imagined, men feel and exhibit mutual hate, which may be the other side of mutual fear. Discrimination occurs in many places, the mere fact of which justifies it no place.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune, July 11, 1963]

THE BLACKER POTS

Secretary of State Dean Rusk told Congress Wednesday that unless it promptly enacts legislation that would permit a Washington bureau to supervise the renting of Mrs. Murphy's spare bedroom and the hiring of a fry cook in a hamburger stand the world will "question the real convictions of the American people."

The argument that we must vastly extend the power of the Federal Government in order to prove to foreigners that we are fair-minded is a favorite of the "liberals." Maybe it's time we looked at some of the foreigners.

Last fall the Government of Saudi Arabia finally got around to freeing the slaves. That is, it agreed to pay a compensation of \$700 for every male slave set free and \$1,000 for every female. But the deadline for claiming the compensations ended last week with few takers. Slaves, it seems, are worth twice as much as the government offered for their freedom.

So let's not worry too much about what Saudi Arabians think of the situation in Mississippi.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt has said a lot of scornful things about America's race problems. The average Egyptian rural laborer makes about \$10 a month. He works and sleeps in the same nightshirt. He is no longer legally bound to the land, but if he leaves his landlord there is no work for him. Must we keep cocking an ear for Mr. Nasser's latest lecture on the "submerged masses of America?"

In northern Japan there live the Ainu, a hairy race more akin to Eskimos than Japanese. An Ainu on the streets of Tokyo is followed by small boys, jeering and shouting "Dog." Ainu are not considered the equal of even the lowest true Japanese. What was the latest in "Asahi" or "Mainichi" about American race prejudice?

The Russian Government has made much of the slow pace of the school integration

drive in America. In Asiatic Russia separate schools continue to be maintained for children of White Russian and Ukrainian officials, while the native Kazakhs, Kirghiz, and Tadzhiks go to their own schools, such as they are.

In India, long the loudest critic of America on race matters, dark-skinned Dravidians from the south have a terrible time getting jobs in India's northern Caucasian cities.

No Australian hires a Bushman for anything except shepherding. The hill Igorotes of the Philippines are not socially acceptable in Manila. London, which contains fewer Negroes than any large American city, has recently had serious race disturbances. And down in Kenya whites are fleeing their neat farmsteads by the thousands as young Kikuyu grin and talk openly of a "night of the long knives" after Kenya gains its independence this fall when they hope to solve Kenya's race problem once and forever.

Now it is proposed that we rush into Federal legislation that would set up autocratic or unenforceable fair employment practices and that would put every American business, however small and local, under Federal regulation in order to stop the world's criticism of America.

Why don't we ask ourselves what is fair, practical and attainable, and let the rest of the world explain itself to us?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THURMOND. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Does the distinguished Senator from South Carolina know of any example in which there has been discrimination under the foreign assistance program on the ground of race, religion, color, or national origin?

Mr. THURMOND. I was speaking about discrimination in the countries to which we furnish foreign aid. I have just cited various countries, including India and Great Britain.

Mr. GRUENING. Do I correctly understand that the Senator does not propose to alter the policies of those countries, but merely to make certain that our foreign aid and its administration do not succumb to discrimination against individuals on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin?

Mr. THURMOND. The amendment on that point is fairly clear. Section 501 provides:

No person in any recipient country shall, on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving any form of the United States financial assistance.

Section 502 reads, in part:

Sec. 502. The Agency for International Development and any other department or agency or which is empowered, or may in the future be empowered, to extend United States financial assistance to any program or activity in any country, by way of grant, loan, contract, or other, is directed to effectuate the provisions of section 501 with respect to such program or activity by issuing rules, regulations, or orders of general applicability which shall be consistent with achievement of the objectives of the statute authorizing the financial assistance in connection with which the action is taken. No such rule, regulation, or order shall become effective unless and until approved by the President.

As I have pointed out, and in reply to the distinguished Senator, we are not

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18121

trying to control the policy of any country; but if we have a national policy of no discrimination and have given this Government the power to withhold funds in our own country in cases where alleged discrimination exists, it would seem to be in order not to subsidize discrimination in foreign countries.

Mr. GRUENING. I believe that the objective of this amendment is laudable, but I wonder whether it is necessary, and whether such discrimination has, in the past, taken place—and if so, where?

Mr. THURMOND. If it is not necessary, there could be no harm in adopting the amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator would not interpret the amendment as going so far as to deny aid to a country which as a matter of policy discriminated against American citizens on the ground of race or religion? I believe the Senator knows of certain Arab countries where American citizens of the Jewish race are not permitted to enter. Would he apply his amendment to those countries?

Mr. THURMOND. Again, of course, we would come down to the construction of the amendment. In the civil rights bill, that is left up to the heads of the administering agencies concerned as to its construction. The same would be the case with this amendment. As the able Senator well remembers, the civil rights bill did not define "discrimination," but left it to the head of the agency or department concerned.

Mr. GRUENING. As I read the amendment, I believe that it is highly desirable, but I wonder whether we could not hear from the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, as to whether he believes that the amendment is essential to prevent the kind of abuses the distinguished Senator from South Carolina is seeking to prevent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield the floor?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I believe that the Senator from Alaska wishes to put a question to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. GRUENING. As I read the amendment, its objective seems to me to be desirable and praiseworthy; but I wonder whether the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee would answer my question as to whether there is any need for the amendment, whether the abuses which the amendment aims to prevent have taken place, and whether they are really taking place.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A simple answer to the Senator's question is that I am opposed to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina. Merely because we have a similar objective in the United States, I am not going to turn around and vote for the same kind of measure to be imposed on other people. We have enough of a burden trying to put the foreign aid program into effect without including this amendment.

As to an answer on the subject of discrimination in other countries, generally speaking, as stated by the Senator from South Carolina, there is discrimination. As it directly affects this program, I am not aware of any complaints or instances in which it has been practiced.

I point to the Export-Import Bank as being one of the most effective and efficient organizations in this field we have ever developed, but I believe it would be a great burden upon that institution if we tried to inject this kind of requirement into its administration. I believe that applying the objective of this amendment would be extremely difficult.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There are already statements of principle in the act regarding discrimination, but not in this form, as a condition.

Mr. GRUENING. I assume that the administration, which has just supported legislation, which I supported, and which the distinguished Senator from Arkansas feels is not the right way to do it, would try to carry out those policies to the extent practicable in foreign affairs. My question is whether this was really a necessary amendment, and whether it adds anything except a declaration of principle.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe it is necessary. I am opposed to it.

Mr. GRUENING. I assume that the objective of the amendment is in sympathy with the views expressed by the chairman, who objected to proposing these methods in this country. I take it that the junior Senator from South Carolina is likewise opposed to them.

Mr. THURMOND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. He proposes, therefore, to impose on the foreign aid program a similar procedure to the objective at home?

Mr. THURMOND. I objected to imposing that procedure on our own people, but if the United States is going to impose it on its own people, I see no reason why we cannot provide for the control of these funds to foreign countries to which we give aid in one form or another.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. In other words, the foreign aid program now, under the national policy of this country, would violate the national policy of this country and would subsidize discrimination. I do not see how any Senator who voted for the civil rights bill can now take another position on the pending amendment and be consistent.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]; the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]; the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]; the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]; the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in the family.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay" and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from

18122

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 8

North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 524 Leg.]

YEAS—25

Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hruska	Proxmire
Boggs	McClellan	Ribicoff
Burdick	Mechem	Salinger
Douglas	Metcalfe	Thurmond
Ellender	Miller	Walters
Fong	Morse	Williams, Del.
Gruening	Mundt	
Hartke	Nelson	

NAYS—34

Aiken	Ervin	McIntyre
Allott	Fulbright	McNamara
Bible	Hill	Monroney
Brewster	Holland	Morton
Carlson	Inouye	Prouty
Case	Javits	Robertson
Church	Jordan, N.C.	Smith
Cooper	Keating	Sparkman
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparnis
Dodd	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Dominick	McGee	
Eastland	McGovern	

NOT VOTING—41

Anderson	Humphrey	Pell
Bayh	Jackson	Randolph
Beall	Johnston	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy	Scott
Cannon	Lausche	Simpson
Clark	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Curtis	Long, La.	Strom
Dirksen	Magnuson	Talmadge
Edmondson	McCarthy	Tower
Goldwater	Moss	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Muskie	Yarborough
Hart	Pastore	Young, N. Dak.
Hayden	Pearson	

So Mr. THURMOND's amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during the fight on the civil rights bill the point was made time and again that the image of the United States was being hurt because of discrimination in this country. As I pointed out in my talk a few moments ago on the amendment, Britain discriminates against Negroes; Africa discriminates against whites; in Asia one nationality discriminates against another, depending upon which is in the majority.

In Peru, and other Latin American countries, there is discrimination against Indians. In British New Guinea there

is discrimination; Indians and Negroes discriminate against each other, whichever is in the majority. In India—and a great deal of our aid goes to India—the infamous caste system still thrives, and discrimination is practiced.

I merely wished to show the futility of the argument that America's image is being hurt, because it was left to each State to determine whether there would be integration or segregation, which some call discrimination. In practically every country there is what some people call discrimination, and yet we must change our whole pattern of life. We must conform to a certain ideal in order not to be castigated by the other nations of the world, all of which discriminate under one standard or another.

Mr. President, I really did not expect the amendment to be adopted.

I have in my hand a statement taken from the Associated Press ticker. It states—

Administration leaders said they would fight THURMOND's proposal, contending it might jeopardize the AID program, which the South Carolinian opposes.

I knew that since the administration was opposed to the amendment it would not be adopted. But I wished to show the hypocrisy that exists. I wished to show that although other countries of the world practice discrimination, yet we are required to change our pattern in this country, in order to eliminate so-called discrimination, by passing the greatest grab for power—which we did when we passed the so-called civil rights bill—that this country has ever seen. There is no question that the so-called civil rights bill did more to centralize power in the Central Government in Washington than any other piece of proposed legislation that has ever been passed. Yet we are being forced to change our form of government, so to speak, the delicate system of checks and balances between the States and the National Government, on the pretense that we are being held up to the world as discriminating, when we are not discriminating any more than are other countries throughout the world. So I hope that the American people will wake up and take note of the propaganda that has been used in respect to the so-called civil rights legislation, and which will be used in forwarding other pieces of proposed legislation which will be offered in the future on one pretense or another to bring about a greater centralization of power in the Government of the United States.

Of course, those who subject to the so-called discrimination in foreign nations cannot vote in our elections, and therefore a legislative bar to discrimination against them has less appeal.

It is conceivable, also, that were my amendment to have been adopted, it would have prevented the expenditure of millions, and possibly billions of dollars of tax funds for foreign aid.

Mr. President, the history of mankind has been a history of the suffering of people. People have suffered where there has been too much power at any one level of the government. Those who wrote the Constitution tried to bring about a dif-

fusion of power. They tried not to put too much power at any one level of the government or at any one place in government. But now we are allowing some people in America to change our structure of government on the pretense that we must do so in order not to be criticized by other countries of the world.

I predict that next year and in years to come we shall be confronted with other proposed legislation by those whose main purpose it is to socialize this country and to centralize more power in Washington. They will use the same form of propaganda and the same pretense, that we must enact a certain piece of proposed legislation from humanitarian standpoints so that we shall not be criticized by other countries of the world.

I hope that the American people will study the amendment which the Senate has just rejected. I hope that they will look back and recall the vote on the so-called civil rights bill, and see how the American people and the Congress, because of public opinion, are forced to pass such proposed legislation that centralizes great power in our Government, and in the end will result in taking away the rights and privileges of individual citizens.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Arkansas, if I may. I should like to propound a question to him.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question regarding section 301(a) of the bill, H.R. 11380. I note that the bill proposes to extend through June 30, 1965, the life of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise. Establishment of the Advisory Committee was required by an amendment to last year's foreign aid bill which I was pleased to introduce. While it took some months to form the Advisory Committee, this has now been done under the chairmanship of Mr. Thomas J. Watson, Jr. It is a very distinguished committee and should make a major contribution toward more effective use of our great private enterprise community in the foreign aid program. For this reason I wholeheartedly endorse the proposal of the Foreign Relations Committee to extend the life of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise. At the same time, however, I notice that the Committee on Foreign Relations proposes to strike out the provision in the House bill which would increase from \$50,000 to \$100,000 the amount of funds which may be used to meet the expenses of the committee. As a lawyer I would not read the action of the Foreign Relations Committee as in any way curtailing the ability of the Advisory Committee to effectively carry out its mandate, but I would request confirmation of my view from the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. The language which the Foreign Relations Committee struck from the House bill is, and I quote:

\$100,000 for all costs necessary to the committee's operations.

At present the statute refers only to the "expenses of the committee."

This difference in the language indicates to me that under the present law

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

18123

not every item of expense incurred by the Agency for International Development in backstopping the operations of the Advisory Committee must be charged to the ceiling. Rather, it is only the direct costs of the Committee that must be so charged. In my judgment, this analysis of the language could not be questioned if it was also clear that the Foreign Relations Committee had no intention of inhibiting the Advisory Committee in carrying out its mandate. So I ask the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee whether it was the intention of the committee in striking out the language in the House bill to curtail the operations of the Advisory Committee in any respect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was not the intention of the committee to curtail the operations of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise. Rather, it was the view of the Foreign Relations Committee that only certain items of cost were to be charged to the ceiling and that on this basis the \$50,000 was wholly adequate. That is why it was stricken out.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator very much. That reply will be very helpful, so that that important committee may do its work.

I should like to address one additional question to the Senator which perhaps he or one of his associates will answer. I call attention to the amendment adopted by the committee at page 3, lines 12 to 15, of the bill, which provides:

Strike out "fraud or misconduct" in the second proviso and insert in lieu thereof "fraud, misconduct, or action not meeting the standard of reasonable business prudence."

That language relates to the guarantees of private investment in underdeveloped countries and would insert a new basis, "the standard of reasonable business prudence," for not honoring claims based upon such guarantees.

I am advised by representative members of the banking community in New York that the inclusion of this vague new standard will very materially cut down the amount of investments under the so-called all-risk guarantees, which are primarily in housing. Some of the largest banks and leading brokerage firms in New York, which have already made housing loans in Latin America, particularly in Colombia and Peru, and are making further investment plans there, including Venezuela and Argentina, advise me that the guarantee in this form would be unacceptable, and that they would not take the risk under such a guarantee because it could be avoided by the Government if it wanted to.

Since the words "not meeting a standard of reasonable business prudence" are as wide open as anybody could make them, I ask the chairman of the committee to tell us why that language was inserted and whether he would consider accepting an amendment to strike it out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This amendment was a result of an amendment by the Senator from Ohio to insert the word "negligence." The members of the committee, including myself, were opposed to it. After extended debate about the

word "negligence," this particular language was offered as a compromise in the belief it would not prejudice the guarantees in the same way the word "negligence" would.

It may well be the Senator is correct. I was not in favor of the insertion of either. This particular language was the result of a compromise in the committee over the word "negligence," which it was sought to impose, and which I opposed. I did not feel strongly about it. I did not think, speaking for myself, this language would make it easier to satisfy private participants than the word "negligence" would.

Mr. JAVITS. The word "negligence" was placed in this section by amendment once before, and it was stricken out in conference for this very reason. After all, what is the use of having a guarantee provision in the legislation if the very people we wish to induce to invest will not do so under such language? These are multimillion-dollar projects.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator feels strongly about it, I suggest he offer an amendment relative to the point.

Mr. JAVITS. In this instance, I would not wish to prejudice the case by offering an amendment which would be turned down.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Personally, I did not think that language was necessary. However, as I have stated, after extended debate on the matter, this was the best we could do. I did not think it was necessary to have either the language "negligence" or this language, but the committee felt otherwise. I went along with the compromise in order to bring the bill out of committee, which we often have to do. Since that time, I have had letters, as the Senator has, that raise a question as to whether it is a workable phrase.

Mr. JAVITS. What troubles me is that the objections come not from people who merely do not like the idea; they come from the very people who are putting up millions and millions of dollars for the very projects we wish to encourage.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may remind the Senator that this matter will be in conference, because it was not contained in the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. JAVITS. I place on the record a strong condemnation of its acceptability. I would not want to prejudice what might happen in conference. I would rather leave the record at this point by stating categorically that those we expect to encourage to invest money in this way, and who have already invested very substantially, object to the language. I have reference particularly to the Chase Manhattan Bank, which has already signed a first investment guarantee contract for Peru and has several other projects pending in an advanced stage of negotiation.

When those we are trying to encourage tell us themselves that this language is discouraging and inadvisable, and that it has a real tendency to cause them not to enter into such transactions, I think we had better take heed. Such language would surely cause a lawyer,

to advise his client not to underwrite a project under such terms, if he was worthy of any fee at all. We had better take heed of the result, and I hope the committee will take heed.

MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article appearing in last night's Washington Star by Richard Fryklund entitled "Minor Incident Led to Reds' PT Attack."

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article on the same subject printed in this morning's Washington Post written by Murrey Marder.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star]
TINY SPARK, BIG FIRE: MINOR INCIDENT LED TO REDS' PT ATTACK

(By Richard Fryklund)

The whole Tonkin Gulf incident which precipitated the crisis in southeast Asia, might never have occurred except for confusion—on both the American and Communist sides—over a little-noted incident last Saturday.

The story centers on a South Vietnamese raid on a North Vietnamese island.

Here's what happened, according to Pentagon sources:

Units of the South Vietnamese Navy took a raiding party to the island of Hon Me, about 10 miles off the coast of North Vietnam on Saturday. Guerrilla forces were put ashore for dynamiting raids.

FLEET PATROLS

The American 7th Fleet was not told about the operation, even though American advisers in Saigon were kept informed.

South Vietnam has a fair little navy of its own—some destroyer escorts and patrol craft—and does not need American Navy help. It coordinates its raids (on what it considers to be the Communist-occupied part of its homeland) with American advisers in Saigon.

The 7th Fleet conducts regular patrols by sea and air close to the entire sea rim of the Communist world.

Specifically, American destroyers, with aircraft nearby, cruised up into the Gulf of Tonkin looking for signs of Red Chinese and North Vietnamese activity—surface shipping, military ships, aircraft, etc.

The destroyed *Maddox* was on such a mission.

She had left Formosa July 28 specifically to see if the new talk in North and South Vietnam about expanding the war had resulted in increased Communist operations.

She sailed north past the Red Chinese island of Hainan, looped up no closer than 12 miles from the Red Chinese mainland and then started southward, well out from the North Vietnamese coast, on Sunday.

As she sailed past Hon Me Island—which is about 30 miles south of the PT boat base of Loc Chao, which was destroyed by U.S. planes on Tuesday—she detected on her radar a concentration of junks, which the North Vietnamese Navy uses for coastal patrol craft, and four PT boats.

SHIP TURNS TO AVOID THEM

Maddox officers did not know it, but these ships were picking up the pieces after the South Vietnamese raid.

The *Maddox* turned slightly aside to avoid them, and sailed on unconcerned.