Welfare. Also on Tuesday H.R. 2985, the Community Mental Health Centers Act Amendments of 1965, under an open rule with 3 hours of debate. Also on Tuesday H.R. 5401, the Interstate Commerce Act amendments, under an open rule with 3 hours of debate.

On Wednesday H.R. 7657, authorizing defense procurement and research and development.

On Thursday H.R. 7717, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

On Friday and the balance of the week H.R. 2984, the Health Research Facilities Amendments of 1965, under an open rule with 3 hours of debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further for the purpose of making some unanimous-consent requests?

Mr. LAIRD. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader if we can expect early programing of the emergency basin authorization bill which was reported yesterday by the House Committee on Public Works, with regard to which there is a growing emergency in terms of monetary authorizations for contracts?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would say that, of course, when the rule is granted on that bill I think we can assure the gentleman of early programing.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the man very much.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN BILLS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD with relation to the bill H.R. 4714.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY IN VIETNAM

(Mr. CABELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, in these days when a better understanding is so important on the part of the American people concerning the administration's policy in Vietnam, it is gratifying to know that our news media is so diligently trying to keep our Nation informed. I pay tribute especially to the Dallas Morning News, a great newspaper, which has so strongly expressed its support of our President.

At this time, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Dallas Morning News on April 21, 1965:

L.B.J.'s DIVIDENDS

Dividends from the President's recent policy speech on Vietnam are coming in. Even if nothing ever comes of the offer of peace with honor, as matters now stand we will have received important cold war gains just by making it.

The speech was not only a combination of sweet talk—which the neutralists like—and strong action—which the Reds understand. It was also an example of Johnson political jujitsu: It threw the Communists off balance at every level from the diplomatic to the tactical.

On the tactical level, the northern Vietminh officers of the Vietcong are having a tough time trying to get any new recruits in the South. Furthermore, they are losing the ones they have. The United States is accentuating the positive goal of development and it sounds good to many Vietcong troopers, apparently.

On the diplomatic level, it is now the Red North Vietnamese and their Chinese "big daddy" who are telling the neutralist peace-seekers to go jump in the lake and warning the U.N. to mind its own business. While this doesn't affect the military situation, it costs the Reds points among the Afro-Asian nations.

In between, it made necessary an embarrassing switch in the party line of the leftist movements in this country. Heretofore, they had covered their goal of a free world surrender with the reasonable sounding appeal for negotiations. The two terms are synonyms in their book, anyway. Now they can no longer use "negotiations" as a cover and must campaign more explicitly for a sellout.

All in all, it appears L.B.J. has won an inning in the Reds' own political warfare game.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROBLEMS OF VIETNAM

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, because of the urgency of the problem of Vietnam, I would like to discuss the implications from the answers on the Vietnam question in the recent questionnaire which I sent to constituents in the 29th District of California.

There were four policy choices available. These choices, with the percentage favoring each one, are as follows:

	Percent
1. Expansion of the war	42
2. Continue current level, without expansion	12
3. Seek negotiated settlement	29
4. Immediate withdrawal	11

Six percent did not give a choice or did not answer. Looked at another way, 54 percent favored continuing or expanding our effort, while 40 percent favored negotiating or withdrawing. Still another way of interpreting the results is that 52 percent disagree with the 42 percent who favor expansion.

We have analyzed these total responses in several different ways, and there are significant differences based on political preference, sex, religious preference, age, and education. I should mention, incidentally, that our sample of 13,000 is extremely close to the average of all voters in the district in terms of political affiliation and most other characteristics. It is slightly biased in favor of men, but I suspect that may result from husbands and wives collaborating in some cases and sending in the results under the husband's name. The returns are also biased in favor of the better educated, who, generally, are less afraid of questionnaires.

Broken down by political preference, the results show only 34 percent of the Democrats favoring No. 1, but 54 percent of the Republicans favoring this course. An equal percentage of Democrats—34 percent—favor No. 3, a negotiated settlement, but only 21 percent of the Republicans favor this alternative. About 10 percent of both parties favor the fourth choice—immediate withdrawal.

On the basis of sex, the women are evenly divided on policy, with 46 percent favoring No. 1 and No. 2 and 46 percent favoring No. 3 and No. 4. The men, on the other hand, favor No. 1 and No. 2 by 60 percent, with 37 percent favoring No. 3 and No. 4.

There is no significant difference between Catholic and Protestant responses, but the Jewish and "other" respondents, who represented about 15 percent of the total, were much more strongly in favor of negotiations—40 percent—and much less in favor of expansion—27 percent.

The distribution of responses based on education was quite interesting, and somewhat difficult to explain. For all of those having less than a high school education—11 years of schooling or less—more supported No. 3 and No. 4 than supported No. 1 and No. 2. For those with 12 years through 16 years of education, which was the largest grouping, opinion was strongly in favor of No. 1 and No. 2. For the "egghead" group—17 through 21 years of schooling—more favored negotiation than expansion. The responses of this group were about the same, in proportion, as the responses of those with less than high school education.

With regard to age, the significant results were that those under 30, who have never experienced war, were much more strongly in favor of continuing or expanding the military action than any other age group. Those 30 and over, whose generation participated in one or more wars, are considerably less enthusiastic.

In a very general way, the profile which emerges from this data is that the citizens of the 29th Congressional District in California are leaning toward a hard-line, expand-the-war policy, led by those who are young, college educated, Republican, and male. Those who are holding back, leaning toward a negotiated settlement, tend to be older, with either more or less education than the hard-line group, Democratic, more predominately female, and of a minority religious belief.

A number of interesting questions are raised as to how I should be guided by results such as these. Which "group" do I seek counsel from? Frankly, I believe that my course should be to decide my stand for myself, based on the best knowledge and judgment I possess. Having done that, I should make my position clear to all, and we should encourage a dialog, a broad exchange of views, to seek to achieve better understanding by all citizens and more reasonable decisions by our Government. We will rarely find that any of us are all right or all wrong. By exchanging views, we may each come a little closer to the truth. Obviously, there is no clear concensus of opinion indicated by the questionnaire results, and a lot of controversy is shown.

It may be anticlimactic for me to indicate, again, that I feel that our country is following the wrong policy in Vietnam.

A TRIBUTE TO THE PEOPLE OF RUSSIAVILLE, IND.

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to pay tribute to the people of the town of Russiaville in my district in Indiana. On Palm Sunday a terrible, devastating storm cut a swath through my district which destroyed millions of dollars worth of property and claimed scores of lives. The town of Russiaville is a small and unincorporated town. They lost their post office and all of their public facilities, schools, and churches. However, the people of Russiaville are determined people and, despite this loss and despite the fact that they have not been able to determine how they might receive aid from either the State or the Federal Government because of the fact that they are not incorporated, they have banded themselves together with a determination which I think is commendable. I would commend their actions to the people of this country as an exemplification of the American spirit. I would trust that the Members of the House might give these people their moral support as they strive and endeavor to rebuild a community of very fine people.

They already have formed a nonprofit organization and will use the funds being obtained toward gaining legal recognition of their town. They have taken the initial steps which I am certain will lead to a new Russiaville replacing the scars left behind in the devastation of the original.

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. O'HARA of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE REVOLVING FUND? NO, NO

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the recent recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget for a $100 million cut in the U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service and to establish a revolving fund for the conservation program is shortsighted planning and is damaging, to say the least, to an effective program which has been one of the most successful ventures of the Federal Government in conserving for the future.

The Soil Conservation Service, initiated in 1929, has without doubt returned dividends amounting to many, many times the original investment of the Government. Created to conserve America's farmland and to protect it from washing, eroding, and devastating windstorms, the Soil Conservation District has been one of the most productive farm programs ever devised.

It is my understanding the proposed reorganization of the program would require that participating farmers pay 50 percent of the cost of conservation practices. Let me reflect briefly on the accomplishments of the Soil Conservation Service.

The program was conceived at a time when the farmers of the United States could ill afford to spend money to conserve and rehabilitate America's greatest resource—the soil, which is the base of our economy. In 1936 when the conservation programs were born, much of our farmland had been both "misused and abused" through lack of funds for rehabilitating the land and also through lack of information about conservation practices. At that time duststorms, gullies, and damaging erosion were steadily and alarmingly consuming our topsoil. Millions of acres had been rendered unfit for crop use as a result. But the advent of conservation policy in 1936 has had miraculous effects. After 30 years of technical assistance through the Soil Conservation Service nearly 3,000 soil and water districts with nearly 2 million operators operating 648 million acres of land are engaged in conservation practices. They have applied 40 million acres of contour farming, nearly 20 million acres of stripcropping, 1.2 million miles of terracing; planted 11.3 million acres of trees; and have built 1.3 million ponds. In 1964 alone the Soil Conservation Service provided direct services to 1,123,801 landowners and farmers. Between 1 and 2 million acres of cropland were converted to other uses during the year as a result of conservation plans worked out by the Soil Conservation Service.

Through the operations of the Soil Conservation Service local needs and practices are worked out locally. The farmers themselves formulate the plans for conservation practices and are able to control and manage the same. By working together on a districtwide plan, countless advances and forward strides in meeting flood control problems and other agricultural problems have been made. Improvements in living standards can form better use of the land and water resources.

It is recognized that our future prosperity will depend on the foresight we have now in planning for the future use of all our resources. Is it not preposterous then to even suggest that this program of vital importance and significance be reduced? Every American, man, woman, and child has an interest in maintaining and conserving the productivity of our soil and for that reason careful thought must be given. The cost-sharing program proposed by the Bureau of the Budget would not work. It would not do the job the present program is doing. The $20 million which the Bureau of the Budget wants to delete from the appropriation is a mere drop in the bucket compared to the returns from the investment. Does the Bureau of the Budget actually believe that the American farmers can afford to engage in soil conservation practices to insure that the land will be productive and fertile for future generations? It really is not his job. It is the responsibility of the Government to plan far in advance for the future. I strongly oppose the revolving fund proposal and any reduction in benefits and operations of the Soil Conservation Service and the agriculture conservation program.

A STATEMENT ON THE MARCH FROM SELMA TO MONTGOMERY, ALA.

(Mr. REID of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute; to revise and extend his re-

3. Calls upon the United Nations, interested governments and appropriate nongovernmental scientific institutions and organizations to intensify research on all aspects of population problems, including medical research and research on economic, social, educational, cultural and organizational problems involved in implementing effective population programs;

4. Urges all parliaments to exercise influence on governments to facilitate participation in the forthcoming World Population Conference of outstanding scholars, scientists and other experts in all relevant fields from both developing and developed countries;

5. Calls on all countries to mobilize their resources for the growth and fairer distribution of the world's wealth and for the harmonious development of the world's population.

U.S. POLICY ON SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of April 21, Joseph Alsop set forth in his column a well-reasoned and much-needed explication of the wisdom of the Johnson administration's policy on South Vietnam.

Mr. Alsop discussed in detail the fallacies behind the wishful thinking of the critics of President Johnson who are arguing for peace at any price. He draws an interesting parallel between those who would retreat in the face of the threat of Chinese intervention and those who, a generation ago, counseled appeasement of Nazi Germany.

I commend this article to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 21, 1965]

POMPOUS IGNORANCE

(By Joseph Alsop)

One proof of the wisdom of President Johnson's Vietnamese policy is its marked success to date.

One must always be prepared for bad news. But it must also be said that since the Pleiku episode drove the President to take determined action, he and his policymakers have been calling the shots with quite unprecedented accuracy.

Another proof of the President's wisdom is the kind of criticism his policy has thus far invited. It is bad enough when Senator FULBRIGHT allows himself to ruminate in public on the desirability of "stopping the bombings." Apparently the Senator believes that this is the best way to promote negotiations on an acceptable basis. One can only reply that credulity is a cherished senatorial prerogative.

A more detailed reply is demanded, however, by the increasing barrage of such pieces as one just published by Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau, of the University of Chicago. Morgenthau is an interesting figure; for he plays almost the same key role among the modern appeasers that Geoffrey Damson, of the Times of London played in the be-nice-to-Hitler group in England before 1939.

The resemblance is curiously exact, moreover. "We are deluding ourselves in Vietnam," says Professor Morgenthau and he gives two main proofs for this assertion. First, he warns that we are getting Communist China's back up, which he thinks dangerous because he also thinks that the Chinese Communists are "the wave of the future."

He does not quite use that phrase from the old days. But his explanations of the need to recognize Communist China as "the dominant power in Asia" appear to have been borrowed, almost in toto, from the old Times of London leaders about the need to recognize Hitler's Germany as the dominant power in Europe.

But just as credulity must always be recognized as an inalienable senatorial prerogative, so the right of professors of political science to play at being realists must also be acknowledged. What is not pardonable in any serious academic figure is simple, pompous ignorance such as is revealed by Professor Morgenthau's statement that "the military conquest of Tibet" is an exceptional episode in Chinese history.

This statement is the key to the second Morgenthau argument, that if no one gets China's back up, China will leave her neighbors to "live peacefully in (her) shadow." But the central fact of Chinese history, its most impressive—indeed, awe inspiring—aspect, is the tirelessness with which the Chinese people have resumed the task of conquest whenever an opportunity offered.

China, properly so-called, appears when her history begins as a rather small region in the Yellow River Valley. Since then, China has regularly expanded whenever a strong central government possessed the means to do so. Even in this century, when China's government was weak for so long, the geographical area of ethnic China—the territory mainly inhabited by people of Chinese blood—has nonetheless more than doubled.

Manchuria is fully Sinified. Inner Mongolia is largely digested. The huge province of Sikang, where tribal peoples lived in effective independence until the end of the Second World War, is already being swallowed down. In one or two more generations the Tibetans, if they survive at all, are only likely to survive outside Tibet. And the ancient peoples of central Asia have heard their doom proclaimed.

Even in southeast Asia, both the Vietnamese and the Thais are refugee peoples, long ago pushed out of what is now China by Chinese pressure. In these circumstances, expecting the Chinese to let their neighbors alone, if everyone is just nice to them, is really a great deal sillier than the old be-nice-to-Hitler arguments.

That does not mean that the Chinese people are evil or perverted. On the contrary, they are enviably intelligent, industrious, courageous and in all ways talented. There is a grain of truth among Professor Morgenthau's silly chaff, in the sense that the formidable qualities of the Chinese people also make them a formidable problem.

One way to solve the problem, to be sure, is to recognize the Chinese as the Asian herrenvolk, and to allow them to gobble their neighbors at will, even though their neighbors happen to be our friends and allies. If Professor Morgenthau possessed enough forthrightness to recommend this solution, he could not be called ignorant, although he might perhaps be criticized on other grounds.

It seems a bit better, however, to stand fast by our allies; to defend our own vital position as a Pacific power, and to hope, with good reason, that the evolutionary power of time and the native strength of the Chinese people will eventually bring the present bout of Chinese governmental Stalinism to an end.

SENATOR McGEE HONORED BY WOOL INDUSTRY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a much-deserved honor that has come to one of our colleagues, Senator GALE MCGEE, of Wyoming, who on May 6 will receive the Golden Fleece Award of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

Senator MCGEE has been interested in the encouragement of the wool industry in the Nation and in his home State, throughout his career in the Senate, which actually started prior to his election to the Senate, when he served as assistant to the late, respected Senator Joseph P. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming.

He is currently the author of a bill to extend the Wool Act for a 7-year period.

I know that the Members of the Senate will join me in congratulating the National Association of Wool Manufacturers for the excellent selection they have made, for we all know the Wyoming Senator—and none better than I, these days—as an energetic exponent of every cause he undertakes.

Senator MCGEE's sponsorship of the Food Marketing Commission, last year, now holding hearings and making extensive studies of the food-marketing institutions of the Nation, is another splendid example of his effectiveness.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release issued by the National Wool Manufacturers, announcing its selection of Senator MCGEE as one of this year's recipients of its Golden Fleece Award.

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

NEW YORK, April 18.—Three men of accomplishment—a U.S. textile executive, an international wool promotion director and a U.S. Senator—will receive Golden Fleece Awards of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers at its 100th annual meeting dinner here on May 6 at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. The awards are given for achievement in the recipients chosen field.

As announced by Roger D. Newell, Newell Textile Sales Co., arrangements committee chairman, the awards will go to:

Ely R. Callaway, Jr., 45, executive vi , president of Burlington Industries, Inc., and a director of NAW.. who is active in the continuing effort to obtain safeguards against low-wage wool textile and apparel imports.

U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, 50, of Wyoming, a major wool-producing State, who is one of the most active Senate leaders working on the wool product import problem, which President Johnson has publicly recognized, pledging that his administration will vigorously seek a solution.

William J. Vines, 48, managing director, International Wool Secretariat, London, which recently launched a worldwide wool market promotion program handled here by its U.S. office, the wool bureau.

Presenting the awards on behalf of NAWM, one of the oldest national trade organizations, will be Arlene Francis, famous actress and television personality. She performed the same function in 1960 when she herself received a Golden Fleece Award in a surprise ceremony.

Mr. Newell said that "the association is proud of its century of service but that NAWM and the wool textile industry are looking to the future and the Golden Fleece recipients illustrate this point because they are young men with many years of achievement still ahead of them."

ARMENIAN DAY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, among the many nationalities which inhabit the area we refer to as the Middle East, few can claim as long a history as the Armenians. The Armenians enjoyed a long tradition of self-government, prosperity, and intellectual achievement.

Although Armenia became a part of the various multinational empires which have ruled much of the eastern Mediterranean area since antiquity, the Armenians were generally able to maintain their individuality and their traditions.

We recognize, today, the right of all nationality groups to independence; yet this was a new and dangerous philosophy in the 19th century, when the Armenians formed nationalist groups and began to agitate for such independence from the empire of which they then formed a part: the Ottoman. The Ottoman authorities tried to repress their movement, and began a brutal series of repressions in an attempt to convince the Armenians of the futility of their legitimate demands.

Beginning in 1895, and lasting for over two decades, the Ottoman Empire took nearly every opportunity to literally massacre the Armenians. In campaign after campaign, the armies of the empire slaughtered thousands upon thousands of men, women, and children in an effort to rid the empire, either by death or by exile, of the Armenians.

Now, 50 years after the most savage and inhuman of these campaigns began, the Armenians give us pause for reflection, for they provide us with reassuring and moving proof that the will of a people to self-determination and liberty can never be eradicated, no matter what the means.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MOSS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I believe that all public officeholders and those who seek public office should make full disclosure of their income, financial assets, business relationships, and every other matter which might be a basis for conflict of interest. I know of no conflict of interest on my part.

I receive an annual salary of $30,000 from the U.S. Senate.

Since coming to the Senate, I have earned approximately $1,000 as honorariums for speeches.

I receive no income from the practice of law or from any business. Upon my election to the Senate, I withdrew from the law practice entirely; and since then I have received no income of any kind—present or future—from the law practice. I resigned from the board of two corporations, and sold my stock, when elected to the Senate. I now have no connection with, or income from, any business corporation, partnership, or proprietorship.

My wife and I own an equity of about $4,660 in the home in which we live in Maryland. I also own an unimproved lot in Holladay, Utah, with a value of less than $500.

Besides our household and personal effects, we own a 1964 Ford and a 1965 Mustang. We own U.S. savings bonds of face value of $1,250, have a savings account of $3,288.13, and maintain a fluctuating checking account of between $900 and $3,300.

We have one son in college—at the University of Utah; one son on a mission for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; one son in junior high school, in Maryland; and our daughter is married.

COMPANY COMMANDER STATES NEED FOR COLD WAR GI BILL FOR HIS MEN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from a military officer, a company commander in the Army. As all know, few servicemen are closer to their men than is their commander; and this officer expresses deep concern for the future of his men when they return to civilian life.

To illustrate the types of educational needs which the servicemen in his company have, and to demonstrate the cogency of this young officer's argument for the cold war GI bill, I ask unanimous consent that this letter, from Capt. Harry C. Calvin, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COLUMBUS, GA.,
April 20, 1965.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HON. SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I am an officer (class of 1960 USMA) in the Army with a permanent home in Houston, Tex.

I am writing to you about the need for a cold war GI bill which will enable many of our deserving and capable citizens to attend vocational and technical schools so they will continue to be useful and contributing citizens to our Nation's economy.

At the present time I am a rifle company commander in an infantry battalion. Fifty-eight of my young men are draftees, many from Appalachia and its borders. They have all done good jobs for me in the past year and served their country well. Some have volunteered for Vietnam duty, but were not called to go because (fortunately) ground combat troops have not yet entered that conflict other than as advisers. More than 75 percent of these men are high school dropouts for various reasons. Many have taken the high school general educational development tests sponsored by the U.S. Armed Forces Institute and passed them, indicating their capability to learn. A few have good jobs to return to in 6 months when they are discharged, but most will be forced to look for work; some admit they will draw unemployment as they do not expect to find work available. If they could only attend some vocational or technical school with Government assistance, they would be able to contribute much more to our society than they probably will under the present conditions facing them.

Another problem along this line is that some of my senior noncommissioned officers will be retiring in a few years. They have served us well from World War II and the Korean conflict through the present crisis in Vietnam. They were entitled to the GI bill of rights from World War II and the Korean war but now that these have expired they face bleak prospects of finding suitable jobs to augment their retirement income. Because they stayed in for a career they have been penalized by loss of the GI bill education benefits. Last week it was brought to my attention that Government statistics revealed one out of five retired Army personnel were still unemployed 6 months after retirement. Don't you think they deserve some assistance to be taught a new avocation?

A personal example I would like to point out is that my executive officer, in for a career, enlisted in the Army shortly after finishing high school. He was honorably discharged, attended college under the Korean bill of rights (Public Law 533), was commissioned an officer in the Army and now contributes much more to our country than if he had been discharged only to face a hunt for a job or the difficult task of going to school without any monetary assistance from the Government. This is only one example from millions of veterans that are now contributing much more to the gross national product than they would had they not been able to attend schools with Government assistance.

I urge you to do everything in your power to correct this deficiency in our national program to increase the economic welfare of our Nation's citizens.

Sincerely,

HARRY C. CALVIN,
Captain, Infantry.

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in a recent editorial entitled "Reaping the Whirlwind," which was published in the New York Times, the problems of soil conservation and land cultivation in the Great Plains areas were discussed.

I do not feel that the New York Times editorial was written with a full understanding of the bionomics of the Great Plains. In the New York Times of April 25, 1965, there was published a letter which D. A. Williams, the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, wrote to the editor. In the letter, Mr. Williams explained the work being done by the Great Plains conservation program, and expressed the hope that a growing percentage of land will soon be safely kept in cultivation, with regular conservation practices. I congratulate the New York Times for printing his letter. Having lived in the Great Plains and a portion of my home State being within the Great Plains area, I have given some study to the Great Plains, its people, production, flora and fauna, and ecology. Mr. Williams' letter is very helpful to an understanding of that great area between the Mississippi Valley and the Rocky Mountains. Because this letter contributes greatly to our understanding of the problems and of what is being done to alleviate these problems in the Great Plains, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 25, 1965]

PROGRAM TO HALT GREAT PLAINS' SOIL EROSION

To the EDITOR:

Your recent editorial "Reaping the Whirlwind" excited considerable interest among

vise their own employees; and the President pro tempore would be charged with the supervision of all other officers and employees of the Senate.

PROPOSALS REQUIRING CONCURRENT ACTION OF BOTH HOUSES

1. Appropriations Committee procedures: House and Senate Appropriations Committees would be authorized to hold joint hearings and half of the appropriations bills each year would originate in each Chamber to expedite congressional business. (S. Con. Res. 28, introduced by Senator CLARK on March 7, 1963, and pending in Rules Committee.)

2. Separate session for appropriations: (S. 2198, introduced by Senator MAGNUSON, and cosponsored by Senators CLARK, NEUBERGER, and HART; pending in Rules Committee.) This bill would divide the annual session of Congress into two parts: a "legislative session" which would begin on January 3 of each year and end not later than the first Monday in November; and a "fiscal session" beginning on the second Monday in November and ending not later than December 31. Under the proposed procedure, Congress would devote the early session to substantive legislation including authorizations. It could then recess for the summer and come back in November to deal with appropriations. The bill also changes the fiscal year to make it correspond with the calendar year, so that all appropriations bills will be enacted before the beginning of the fiscal year to which they pertain.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 7 minutes. The request is not necessary unless the Senator wishes to speak out of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

WELCOMING TO THE UNITED STATES THE INTER-AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 349, which was messaged to the Senate this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 349) welcoming to the United States the Inter-American Bar Association during its 14th conference to be held in Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution? There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the Inter-American Bar Association was organized at Washington, District of Columbia, May 16, 1940, and is now celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding; and

Whereas the Inter-American Bar Association will hold its fourteenth conference at San Juan, Puerto Rico, during the period May 22–29 1965; and

Whereas this is the first time that the Inter-American Bar Association has planned a conference in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

Whereas three previous conferences of the association have been held in the United States; and

Whereas the purposes of the association, as stated in its constitution, are to establish and maintain relations between associations and organizations of lawyers, national and local, in the various countries of the Americas, to provide a forum for exchange of views, and to encourage cordial intercourse and fellowship among the lawyers of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the high character of this international association, its deliberations, and its members can do much to encourage understanding, friendship, and cordial relations among the countries of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas there were adopted by the Eighty-eth Congress, in its second session, and by the Eighty-sixth Congress, in its first session, concurrent resolutions of welcome and good wishes to the Inter-American Bar Association on the occasion of its holding conferences in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States welcomes the Inter-American Bar Association during its fourteenth conference to be held in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and wishes the association outstanding success in accomplishing its purposes; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary General of the Inter-American Bar Association.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Alaska for yielding.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM—XI: OUR POLICIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA ARE AIDING AND NOT THWARTING IMPERIALIST COMMUNISM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, during his press conference Tuesday, President Johnson commendably rebuked those columnists who, speaking not alone for themselves but for the underlings in the Federal bureaucracy intent on justifying their past errors, are attempting to stamp out any and all criticism, however justified, of our policies in Vietnam.

In answer to the question, do you think any of the participants in the national discussion on Vietnam could appropriately be likened to the appeasers of 25 or 30 years ago? President Johnson incisively reasserted the right of critics to bring out their point of view on the mess in Vietnam by replying:

I don't believe in characterizing people with labels. I think you do a great disservice when you engage in name calling. We want honest, forthright discussion in this country, and that will be a discussion with differences of views, and we welcome what our friends have to say, whether they agree with us or not. And I would not want to label people who agree with me or disagree with me.

I am gratified at the President's reply—as all right-thinking Americans should be—but not surprised. I would have expected no less from one nurtured in the finest traditions of the Congress where, in the Senate, the right to "take the floor" and speak out on any topic is assured. Of late, however, critics of our Vietnam policies have done so at the risk of vituperative comment in the press. Some of us who have done so have run the danger of being called beatniks, even though beardless.

I commend President Johnson, therefore, for his defense of his critics and in the same vein in which he said, "We want honest, forthright discussion in this country, and that will be a discussion with differences of views, and we welcome what our friends have to say, whether they agree or not." And I shall continue to criticize the current, unrealistic United States policies in Vietnam.

President Johnson's statements about Vietnam at his press conference yesterday sounded reasonable but were unrealistic.

Our administration's policy is unrealistic because it does not take into account the facts of life in Vietnam and of history.

It is unrealistic because it continues the past errors responsible for our being mired in the quagmire of Vietnam.

It is unrealistic because it does not take into account the fact that we are dealing in Vietnam with human beings and not machines.

It is unrealistic because it assumes a monolithic, absolute control of the Vietcong by Hanoi that simply does not exist.

By some sort of a process of self-mesmerization, those advising President Johnson have convinced themselves—and President Johnson, apparently—that the National Front of Liberation in South Vietnam is only a "front" for Hanoi.

Of course, it is in part.

But to say so does not mean that the National Front of Liberation has no entity of its own—that it has no aspirations of its own—that it has no will of its own.

The National Front of Liberation will accept from Hanoi direction and control in its efforts to conquer all of South Vietnam so long as Hanoi's objectives coincide with its own.

But, by excluding the National Front of Liberation from the groups with which he is willing to negotiate, the President is being entirely unrealistic.

Suppose we do go to the peace table with Hanoi and the latter should agree to discontinue its aid to the Vietcong.

Does anyone realistically believe that Hanoi could then issue orders to the Vietcong to lay down their arms and become part of the one big, happy family of peaceful Vietnamese?

Anyone who takes such an unrealistic position misreads history.

After Dienbienphu in 1954, Ho Chi Minh, leader of the Vietminh, agreed to the armistice terms at Geneva, which provided for the temporary partition of Vietnam at the 17th parallel only because those armistice terms contained the explicit agreement that free, supervised elections would be held by July 20, 1956, leading to the reunification of Vietnam.

In a separate declaration, the United States agreed to this reunification provision. Then in 1956 the United States acceded to and supported the breach of this provision of a solemn international undertaking.

In not even alluding at his press conference on Tuesday, April 27 and at Johns Hopkins on April 7 to this provision of the Geneva agreement—a return to which he called for in his March 25 remarks—by not holding out the smallest hope of ultimate reunification of all of Vietnam—President Johnson, despite his oft repeated offer of unconditional negotiations, is in effect saying that one of the conditions of negotiations is the agreement in advance that this provision of the Geneva agreement was nonnegotiable. In other words, while talking unconditional negotiation we are in fact asserting a condition precedent to any negotiations.

Such a condition precedent to negotiations ignores history. It conveniently slides under the rug not only the reunification provision of the Geneva agreement, but also the fact that for 800 years after it had ousted its Chinese conquerors and before it was colonized by force by France, the whole of Vietnam constituted one undivided, free, independent sovereign country.

I oppose U.S. policies in Vietnam—and have done so for over 13 months now—not alone because they are unrealistic and are leading us down the path to a full scale, major war, but also because they are playing right into the hands of Chinese imperialist communism.

Let us carefully and realistically examine the direction in which our present policies are headed.

We start out with the known fact that, having been a colony of China for over 1,000 years, and having expelled China by force of arms, North Vietnam is not anxious to be reconquered by China at this point in history.

We have now been bombing North Vietnam for nearly 3 months and the makers of policy in the Pentagon and some of the pundits in the press are pointing gleefully to the fact that neither the Red hordes from Communist China nor the forces from Communist Russia have poured across the 17th parallel.

But the fact remains that Hanoi does not need manpower either from Peiping or Moscow. It needs weapons and materiel and recent reports of the installation of missiles in Hanoi and elsewhere in North Vietnam indicate that it is or will be shortly obtaining Russian weapons and materiel. As for men, Hanoi has sufficient for the time being to maintain its infiltration of the civil war in South Vietnam.

Some may interpret the lack of Red Chinese fighting men in South Vietnam as restraint on the part of Red China.

One explanation is that the Chinese are anything but unhappy about the situation in which the United States finds itself.

They—the Chinese—see the United States entrapped in a war on the continent of Asia.

They see it realistically as a war in which we are losing American lives and spending vast sums of money.

They see the escalation of this war as an intensification of these two conditions—more American lives sacrificed, more dollars expended.

They see the Western white man—the United States—fighting all alone a small Asiatic nation on the continent of Asia and being held by that small nation at least to a standstill.

They note that the United States has been fighting this war all alone.

They see this war alienating from the United States the support of the neutrals and its allies.

Why should the Chinese not be more than content with this situation and let it develop without specific action on their part? For despite the allegations by some spokesmen for the administration—and indeed the President's own reference to Communist China—that China is behind the Vietcong it is more than evident that to date the Chinese have shown a complete self-restraint as far as any military action is concerned.

There is another explanation for Chinese inaction to date.

It is more plausible to interpret events as indicating that Hanoi has not invited Red Chinese troops into its country.

And for good reason.

Hanoi well remembers the last time Chinese hordes invaded Vietnam and how it took more than a thousand years to free itself.

Hanoi wants no repetition of that event.

But United States present policies may be driving Hanoi into the waiting arms of Peiping. If our war efforts are escalated and North Vietnam is laid bare, then Hanoi may be forced to call for aid from both Red China and Communist Russia. Once Red Chinese troops occupy North Vietnam, how many thousands of years will it take before they leave? It will be difficult to drive them out.

Our policies are also driving Peiping and Moscow closer whereas their deep split was a cause for rejoicing in the free world. Our policies are likewise estranging us from our allies and strengthening imperialist communism.

How are our policies in southeast Asia strengthening imperialist communism?

Because if we had adhered to the Geneva agreement and would adhere to it now, and announced our purpose to hold the elections promised in the Geneva agreement which we supported, a united Vietnam would inevitably firmly resist a takeover by the Chinese. This would be a complete accord with its past history.

The Vietnamese want to be independent. They objected to the presence of the French. They object to the presence of the United States. They would oppose the presence of the Chinese.

What would emerge in all probability judged by past history, both long time and recent, would be a Titoist form of government independent of Peiping.

To secure that type of independence from Moscow, the United States has invested $2 billion in foreign aid in Tito's Yugoslavia.

We could have pursued the same policy in southeast Asia, although in consequence of our aggressiveness there and now bombings of North Vietnam and our repeated declarations for an independent South Vietnam, this policy would now be more difficult to achieve than it would have been a year ago. But it is still possible.

In this policy we would have Russian support.

But if we escalate the war still further, go still farther north, continue to bait the Government of China, the Chinese may move in with ground troops into both North and South Vietnam. And once they occupy Vietnam it would be infinitely more difficult to get them out. It has been extremely difficult and as yet impossible to get Joseph Stalin's troops and tanks and their successors out of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland and Czechoslovakia. But we managed to assist Tito in proclaiming and maintaining a considerable degree of independence from Moscow. We are pleased with the result and consider the $2 billion dollars it cost the American taxpayers as a sound investment.

His government is Communist, but it is a communism independent of imperial control which Joseph Stalin sought to impose. It is not a communism which is exported for the purpose of dominating other nations.

Similarly, if we had pursued or could now pursue a corresponding policy in southeast Asia, a reunited Vietnam choosing its own government would in all likelihood maintain its independence from the Peiping rule of Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai.

Unfortunately our present policy is likely to nullify that desirable solution.

Actually, our policy is leading to the very Chinese imperialist expansion which we declare it is our purpose to obviate.

I repeat my previous suggestions.

We should:

Stop the bombings in North Vietnam, at least for a limited period of time, so that negotiations can get underway without North Vietnam being dragged to the conference table with a pistol at its head.

Press for an immediate cease-fire in South Vietnam with international supervision.

Offer to go to the negotiating table with all the parties involved, including the Vietcong, the real opposition to the South Vietnamese Government which the United States supports.

It has been said that all wars end at the negotiating table, so why not this one?

I fear that this statement may no longer be true. The thermonuclear capabilities of the major nations of the world mean that the next—the last world war—could end not in negotiations but in total destruction of the peoples of the world, leaving no one to negotiate.

Is it not time for the President to take another firm, hard look at the policies he has been advised to pursue?

It is not too late—yet—for reason and realism to prevail.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th

amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 117

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to amendment No. 82 of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, of the amendment numbered 82, change the period to a colon and add this additional sentence: *"Provided, however,* That this provision shall be applicable only to elections held for the selection of presidential electors, Members of the United States Senate, and Members of the United States House of Representatives."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, let me state briefly the reason why I offer my amendment to the pending amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

I am in favor of amendment No. 82. However, in my opinion amendment No. 82 in its present form is unconstitutional because it is not restricted to Federal elections. By the term "Federal elections", I mean elections in which presidential electors and Members of the U.S. Senate and Members of the U.S. House of Representatives are chosen.

The only effect of my amendment would be to confine the application of amendment No. 82 to Federal elections and thereby make it constitutional under the interpretation placed on the 15th amendment by the Supreme Court of the United States in a number of cases.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I concur in the statement just made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. I find his amendment to my amendment to be perfectly acceptable. In fact, I believe that it would make my amendment stronger, which is the objective we are trying to achieve.

Since the yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to modify my amendment to accept the provision of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], numbered 82 as amended by the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. The Chair will put the question.

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

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

AMERICAN POLICY IN VIETNAM AND DEBATE IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a great national debate on our policy in Vietnam has moved a considerable distance since it opened on the floor of the Senate on the 17th of February. It is with some reluctance that I take issue with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], who has just preceded me, but he and I have had rather strong differences on this question for some time. Let me add that we have likewise enjoyed the additional pleasure of exchanging those differences, not only in debate on the floor of the Senate, but also in debate on some of the campuses of the universities across this great land of ours.

It is that kind of debate which, it seems to me, is in the tradition of free inquiry and open discussion in the test of conflicting positions in the public forum. This helps to firm up the wisdom of policy positions.

Because of the debates which have taken place in the past 3 months, we can now point to a higher level of both discussion and debate, but now more often on the right questions for the right reasons instead of the wrong reasons, and with not quite so much misinformation as characterized the opening discussions.

This is all to the good. The country as a whole has become much more closely attuned to the tough issues which need to be resolved in southeast Asia. Much of the helpful delineation and consideration which plague our great country has come from high places in the administration, led by the President himself, aided and abetted by Secretary of State Rusk and Secretary of Defense McNamara, as well as some of the President's closest personal advisers. Likewise, articulate voices in the Senate have continued to contribute to the discussion, and thus have contributed to the shaping of policy positions.

Not the least of the forces which have contributed to enlightened debate have been the voices that have come from the nongovernmental level, from town meetings, community seminars, and perhaps most of all from the campuses of our great educational institutions, both large and small.

The knowledge of the academic world in these matters has taken on new dimensions during this time of crisis. Perhaps more so than at any time since the 1930's, the college campuses have come forward to participate in a controversy with debate of high caliber and considerable magnitude.

As a former academic, I am delighted to see this manifestation of deep concern about an issue of such vital international and national significance.

Having said that, however, there is one aspect about it that remains disturbing to many of us. This is the seeming impression, which has come to us at least through the media of communication, that the campuses of the land are almost totally in the grasp of those who oppose the President's position in Vietnam that they are engaging in a monolog rather than a dialog. We are being led to believe that the teach-ins, the picketing activity, the marchings, and the public student demonstrations all reflect a cross section of the campus life today.

It is unfortunate that this impression has gotten abroad in the land—unfortunate because it is not only unrealistic, but also because it is untrue. Yet at this very moment the image of the intellectual world is a one-sided image. It suggests that the students and their professors and intellectuals are all automatically pacifists or troublemakers, whose loyalty to their country may be open to question.

In the interest of objectivity, as we seek to judge the academic world of our time, particularly on the issue of Vietnam, it is necessary that we bear in mind how such distortion could emerge in the first place.

At the outset we ought to recognize that if the campuses were to rally around a policy that was already invoked, if the campuses were to accept what already is a fact, it would be less newsworthy and it would not attract attention from off the campus, and therefore the protester against the existing situation has the advantage in headlines.

Second, campuses generally and understandably draw hangers-on, those who are professional protesters, even though not officially members of the intellectual community. These hangers-on should not be confused with bona fide academics.

Third, major segments of the academic world have contributed through their intellectual resources to the warp and woof of the present American policy in Vietnam. The President himself is a former teacher. The Secretary of State was a professor of political science and a Rhodes scholar. The Secretary of Defense is a distinguished scholar PBK. McGeorge Bundy, a key adviser to the President on defense matters, was dean of arts and science at Yale. And Walt Rostow, chairman of the policy planning staff shaping these questions, was a professor of economic history at MIT and a Rhodes scholar.

In other ways, through position papers, field studies, public debates, and community dialogs, other voices from the classroom have helped to shape and to raise the level of understanding of the central issues in the Far East. On my own campus at the University of Wyoming my former colleagues in the department of history have taken the lead in this regard.

It is unfortunate in the light of this that only one side of the academic face is coming through—that which protests a strong policy in Indochina. One of the regrettable consequences is to give to the general public the wrong image of the intellectual in America—wrong only because it portrays him as being one sided and with a closed mind. It is not that students and professors should not protest, for whatever else, protest should ever remain a hallmark of academia. Exploration of the unrealistic as well as the realistic, of the frowzy as well as the fundamental, should always be a way of life on the campus. The right to think otherwise or be otherwise should remain a cherished tradition in the halls of ivy.

On a question of the magnitude of American policy in Vietnam, it is important that the public image of the position of American intellectuals on it be brought back into balance. For all too long in our country's history academics were suspect, particularly in the

public arena of politics. Among others, the Soviet Union frightened some of our countrymen into the realization that perhaps there was a proper place for intellect in a modern state. In any event, the intellectual has acquired a higher status and public respect today never before enjoyed—at least in this century. Thus, the campus is on the spot, and the urgency of getting through a balanced profile becomes even greater.

So I appeal to the currently silent segment of our campuses who support the President or who may agree with fundamental tenets implicit in a firm posture in Asia to declare themselves now in a public way. Let the professors speak out; let the students petition. It is time to stand up and be counted.

For several weeks, I have been meeting with groups of students and professors on the question of Vietnam. Their questions, their newspaper ads, and their picket signs generally center around half a dozen ideas. It has been my experience that the ideas often are noble but that the facts which led them to those ideas were often irrelevant. While ferment on the campus is to the good, we can ill afford campus monologs premised upon fermented facts, namely, facts that are old and out of date. How well I remember my own classroom days. It is with no thought of disparagement at all that I recall that Professor McGee had a lot more solutions to the problems of the world than does Senator McGee.

That may suggest, in capsule form, why President Truman, who may have held a different position until he became President, why President Eisenhower or President Johnson, too, came to about the same answers on this question. It is the difference between sheer speculation or posing theoretical postulates, and having to accept responsibility for taking a given policy position now on any given issue of the day.

Let us examine some of the questions and some of the answers to the questions which appear most frequently and most commonly in the student bodies with whom I have met, and many of the professors whom I know so well. These questions take into account the kinds of uncertainties that still prevail in many sincere and expert academic minds.

At the same time the answers take into account the radical changes in the status quo that have occurred in the last 6 to 8 months.

Perhaps one question that is put most often, or most frequently, is this: Why do we interfere in what is largely a simple civil war between two factions in South Vietnam?

Of course, the answer to that question lies in the developments which have occurred in recent months. In that interval of time the government in Hanoi has intensified its training of skilled guerrilla forces, recruited in North Vietnam, and they have likewise stepped up their infiltration of the territory south of the 17th parallel.

Also, in recent months Hanoi has begun to give direct radio signals—orders, if you will—to most of the units operating in South Vietnam. This has meant coordination of movement and a concentration of targets, and thus a greater effectiveness or a greater threat of their capability to disrupt and destroy in the south.

Third, we now have abundant evidence to suggest that even major regular army units from Hanoi are now operating across the border in the south. There has begun wholesale importation of supplies and armaments from outside Vietnam, which are then smuggled into the south on behalf of the guerrillas. We have learned that in recent battles the Vietcong has been armed with small arms of which more than 90 percent came from outside the area—notably arms from China, from Czechoslovakia. Almost 100 percent, of the larger weapons were of Chinese manufacture.

Until 6 months or so ago, the guerrilla operations were largely endemic in their nature. Very often they were cannibals from the standpoint of arms, either converting arms that they captured or using arms that they had discovered in caches left over from the Japanese occupation or the war with the French.

But that has now changed; and this change is the point to which we ought to lend emphasis as we seek to respond to the academics who still call into question policies in Vietnam on the basis of outmoded and outdated fact.

Another question that is commonly raised in the campus discussions is as follows: Why do we remain in a land that wants no part of our presence there, where a large segment of the population is openly trying to throw us out, and is strongly supporting the position of the guerrillas or the Vietcong?

That item, I submit, is nonsensical on its face. In the first place, how do we measure the attitudes of the rural peasant population in South Vietnam? How do we determine the state of mind of the people in the hills and the mountain country north of Saigon?

Mr. Gallup has not been over there. There is no known standard of measurement that would stand up to the test of validity. But one of the students suggested to me on one occasion. "Whenever the guerrillas come into a village, the first thing they do is to get cooperation from the local villagers."

Mr. President, students have often suggested to me that the best evidence of the fact that Americans are not wanted in Vietnam is disclosed in the fact that villagers themselves often aid the Vietcong by giving them rice, where possible, by helping them repair weapons, and even by supplying them with manpower. This cannot be denied as a fact, but in my judgment it is a fact that very often stems from terrorism of the most extreme sort. I suggest that most villagers, wherever the village, confronted by the shooting in cold blood of their tribal leaders or of decimation of their ranks by firing squads or by other atrocities practiced upon selected leaders of their community, would more readily surrender to a guerrilla occupation, however small, than to try to resist them, only to suffer the same fate themselves.

The real point is that most of those people, being without adequate means to defend themselves, would find it easier to go along and cooperate, and perhaps spare the lives of the young ones or themselves, than to be mowed down by well-armed groups of terrorists from the ranks of the guerrillas.

On the other hand, terrorists have every advantage in some respects. In order to win, all that they have to do is to hit and run. All they have to do is to strike terror, not to deliver a program, and then fade away under cover of jungle or night, to strike again at some other place.

I reject, thus, the equation of the villagers cooperating with the terrorists with the opposition to the United States and our presence in Vietnam.

Another question that comes from the colleges suggests that, as a practical question, we are losing the war in Vietnam, anyway, and, therefore, we should not continue an effort to do better there; that we should get out while we can, and perhaps get out as gracefully as we can.

That point of view, too, is nonsense, as I see it. The war in Vietnam has been going on for 10 years. At the very beginning it was said that the war could not last for more than 6 months. That kind of warfare has almost become a way of life because of practices and policies designed to unsettle and terrorize that have plagued the Government in South Vietnam. This is not to make any apologies for the little game of "who is the president in South Vietnam" from time to time, for that in itself is another subject. But it is to say that the war is not lost and need not be lost in South Vietnam.

A noted correspondent for the Paris weekly, L'Express, Georges Chaffard, has filed a series of dispatches which indicates that there has been a serious shifting, a significant one, in Vietnam. That statement comes from a source which, in general, has been sharply critical not only of the American position there, but of the Saigon Government there as well. These articles report increasing cases of battle fatigue among the North Vietnamese and among guerrilla groups, whose ranks are no longer marching in a single step, as once was the case. It should be pointed out, as Joseph Alsop has mentioned in one of his columns, that Georges Chaffard is no friend of our present position there, but is merely recording a significant shift as he sees it on the spot. The correspondent does not predict, I hasten to add, an immediate end to the struggle. He has not pronounced that, therefore, in the wake of some depressing developments, there is suddenly to be a victory. What he is saying is that there has been a measurable shift, and it is the kind of shift that represents a basis for realistic judgment of the present policy that our Government has been pursuing in Vietnam.

Further, we now increasingly read in the press, reports of new cracks in the facade of intransigence, at Hanoi; cracks that suggest that the North Vietnamese themselves have become badly split due to the new pressures that have been imposed upon them.

Other correspondents write of vastly improved morale in South Vietnam, including the fact that 7,000 young men volunteered for military service in the South last month alone. A few months ago, the reports would likely have been that the same number of men had dodged the draft.

I would note that the picture is not all bright, and one would not find it wise to be overenthusiastic in the circumstances. There are those who still consider the conflict incapable of successful resolution, and they offer evidence to support their concept. But I insist that there has been a sufficient shift in the general complexion of affairs in South Vietnam today to sustain an attitude of guarded, cautious optimism, and a spirit of determination to continue the President's policy of a careful and planned use of force in North Vietnam.

We have also heard much of the idea that China represents the wave of the future in southeast Asia, that its power will inevitably dominate the entire area. I would agree that China will certainly be of increasing influence in that area in future years, but that is a totally different concept than actual domination of smaller, weaker nations. On this point I subscribe to what President Johnson said at Johns Hopkins that "there is no end to that argument until all of the nations of Asia are swallowed up."

Some of the comment from those who protest our involvement in Vietnam casts us in the role of blood-thirsty warmongers, unmoved by the slaughter of innocents, the deaths of women and children, and completely unaware of the issues causing their deaths.

On Tuesday I had printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Anguish of Power." That editorial pointed out that the responsibilities of world leadership, which cannot be ignored, present us with alternatives, all of which will result in bloodshed and human suffering. It noted:

> Each of our decisions to use force or to fail to use force is filled with potential pain and injury for millions. This is the anguish that goes with great power. No one can deliver us from it.

The last question from the academic world which I will discuss here today—although there are many others—is the charge that we are all but alone in the nations of the free world in our policy in Vietnam, that we are earning universal condemnation and further tarnishing whatever good image is left us around the globe.

Let me say, that we must win our own respect first. We start with ourselves, to acquire what we regard as the best educated guesses, and we realize what our obligation is to mankind and to the world of which we are a part. We have to live with our conscience. We have to do what we believe in our best judgment is right because it is right, not because we are trying to win a popularity poll with some of the governments of the globe.

Any time we weigh foreign policy on the basis of taking a straw vote around the nations of the world, at that time we will be in deep trouble. This is not to suggest that we should ignore them. We must weigh and assess world opinion, national opinion, and the opinion of our colleagues, at all times. These are factors which we need to fit into the total scale of values which will guide us in our judgments. It does not mean that they should become a determining factor.

Those who are the most powerful in this world are rarely the most loved. Need I remind the Senate of the traditional role in history of the British nation for so many centuries, which in some respects became probably the most hated country in the world. We know that was true up and down the east coast of the United States for a long time. Especially was it true in Chicago during the 1920's, when the Mayor of Chicago ran his political campaigns based upon vilification of the King of England. This should remind us that with great power goes great responsibility and a great deal of unpopularity in the world.

We can never conduct our policies on the basis of trying to be loved by everyone or trying to be the good guy. We must do what the times require, for the simple reason that this is a world made up mostly of anarchy, and no one has agreed upon what rules we are to play as a result. There are others who are willing to be the bad guys, to take advantage of the inhibitions of civilization, of culture, of decent people, in order to exploit their inclinations not to act.

We dare not surrender to the temptation on the other side to exploit our respect for human life, our respect for the high level of civilization, and our abhorrence of war. One of the great calculations in the East has been the conviction that although the United States is a great power, that because of its highly civilized inhibitions it would not be willing to use its power. They are gambling on our unwillingness to use it.

It is not sufficient to suggest that because we have some new answers to old questions that we have sufficient justification for our role in Vietnam. We must ask ourselves—regardless of the success of our role—what business do we have in Vietnam at all. I submit that there are several reasons why to forfeit our presence in this troubled area would be to forfeit our leadership of the free world.

In the recent history of mankind the only force which has been able to keep international relationships on a peaceful plane has been that of balance of power. The Pax Britannica is a demonstration of how this concept, if pursued skillfully, can eliminate international conflicts on a global scale. And I would point out that though international conflicts once could be resolved upon the battlefields of Europe, this is no longer the case.

It makes a real difference to southeast Asia where the line representing the balance of power is drawn. This line is fairly well determined across most of the globe but in Vietnam we have a soft spot that the Communists seek to exploit for the extension of their domination.

The nations of southeast Asia have adopted the concept of wait and see over this struggle. For it is evident that the future course of these nations will be determined by our success or failure in stopping this pattern of conquest. Already we see the revival of Communist activity in Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia, Laos, and Cambodia. The picture is clear: what can succeed in South Vietnam can succeed in these nations, too—and this applies for both sides in equal measure.

National independence is a concept for which peoples have died over the centuries. I am convinced that the independence of these nations from direct external control, no matter what is the nature or form of their government, best serves the interests of these nations and of world peace.

The policy of planned escalation of this conflict is the subject which began here in the Senate on February 17. That policy now is being carefully applied by the Johnson administration. These are what I consider to be the goals of this policy:

First, we seek to set the stage for negotiations between the parties involved in this dispute. We mean to convince those who thought we were summer soldiers that we will honor our commitments in South Vietnam regardless of the discomfort, regardless of the size of the effort. I believe this fact is now becoming apparent to Hanoi and I believe this fact is now becoming apparent and I believe the chances for meaningful negotiations are improving.

All of us readily admit, unless it be the most rabid militarist on the loose—and I trust there are none of those except in retirement—that there is no military solution to southeast Asia. We will not solve the southeast Asia problem with bullets, guns, and troops. We must reach the kind of stage at which it will be possible to sit down realistically and try to find some substitute for war there.

But in February we were in no position to negotiate. The other side was not disposed to negotiate. Why should they? They were convinced that they were going to get everything free. They would get all that they desired without sitting down with anyone. If they would only wait it out, the Americans would soon go home.

Thus, likewise, we had to acquire a position which would lead them to understand that we were there to stay, and that their only chance to realize some kind of settlement better than the drains on their resources that war was making is to talk.

So these, then, were the purposes of planned escalation.

Now, nearly 3 months later, it is possible to assess our Government's program with the advantage of hindsight. In spite of the attacks made by the critics of the President, in spite of the assaults

on the part of those who thought that it would be suicide and that we ought to get out, it is now possible to note measurable progress through the policy of planned escalation.

Second, we seek to lessen the chances of accidental war. To those who believe that our policy is just the reverse, I would suggest that accidental wars are created by those who misread the intentions of their adversaries. A policy of uncertain response to aggression encourages that aggression and further aggression. At a certain point our alternatives would be exhausted and we would be at war. When the Communists understand our intentions, I believe the chances for accidental war will be materially lessened. We shall never be free of the threat of war, but we can reduce the risk as much as possible.

A third goal of this policy is the sealing off of the problem of South Vietnam. As George A. Carver, Jr., pointed out in an excellent article in the April issue of Foreign Affairs, there is a power struggle in South Vietnam, but neither of the two sides are connected with the Vietcong. The infiltration of men and arms from the North was stepped up in February in an attempt to solve all problems from the outside. The South Vietnamese should be given the chance to work out their own future and a closed border will help them do it. No one suggests that democracy as we know it can be installed there, but that is no reason to deny the South Vietnamese the right to plot their own future free from outside domination.

With these goals in mind, I firmly believe that we are making definite progress in this conflict. A cross section of press accounts indicates the morale is increasing in the South. The increase in military volunteers has already been referred to. More and more weapons are being captured by the South Vietnamese Army. The ranks of the guerrilla forces are being thinned by the failure to replace casualties and the increasing number of deserters. More and more of these South Vietnamese trained in the North for guerrilla warfare return to their homes and families immediately upon being infiltrated southward. In many places they have shifted from offense to defense.

Further stresses and strains are visible in the Moscow-Peiping Axis. Name calling between the two is increasing and some physical conflict has appeared in Chinese student attacks upon Soviet Embassies and reversed incidents in Moscow.

In Hanoi there are increasing reports of a split in the ranks of policymakers. Young officers are contesting the strategy of the old revolutionaries. Doubts about the wisdom of present policies are increasing.

The announcement this morning that a battalion of Australian infantrymen are being sent to South Vietnam is welcome news which indicates that our allies have confidence in our ability to carry out our program and that we do not stand alone in this troublesome endeavor.

Finally, the President's speech in Baltimore, following as it did in the wake of American escalation and in the wake of a dispatch of increased troop personnel from the United States to Vietnam, came as a gesture of strength and of a sincere desire for peace, rather than being subject, instead, to being considered a desperate porposal by a nation that was on the ropes in southeast Asia. That speech could not have been made in February with any dignity. That speech could not have received any kind of credence anywhere around the world 2 months before. But because of the acceleration that was planned in North Vietnam, it was possible to show to the rest of the world again the true face of America; namely, that we have no designs on anyone else's government, that we covet no other country's territory, and that our goal is peace wherever we can obtain it and in whatever proportions it can be achieved. We have shown to the world that we are willing to put our men, our money, our policy, and our hearts where our words have been. That is an important step forward.

None of these facts suggest that we shall be at the negotiating table next month, but they are signs that our policy is having the effect we wish it to have and that it should be continued.

The responsibilities we have accepted in Vietnam are ugly and unpleasant, filled with suffering, death, and dislocation. But we have accepted them in the hope that in the final tally mankind will have benefited, that as a result of what we do here this year and next some peoples will have a chance to seek and find independence and self-determination that otherwise would have been denied them.

Our policies, as a product of human endeavor, may not be perfect. They should be debated, discussed, analyzed, and criticized by those in our colleges and universities and by the man on the street. But it is my hope that these debates and discussions will be conducted with an objective view of the facts and in the context of honorable differences among honorable men. We have the choice of helping to steer the course of history or of muddying the waters with fruitless and irrational posturing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a series of columns and articles. First, an article from the Evening Star of April 27 on the war; second, an editorial from the Washington Post, issue of April 28, on the war; next, a column by William S. White that was published in the Washington Post on April 28 on the same question; still another by Roscoe Drummond, from the same issue of the Post; likewise, an editorial entitled "Two-Pronged Attack on Vietcong," published in Life magazine of April 30; and a reprint from Life magazine of April 30 of material that appeared in a French weekly, L'Express, to which I referred earlier in my remarks as reprinted in Life magazine.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 27, 1965]

"MCNAMARA'S WAR"

Secretary McNamara said he decided to hold his televised press conference on the war in Vietnam at the request of the reporters who cover the Pentagon. Undoubtedly there was a factual basis for this. Our guess is, however, that the Defense Secretary also wanted to let the people see how things have been going in which his critics call "McNamara's war."

They have been going rather well. Since the much-condemned bombing of North Vietnam got underway in February some 14 highway and railroad bridges have been knocked out. In addition, there has been substantial damage to military installations, radar stations, supply depots, truck convoys, and the like.

Mr. McNamara says that this has not halted the movement of arms, supplies, and men from the north to South Vietnam. It may not even have substantially slowed down this traffic. The essential point to bear in mind, however, is that we can keep up the bombings day after day after day. And to an appreciable extent, we can also interdict any similar movement along the sea routes.

The critics say that the bombings will never bring the Communists to the conference table and that, instead, they will merely stiffen the resistance of Ho Chi Minh. We do not believe it.

It is perfectly clear that American power in the air and in the China Sea cannot be successfully challenged. And as long as we control the air and the sea it is absurd to think there will be any massive introduction of Red Chinese or Russian troops into the combat area. They couldn't be supplied if they could get there. Meanwhile, it is also clear that the United States and the South Vietnamese Air Force can continue to chop away at every target of consequence in North Vietnam. It may take a long time, but these targets surely are doomed if Hanoi hangs on.

So what thoughts must be running through the mind of Ho Chi Minh? According to Mr. McNamara, some 89,000 Vietcong troops have been killed in the past 4½ years. The Communist sources of manpower in the south are drying up, and it is becoming increasingly necessary to send in reinforcements from the north. Ho Chi Minh is nobody's fool. As he sees the turn which the war is taking as he notes the absence of important aid from Peiping and Moscow, and as he surveys the mounting ruin in his own country, there must be times when he is a deeply discouraged man.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr 28, 1965]

VIETNAM POLICY: CONSENSUS OF EXTREMES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

There is every reason to believe President Johnson will widen and hold a decisive consensus in support of a strong policy in Vietnam.

He has one special asset. He is occupying his usual stance at the center. His policy is wedded to neither extreme. He rests on two pillars—clear determination to defend as long as the aggression continues; clear willingness to talk whenever Hanoi will start talking.

His senatorial, newspaper, and professional critics can offer no acceptable alternative. They are prepared to accept Chinese Communist domination of all southeast Asia. This is an alternative the American people will not accept without trying to do something about it.

The President has the backing of many Democrats (his offer of unconditional discussions won the approval of the ADA) and most Republicans.

Despite the honest, emotional student pickets and the college teach-ins, this leaves Mr. Johnson in a strategic position. And here is the evidence:

The Gallup poll finds that 29 percent of the country would like to see the United States withdraw completely from Vietnam, stop the fighting whatever the effects, and start negotiations whatever the outcome. It also finds that 31 percent of the country favors stepping up military activity and going the full distance of declaring war.

The President embraces neither extreme. He does not propose to withdraw or even cease defending. But he will start talking even while defending. He does not seek a solution by military means alone, but he will use military means until Hanoi is willing to use the conference table.

Where does this leave Mr. Johnson with respect to a public consensus? To obtain further evidence of the public's attitudes toward the handling of the situation in Vietnam, Dr. Gallup put this question to people in the same survey cited above: "Do you think the United States is handling affairs in Vietnam as well as could be expected, or do you think we are handling affairs there badly?"

The result was that by a ratio of more than 2 to 1 the American people approve of the Government's handling of the situation.

If there is any threat to the President's expanding and holding this consensus on Vietnam, it would only come, I think, from any sign of weakening in his policy.

Republican support is crucial to the Johnson consensus. The President knows it.

But the President knows that any sign of appeasement, intended or accidental, Republican support would vanish like a rocket into outer politics. As they did to President Truman over Korea, the Republicans can never call this "Johnson's war," but they could fight and possibly win election if it ever turned into "Johnson's appeasement."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 28, 1965]

VIETNAM POLICY

President Johnson's press conference statements, added to those of Secretary McNamara earlier this week, make the American policy about as clear as it can be made with words. The policy enunciated at Baltimore stands. It is, as the President described it, a policy of "firmness with moderation."

The two press conferences have put at rest the alarms about nuclear weapons—if there ever was any justification for them. And that is a good thing. The situation is alarming enough without conjuring up risks that nothing but sheer folly could persuade this Government to take in the Vietnam war. Nuclear weapons would be about as useful in Vietnam as French 75s in a fly-swatting campaign. It is to be hoped that this will end this scare.

The President reemphasized that the American purpose is a "peaceful settlement." It is to be hoped that this strong reaffirmation has not been overlooked by Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow. The crisis in South Vietnam is one that admits of a peaceful solution. The United States has no purpose there inconsistent with the legitimate aims of North Vietnam or irreconcilable with the independence of South Vietnam. The President has pointed this out again in terms that can only be construed as an invitation to peace—if peace is desired.

The strong emphasis that the United States now is giving to the role of North Vietnam, evident in the President's press conference, the McNamara press conference, and in other public statements, makes the fact of North Vietnam's aggression a first premise of our position. The indicated scale of infiltration may be in conformity with the available statistics and intelligence. But our reports should not be so phrased as to suggest that there is no indigenous revolutionary force in South Vietnam. The country must not be misled in the belief that this is wholly a case of external aggression any more than it should allow itself to be misled by critics and enemies into the belief that we deal only with a civil war. It is both. If the infiltration from the North could be stopped, the internal struggle might be manageable, but it would not necessarily end at once. It would still be difficult.

Americans must resist the temptation to believe that the recent improvements in the military situation forecast any quick or easy solution. Our firmness and resolution will be the more believable if we make it plain that we know how troublesome and dangerous a trial we face, and that we nevertheless are determined to fulfill our commitments. Our professions of peace will be the more believable if we do not conceal our anxiety to bring to an end this struggle and the sacrifices it entails.

It is to be hoped that the President's plain speaking will be understood.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 28, 1965]

SCREECHING SPLINTER: ARTICULATE POLICY SUPPORT NEEDED

(By William S. White)

The frightening outlines of what could become an American tragedy without example can be seen in the feverish attacks of American citizens on the integrity of their own Government's course in resisting Communist aggression in Vietnam.

A small but screechingly articulate Democratic splinter in the Senate is day by day inviting the North Vietnamese and Chinese Communists to believe these monstrously dangerous falsehoods:

That the United States does not really mean it when it says we will not allow the Communist invaders a free run over South Vietnam on the way to eventual conquest of all southeast Asia.

That the Communists may safely persist in their attacks in the supposition that President Johnson's policy—which was also the policy of the Republican President Dwight Eisenhower and the Democratic President John Kennedy—is opposed by a great and possibly even a decisive part of the American political community.

That any number of Communist refusals to open honorable negotiations—that is, negotiations preconditioned by a halt in Communist assaults upon South Vietnam—will not stop the critics from ceaselessly demanding that the United States cease its own bombing; anyhow, and regardless of continued Communist aggression.

And what is to all accounts a small but screechingly articulate minority of college students and professors is contributing its bit. It is suggesting—and the Communist foreign press is lapping it up—that the real intellectuals and true friends of "peace" in this Nation are in total revolt against our cause in Vietnam.

Thus when the monumentally patient Secretary of State Dean Rusk at last speaks out plainly against all the bitter nonsense, all the blind rejection of the demonstrated facts of history about Communist aggression, what befalls him? Why, such a Senator as WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, calls for the head not only of Dean Rusk but also of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

To MORSE, our action in Vietnam, in which we are carrying out the solemn pledges of three American Presidents, is "immoral and godless." He rages at the word appeasement. But what else, in fact, is it when men in public positions persistently find so much that is wrong with us and so much that is right with the Communist invaders? Another Democratic Senator, RUSSELL LONG, of Louisiana, goes to the heart of it.

For, he says truthfully, "modern-day appeasers and isolationists" are leading the Communists to suppose "that we will surrender all Asia to them if they will just keep up the pressure. So long as our adversaries suspect that this may be the case, they are going to pay an increasingly greater price to test our will."

Criticism of any foreign policy is, of course, both right and useful, so long as critics do not distort the demonstrable facts of history beyond reason and beyond belief. But no decent dialog can be conducted with Senators who use hysterical venom in place of reason and shameful attacks upon devoted public men—from the privileged sanctuary of the Senate floor—in place of logic and persuasion.

Nor can such a dialog be held with students who openly threaten to resist the common obligation of military service "unless we get out of Vietnam," even while they are applauding motion picture propaganda openly made by the Communists in Vietnam. This is nothing less than sedition; and from men whose very status as students gives them right now a deferment from the draft while better young men are carrying rifles in Vietnam.

Why don't we hear more from the college students who do not go along with this sick and ugly thing? Where are the college professors who respect history and who do not believe in dishonoring the honorable commitments of this counrty? It is past time for every American to do his duty, so as not to allow these noisy and fatally foolish fringe groups to lead the Communists into some mortal underestimate of the real strength and the real resolve of the vast, sensible majority of the American people.

[From Life magazine, Apr. 30, 1965]

TWO-PRONGED ATTACK ON VIETCONG

It is quite possible for the forces of law and order to win a war against Communist-backed guerrillas. This has just been proved in the Congo, where the Tshombe government's mercenary-led army has swept the Simba rebels out of the crucial northeast. "The water has dried up in the Congo," said one Leopoldville observer, referring to Mao Tse-tung's famous textbook for guerrillas, which tells them to move among the villagers like fish.

The war in Vietnam is much vaster and more complicated than the Simba action, but it is also a guerrilla war in which the Vietcong still move like fish. Its military objectives are not the bases and bridges our bombers have been clobbering in the north but the villages and rice fields where most of the 15 million South Vietnamese try to live and work. It is a political as well as a military war and "will be won or lost here in the provinces," as Joseph Grainger, the civilian AID man recently killed by the Vietcong, wrote his mother. Like hundreds of other U.S. civilians trying to improve the lot of the Vietnamese, he was fighting the political war. It is that war in which Ho Chi Minh still thinks he has the advantage and which our bombers alone cannot win.

There is nevertheless mounting evidence that the air raids in North Vietnam and the general firming up of the U.S. military commitment have had a marked effect on the decisive political equation in Vietnam. Our increased pressure has slowed the flow of supplies from Hanoi, boosted the morale of the Saigon government and armed forces, and increased the willingness of Vietnamese peasants to volunteer much needed information. The military and political wars interact on each other. It is therefore idle to criticize the "official theory of the war," which in-

cludes bombing, on the ground that the war can't be won by airplanes.

President Johnson is right to pursue his "official theory" until its full results are proved. He is right to ignore the untimely suggestion of Senator FULBRIGHT for suspending the air strikes. He is right to intensify U.S. support of the Vietnamese Army, to extend the sea patrols and to pursue other forms of action recommended by McNamara and Taylor after their meeting in Honolulu last week.

We even sympathize with the impulse, though not the method, of Johnson's impatient handling of Indian Prime Minister Shastri and other unhelpful critics of our policy in Vietnam. Johnson himself adopted the proposal of 17 neutralist nations meeting at Belgrade for unconditional discussions toward a cease-fire and peace. Since Moscow, Peiping and Hanoi have all spurned that proposal, the diplomatic ball is not in Johnson's court. He is right to pursue the tough side of his well balanced policy. He could report a fortnight ago that "news from the battlefront is improving;" he can legitimately hope to report better diplomatic news before too long.

The political war in the villages, meanwhile, needs beefing up along with the military war. Johnson has promised "a massive new effort to improve the lives of the people of southeast Asia" and appointed Eugene Black to work out details with the U.N. He has just sent rural electrification experts to Saigon. More effort along the same lines need not await a cease-fire. The villagers need more protection against Vietcong terrorism and they also need more tangible expectations against Vietcong promises. Apathy as well as fear compose the water in which the Vietcong swim.

As in the Congo, it can be dried up.

[From Life magazine, Apr. 30, 1965]

IS THE VIETCONG SUCH A SURE WINNER AFTER ALL?

(NOTE.—The following is excerpted from a four-part series in the liberal French weekly L'Express. It is by the respected French correspondent Georges Chaffard and is the first assessment from behind enemy lines of the effect of toughened U.S. policy on the Vietcong and North Vietnam.)

The American Air Force's show of strength, the encampment of marines in central Vietnam, the use of new weapons, China's and Russia's relatively passive attitude have tended to arrest pacifist trends which had begun to be rampant in Saigon. In the capital, one is no longer so sure the Vietcong will be the real winners; American determination makes one think. In short, a turn in public opinion has begun.

In the military domain, the influx of munitions and the new Marine units will force the Vietcong command to attempt a few decisive operations before the weight of the formidable American machine burdens them much longer. It would be no surprise, therefore, if an offensive were launched shortly by regular battalions against the Da Nang base, no matter what the cost.

However, such an increase in effort by the Vietcong will coincide with an appreciable decrease in the flow of aid by land and sea from the north. The heavy arms—105 cannons, antiaircraft weapons, 81-millimeter mortars—required to attack American troops head on and to neutralize their air support are scarce. There is no other choice than to chance supplies from the north. But only limited activity is possible on the infiltration routes along the Laotian border: first, because the American bombing raids occur almost daily; then, because the north-south trip lasts many weeks personnel is decimated from malaria and dysentery; finally, because the American-South Vietnamese Special Forces operating along the border have sophisticated detecting devices which allow them to pinpoint far in advance the truck convoys which sometimes try to come down the Ho Chi Minh trail.

The sea route is both shorter and more efficient. But the 7th Fleet's program to provide small boats will be accelerated and buttressed by the addition of small craft of a type similar to minesweepers.

A decrease in the flow of aid when the Vietcong needs it most, and the psychological repercussions of the American strikes in the north, will place the Vietcong in a difficult position in the weeks to come. This is not to say that those hardened fighters are ready to yield. They continue to voice confidence in the validity of their reasoning and to bet that Americans will not escalate the war beyond the fatal point. Moreover, some statements dropped by people in the Vietcong suggest that after all it is now up to the North to "sweat."

Since the first American air strike in August 1964 after the Gulf of Tonkin incident, the Government and the military leaders of North Vietnam have begun to prepare a new resistance on their own. Food and ammunition stocks have been replenished in the higher regions, in fortresses held at one time against the French. Military training for peasant and workers' militias has been intensified. An evacuation plan for the factories and their personnel has been developed. Since the Donghoi bombings in February, part of Hanoi's civilian population has been sent to the provinces, starting with the women and children—80,000 persons had left Hanoi by the beginning of March. The ministries are prepared to evacuate en masse the capital archives and government staff.

The principal danger for North Vietnam is not an invasion of American troops. But if American aircraft raze the factories around Hanoi, destroy the port of Haiphong, deactivate the coal mines of Hongay, flatten under their bombs the famous steel complex of Thai Nguyen—the pride of North Vietnamese industry—and, finally, sever the three railways which link Hanoi to Haiphong and to Red China (Langson and Yunnan), then the country is paralyzed—18 million North Vietnamese reduced to a subsistence economy, isolated from the rest of the world. "In that case, we would be done for," admitted a Hanoi official.

To avoid such a collapse, the Republic of North Vietnam needs antiaircraft weapons and planes capable of matching the American armada. It needs to rebuild its chain of radar stations methodically destroyed by American bombers. It does not need volunteers, Chinese or otherwise. It would have no use for them as long as it is not faced with the threat of land invasion. The presence of Chinese is, furthermore, unwanted because of the political debt that would be felt around North Vietnam.

But who will provide Vietcong Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap with the modern weapons he needs? China? It does not even have any of its own. Russia? The Russians would intervene in the Vietnamese trouble only reluctantly. Privately, the Russians explain that a Soviet-United States war would be a horrible thing and could not be accepted except for a stake more important than Vietnam. "Let the leaders of Hanoi begin by helping themselves, and Moscow will give aid.

In this connection, one Soviet official cracked: "When a man is losing his pants, would you want someone to give him a belt? Let him pull up his pants first."

But one thing is certain: if the war were to spread to North Vietnam and the United States were to climb the last steps of an escalating war, Hanoi would not yield. North Vietnam's regular army would no longer hesitate to join hands openly with the resistance fighters in the South.

The French Communist Party delegation was in North Vietnam several months ago. In the course of lengthy discussion, the Hanoi leaders explained the substance of their objectives for South Vietnam: to obtain the withdrawal of American troops (but under conditions that would not cause the United States to lose face); to reestablish the traditional exchanges between the two zones (the North needs South Vietnamese rice urgently).

So far as negotiations are concerned, North Vietnam is more than willing to join in any peace talks which would give it a chance for the diplomatic homecoming" dreamed of since 1954, and to appear at such talks as the prime Vietnamese spokesman. Ironically, the American bombings have increased the desire for negotiations (to spare the North from systematic destruction of its economic network), at the same time making the desire harder to articulate without appearing to give in to the "imperialist gangsters."

There have been a number of recent popular revolts in Namdinh, North Vietnam. They were put down quickly, but they showed that tightened police controls and the increased deprivations imposed by the shadow of war have been poorly received.

An interruption of aid from Hanoi to the Vietcong could only lead to bargaining. Even the Vietcong guerrillas, living under extremely difficult conditions in their hideouts, where they strut around in front of any foreign visitors, hope for peace. But the guerrillas make harsher demands than their allies in Hanoi. They are afraid of being duped by diplomatic maneuverings and are tired of playing the game of North Vietnam as well as that of the pro-American middle class of Saigon.

Finally, the National Liberation Front feels it can win the war with its own forces and doesn't need to accept a doubtful compromise.

My most interesting contact on this point has been a vice chairman of the NLF, Huynh Tanh Pat, a dry and smiling little man who fought with the Peace Movement before joining the Vietcong.

"Doesn't the increasingly serious nature of American intervention bother you?" I asked him. "We are convinced that the Americans won't go beyond certain limits," he replied. "That's why Hanoi hasn't retaliated by sending troops south."

"We're ready to fight for 10 years, 20 years or more," assures one NLF proclamation issued March 22. But at the same time, the regular battalions and one section of the administrative personnel of South Vietnam were retreating to the mountains north of Saigon, leaving behind them farewell messages strongly reminiscent of 1954, epitomized in the slogan: "Provisional withdrawal to return another day."

Wasn't this the admission of defeat in South Vietnam? Certainly they hoped that by regrouping the major portion of their regular troops in a less accessible place, they could establish impenetrable citadels which would be assets in negotiations.

I often questioned my contacts in the NLF on aid extended by the North. The answer was never a flat denial. It was more an indirect admission that betrayed the inadequacy of this aid: "If you think it is easy to deliver men and cannons through the Laotion trails. * * *" one said to me.

Guerrillas in the southern areas sometimes have the impression of being left to their own resources. The situation is certainly different in central Vietnam and in the mountain regions, near the Laotian infiltration routes.

Up to the last few months, mostly South Vietnamese in the Vietcong were sent to the south. These men had retreated to the north after 1954 and volunteered to return to their native provinces. But now Tonkin (native northern) groups are taking part in

the convoys—first because the veterans of 1954 have grown older and are not always capable of undertaking long treks through the underbrush; secondly, because once they arrive in the south, their first thought is to see their families. Some do not rejoin their units.

Progressively, as the war has escalated, the Vietcong administration itself has been forced to levy taxes—first in produce, then in money—and to draft soldiers. Taxes and the draft are, in normal times, considered by any peasant in the world to be a necessary evil. But when you have believed, in a moment of enthusiasm, that the new leaders are going to do away with one or the other and when, on top of it all, still another authority, Saigon, continues to get its cut and recruit its soldiers, you can understand the sort of pained resignation in the faces of the peasants. Certainly the arguments of the Vietcong are glib, letting everyone think anything bad that happens is the fault of the American aggressors. But the buildup evident in the air attacks and the all too obvious destructive powers of napalm and gas have thrown the country people into a state of mind close to rebellion. Now it isn't just the withdrawal of the Americans that they want. They want peace; no matter what the terms are and no matter who the leaders are.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Frequently when I hear discussions urging our withdrawal, the thought comes to me: To what area shall we withdraw? How far must we retreat to become freed of this threat to the security of the nations of the free world?

I have in mind that during the French Indochina War, the Geneva Pact was made. By that pact, it was determined that certain lands would be given to the Communists, certain southern parts would be assigned to the nations of the free world, and that that would bring tranquillity to that area. But we have found that that did not bring peace.

The Communists were not content with the creation of a dividing line. We had trouble in Laos, which was, of course, a part of French Indochina. In 1962 we made a pact declaring that Laos would be neutral. Many of us contended that a coalition government in Laos would not work. But the Government of the United States and the governments of other nations made an agreement to create a three-headed government, with a neutral in the middle, a Communist on the left, and a Conservative on the right. That was 3 years ago.

The nations of the West pulled out their men. France did. The United States did. The Communists did not. If our position in South Vietnam is dangerous, it is partly as a consequence of what happened in Laos in 1962.

My question is: Where do we run to? Will we have quiet and tranquillity if we pull out? What will happen in Thailand? What will happen in Malaysia? What will be likely to happen in Taiwan? How far away must we go to appease the Communists? Has the Senator from Wyoming given any thought to that?

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his discerning question. He himself is an expert on this subject, being a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He has given deep study and thought to the problem.

We ought to have learned the hard way in history that the appetite of an aggressor is not satisfied by giving him a little; by giving him somebody else's food supply or somebody else's territory. We tried that with Mr. Hitler. We tried it in Austria. We tried it in Czechoslovakia. We tried it in Poland, hoping to succeed, but the only result was to intensify the hunger and ambition of a dictator.

There are those who seek to answer this question—by saying that we still have our great power—our Navy and our Air Force, and that we should pull out and get off the mainland. But by pulling off the mainland of Asia we forfeit one of the great prizes in modern power structure; namely, southeast Asia to mainland China.

We could have pulled out of Western Europe in 1945, at the end of World War II. We alone had the atom bomb, and we could have defended ourselves in a very narrow way by maintaining our own defenses and leaving Europe to defend itself. But Europe is a great ally. She is a great source of strength. Europe wanted to know if we would pull out or whether we would stay and help her to become independent; to help resist the encroachment of the Soviet Union upon the West. Berlin answered that question. We answered with no uncertainty.

The same kind of question is argued today. We would not have the same power if we made our enemy more powerful by retreat. Our relative strength would be diminished.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations for 8 years. I have heard the advice of Secretaries of State, Secretaries of Defense, members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and, indirectly, the advice of the Presidents who have held office since 1956. I have also heard the advice of President Truman.

The record will show that every President, beginning with Truman and continuing through Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson; every Secretary of State, every Secretary of Defense, and every member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has taken the uniform position that the security of our country is wrapped up in keeping southeast Asia in the hands of people and governments that are friendly to the West.

Time and again, I have asked the question, If we should pull out of southeast Asia, what would happen? The answer has been that a vacuum would be created; that the Communists would step in; and that the first line of defense of the United States, instead of being 10,000 miles away, would be moved to the shores of California, or even, I suppose, to the shores of Hawaii.

The Senator from Wyoming touched on a subject that we have forgotten, that is, the history of what occurred in the days of Hitler, in 1933, when World War I had been concluded and the Versailles Treaty and other treaties were made. Two important provisions were included in those treaties. One was that Germany was not to have a military force; second, that the Rhineland was to be a neutral, nonmilitarized area.

That pact was kept until Hitler came into power. In 1933, in violation of the pact, Hitler began to conscript German youth. France and England protested: "You are violating the treaty." But that was as far as they went. Hitler built up his 500,000 men into stormtroops and then moved into the Rhineland. That was in 1935, as I recall. The United States protested the action in the Rhineland. We said: "You are violating the treaty." But that was all that was done. Hitler's maw was not appeased. He wanted Austria, so Chamberlain went to Austria with his umbrella. It is a pitiful and shameful episode to read how that great man trembled in the presence of Hitler. But he laid down the rule and surrendered Austria.

The world thought that that would satisfy Hitler. But no; he then asked for the Sudetenland from Czechoslovakia. The same story was repeated. Hitler got Sudetenland and then said, "That is not enough. I now want Czechoslovakia." Mussolini went into Ethiopia. He took Albania, a nearby country. Then Hitler said, "I want the corridor to Poland up to Danzig." He demanded it. It was not given to him immediately.

Then, France and England said, "We cannot stand it any longer. We must fight." They decided to defend themselves at the time that was most dangerous, and at a time that insured that the loss of life would be tremendous compared to what it would have been if they had stopped him from militarizing the Rhineland, and developing his military forces.

What the property damage was and what the loss of life was through that program of appeasement can never be told.

All we know is that the lands of the earth contain the bodies of the men who died in the millions because freemen did not have the will to say, "You cannot continue to violate your pacts."

I commend the Senator from Wyoming for his statement. We all want peace. It would be calloused and wrong to think that there is anyone within our country, especially those with high responsibility, who does not want to insure that our youth shall be free from the ravages of war.

I am definitely of the conviction that we can never surrender enough to satisfy the Communists. Satisfaction will come to them only when their flag is on our dome and we are the slaves of the dictators. Those who argue retreat and withdrawal have no conception of what the eventual price might be.

I am not one who would say to the men who fought in World War I, World War II, and Korea, "Your valor has been forgotten." I am not one who would say to the families of soldiers who were killed, "We care not for those who died." We

owe something to those who died and to the families of those who died.

President Johnson does not want this involvement. He has not brought it upon us. It is the Communists who have created this situation. The situation will grow worse if we show any sign or indication that we do not have faith in our country.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his contribution. I suggest to him that he should have been a professor of history in view of his recitation of the history of the thirties, which years produced Hitler and Mussolini. It is a history that ought not to be repeated now for any citizens of the world.

It is sometimes said that history repeats itself. But it was the great historian, Arnold Toynbee who reminded us that history repeats itself only when men make the same mistakes again. It is no great disaster to make a mistake sometimes. But it can be a disaster if one makes the same mistake again.

We have the story of the thirties, as has been so ably related by the Senator from Ohio, to guide us now. There are those who raise the question, "What is the connection between the western and the eastern world? Their philosophy, standards, and priorities are different in the East." I say to those who raise those questions that there is one common denominator. That is the integrity, independence, and knowledge that an aggressor cannot be stopped by feeding him someone else's possessions. An aggressor must be stopped by our willingness to risk the use of force, if necessary, in order to withstand his continued pressure to move into new areas.

That is the issue in the East right now. I am not one who believes that our frontiers would be pushed back to Hawaii, San Francisco, New York, or Boston. I believe that we would still have Okinawa as a bastion of our defense there. We would still have some support at Taiwan. We would have the advantage of our Navy and air bases. However, the real point is that the moment a critical area is given to the other side in southeast Asia, at that time we diminish our relative power in the world. This part of southeast Asia has been a key goal of major powers throughout the history of our time. Japan started World War II in an effort to get southeast Asia, as I have said on another occasion. England fought a war to get it. So did the Dutch. So did the Germans. So did the Portuguese. The hard fact is that it makes a difference who has southeast Asia, as to what kind of balance exists in the world.

In my judgment, China, already with more people than it can feed and with its few resources to get its economy moving, is not a power which should be permitted to walk freely into this part of the world.

In southeast Asia are great repositories of rice, tin, oil, bauxite, and rubber. This indeed is a prize in the hard technique of power politics around the world. Why hand it over to the other side when, by the tide of history, we have placed upon us the responsibility of trying to make the world a little better, a more peaceful and stable place in which to live?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with respect to pulling out of southeast Asia, I do not feel that if we pull out of South Vietnam and wait to see what will happen, there will be an immediate pushing back of the line. However, if we pull out of South Vietnam, where will the next trouble spot be?

The next trouble spot will be in that area. There is no question about it. In my judgment, the next trouble spot will be in Thailand, and there will be increased trouble in Malahia. They will try to cause riots and demonstrations—some nonviolent and others violent—in Taiwan and Korea.

There will be no end to it. Many people are duped into the belief that we should pull out of South Vietnam or all will be over. It will not be over. There is not a chance in the world that it will be over. It is the old domino game. Knock one country over and the others fall successively.

I commend the Senator from Wyoming for his very fine presentation here and for the answers which he has given to the many people who are wondering why we should be present in southeast Asia.

No one wants to be there. I wish we could pull out. However, we cannot.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we are to buy the argument that because this nation borders on China, it is in China's sphere of influence and we must get out and let China take over, would not the same argument apply to every other country there, starting with Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines, the Malay states, Burma, Pakistan, and Iran? Would not that argument in effect mean we should back out and let them take over 900 million people?

Mr. McGEE. That is correct; and when they take over the 900 million people, will they stop there? Perhaps we should have a "General Motors" for the world, and let it be operated that way. That is what the meaning of it is.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not hear the beginning of the Senator's speech, but is it not also correct that the Vietnamese are really doing the fighting? I saw a headline in one of our newspapers a day or so ago stating that one American was killed. When I read further in the story, I learned that there had been a battle between the Vietnamese and the Vietcong, and that the Vietnamese had killed 400 Vietcong. The headlines stated that one American had been killed.

Is it not true that the South Vietnamese have killed about 89,000 of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese? The South Vietnamese have paid a lesser price. They have paid about one-third of that price in lives.

Is it not correct to remind persons who say we should leave there and turn our tails and run and leave the 19 million people who are there that we are paying only a small price? The real fighting is being done by the South Vietnamese, whom we are trying to help to maintain their independence. When there is talk about an American being killed, about 200 or 300 of the Vietcong are being killed every day.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator for his contribution. We hear a great cry to the effect that American blood is being spilled and Americans are being involved. There is no alternative. If we pull out, there will be greater bloodshed. The question is, What should we do in a world in which we seek independence and peace; and are we right in paying the price required?

Not quite a year ago I was measuring the volume of mail that came into the office. That very month we had lost seven men in Vietnam. There was a basketful of mail protesting it as unnecessary. Within a month we were conducting a "play" war in Arizona, and in that activity a dozen to 15 men were killed. I did not receive a single letter of protest against that.

It seems to me we ought to get our "ducks in line," we ought to put our priorities in order. We must expect to pay a price, and remember that peace is not going to be handed over to us merely because we are "good guys." We must pay a price to achieve law and order. The alternative is to give up and go on the other side.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Some people do not seem to realize that it is a dangerous world we are living in, and it always has been. I was born at the end of World War I. There were some intervening years when people thought there would never be another great war, but we have found that as long as we have to struggle with those who want to take over the whole world, as long as there is communism, they are not going to change their spots or their minds. They want to take over the whole world. So it is going to be a dangerous world. Even without that factor, it would be a dangerous world. We must accept the fact that it is better to accept the burden of fighting every attack on freedom. In that way we shall live longer and be happier than we would otherwise be. There is no place else for us to go. We have found out that the world is round, and that we are on the same planet together. Those who want to back away from Vietnam will find that we will have to stop them somewhere. We must confront them in Vietnam and all over the world; and it is going to be that way in our lifetime. We had better hope it will be that way, because the alternative would be to be under the domination of Communist China or Communist Russia.

Referring to the taking of a popularity poll, I recall so well, during the fighting in South Korea, when we were helping them to maintain their independence at a heavy cost in American lives, that I happened to be in Libya, inspecting a military installation. I asked their Defense Minister about the reaction of his people to what the United States was

doing in South Korea, because it seemed to me that a small nation such as Libya would applaud America's efforts to help a small country defend itself against aggression.

His first reaction was: "It is far away." In other words, his country really did not care much, one way or the other.

I imagine that would be the first reaction we would get in Mali, Uganda, Ghana, or any one of the distant African nations, if we were to ask them what they thought about U.S. efforts to help South Vietnam defend itself. Whether they knew anything about the situation at all—which they probably do not—their probable reaction would be that it was none of their concern. This is understandable, because such countries have never had to carry such a burden, have never had to face such a problem. I am quite sure they are not particularly excited about our involvement there.

Someone was asking me how much concern the people of Louisiana have regarding this issue. To tell the truth, I am sure that the people of Louisiana are much more concerned about voting rights than they are about the war in Vietnam.

Mr. McGEE. I can understand that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They are very much more concerned about voting rights and civil rights matters. They discuss that subject a great deal more than they discuss the situation in Vietnam.

The Senator from Wyoming has well pointed out that if we are to take a poll to find out what someone in the Near East thinks about it, or what someone 2,000 miles away thinks about it, we will not get an informed opinion anyway, because those people do not have the responsibility to try to contain communism.

Mr. McGEE. If I might suggest a parallel, what might be true in New Orleans was probably also true in Cheyenne, Wyo., let us say in 1935, concerning the aggressions of Hitler in Western Europe. At that time, his depredations seemed a long way away. Our country had emerged from a rather short history with some fortunate experiences. Whenever war had broken out in Europe, there were two sides, of course, and we enjoyed the luxury of 3,000 miles of ocean between us and the combatants. We had the luxury of looking at the two sides and picking one, whenever one of those wars began—even though we may have had a stake in the war at some stage. We had the further luxury of being able to delay a decision while someone else held the frontline. During the First World War, France held the line, England held the line, as did the Belgians and the Dutch. That gave us time to dawdle and delay until we made up our minds.

Times have changed.

For the first time in our history, the United States is now one of two sides engaged in a war in the world. We have no choice.

Strangely, for the first time in history, we find ourselves on the frontline of the world with no one to hold the line for us until we make up our minds.

The burden rests upon us. We must do the job. This is not an obligation. This is our responsibility. This is the context in which we must view the requirements imposed upon us in regard to the relative position of the forces at stake in southeast Asia.

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

Mr. McGEE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. I compliment the Senator from Wyoming upon the scholarly and careful way in which he has treated a most difficult subject. I associate myself with his remarks.

Several times on the floor of the Senate, and most recently yesterday, I made two points which I think the Senator from Wyoming has again brought to mind. First, as the Vice President of the United States used to say when he was a Member of the Senate, "There is no such thing as instant peace; there is only instant annihilation."

Those who advocate either less activity on our part or more activity on our part in southeast Asia, with the hope that some immediate and dramatic solution of the problem can take place, hope in vain, because, as in human affairs, in international affairs much perseverance and patience are required to achieve a lasting peace.

The other point that I think is imperative is one which I also made yesterday; that is that he who takes risks now in order to secure a just and lasting peace is no less a peacemaker than he who asks for peace immediately without the assurance that it can later be defended, or can be enforced even at much greater price.

I commend the Senator from Wyoming for his astute observation of the situation in Vietnam, including the hopeful signs we now see, especially in Australia's increased effort in that area. We recognize that what is happening is not merely a small conflict involving the people of North and South Vietnam; it involves, indeed, the peace and security not only of southeast Asia, but of the whole world. The Senator from Wyoming has made this point very well.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the junior Senator from Oklahoma for his comments. Although he is very new in these Halls, he has quickly won a place for himself as a true specialist and scholar on questions involving the national interest. His contributions are always constructive and helpful as we seek to discuss the alternatives that confront us.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I commend the Senator from Wyoming upon a most eloquent and lucid exposition of the situation in southeast Asia. I should like to ask him several questions.

Does the United States have the power at this time to make an honorable peace in South Vietnam?

Mr. McGEE. Does the United States have the power?

Mr. ERVIN. The power to make an honorable peace at this time in South Vietnam.

Mr. McGEE. Peace is not achieved by decree. Peace is achieved when all the forces of power are available to produce agreement upon some stabilizing settlement. Therefore, a good bit more is required than what we could strike in the way of sheer power. Peace is not achieved with power; power merely affords an opportunity to achieve peace.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that the United States is without power to put an end to the hostilities at the present moment, except by way of appeasement or surrender?

Mr. McGEE. I suppose we could make a decisive change there if we were wantonly to use our great airpower and obliterate Hanoi and some of the other cities in North Vietnam, to start with. Fortunately, we have been much more restrained. Our goal is not to destroy people; our goal is not to obliterate the capital of another land. Our goal is to try to deliver a message that the aggressors can understand when it is presented to them in black and white. Although they may not understand it on paper, they are understanding it in action.

In my judgment, the President has been highly restrained in his application of escalation in the north because, again, we have selected the escalation. It is planned escalation to meet a specific target, at a specific time, for a specific purpose. There has not been wanton warfare with the destruction of people.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that the escalation has been deliberately planned in the hope that it might enable us to negotiate from strength and thus bring an end to hostilities in that part of the world?

Mr. McGEE. Indeed, it is. There is an old truism in the realm of diplomacy among the great powers, a truism that we need to understand fully: that a nation cannot win at the conference table what it is not willing to risk on the battlefield. That is a truism that is as old as politics itself. It is still true.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that the government which sits in Hanoi is the only government that could put an immediate end to hostilities at this moment?

Mr. McGEE. Hanoi could take the step right now that could terminate hostilities there in the almost immediate future. It is within their power to do so.

Mr. ERVIN. There is an old adage to the effect that even the most righteous man cannot live in peace unless his wicked neighbor is willing to have him do so. Is it not true that the war in South Vietnam exists because the government of Hanoi is encouraging what is called infiltration, but is really an invasion of South Vietnam by the Vietcong?

Mr. McGEE. I think it is true, because the policies emanate from Hanoi; and it is true because it is to the obvious advantage of Peiping to maintain uncertainty, pressure, and difficulty in North Vietnam.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Wyoming agree with the Senator

from North Carolina that the Secretary of State has made it clear on a number of occasions that the only thing that is necessary to put an end to the unfortunate hostilities now is to have the North Vietnamese cease their penetration of South Vietnam?

Mr. McGEE. It seems to me that even in elementary language or at the elementary level, the most elementary person could understand that. The language has been clear and unadulterated.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that it is an impossibility for the United States to achieve peace by negotiation unless someone else is willing to negotiate?

Mr. McGEE. It takes two to negotiate.

Mr. ERVIN. Has not President Johnson made it as clear as the noonday sun that the United States stands willing to enter into negotiations with a view to bringing about peace in Vietnam with anyone who is willing to negotiate and who has the power to accomplish that purpose?

Mr. McGEE. I would qualify my answer by saying that it is as clear as the noonday sun in Wyoming, where the sun shines all day; I am not certain about the noonday sun in this area.

Mr. ERVIN. Has not the President iterated and reiterated that the United States stands willing to enter into negotiations with anyone who can offer any prospects of putting an end to hostilities in southeast Asia?

Mr. McGEE. Indeed, he has. All the world is watching because everyone understands the disposition of the President to sit down with anybody, at anytime, anywhere, to discuss a settlement of the problem in South Vietnam.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator for yielding. I again express to him my commendation upon an eloquent, lucid speech.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

(At this point, Mr. HARRIS assumed the chair.)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I do not believe the President made it clear that he would be willing to conduct conversations with the Communists actually involved, the Vietcong. There are those who think that, for the conversations to be productive, all sides and factions would have to participate.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I believe that statement is correct. The President has not made it clear that he would talk with the Vietcong. However, there is very good reason for not agreeing to such conversations. The factor that is so upsetting and unbalancing is the force that is being generated from Hanoi.

The President has made it clear that he would not talk with the North and South Vietnamese Governments about what kind of government would be in Saigon, but would talk about what may happen between South Vietnam and North Vietnam.

What the President has expressed in his comments, it would seem to me, is that the conflict between Hanoi and South Vietnam is one kettle of fish and whatever endemic civil strife there is within South Vietnam is another.

These situations should not be confused. There is a much larger question that would have to be resolved over a much longer period of time. It would be a mistake to have these problems mixed up around the same conference table.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I very much hope that the Senator is correct and that the two problems can be kept separate.

Mr. McGEE. The effort in the general escalation is a genuine effort to try to separate them. In a measure, it is succeeding.

The first real measure of actual separation would be the realization and willingness of the Vietminh to stop the predatory activities across the lines.

That would lead us to the question, if we were to have such a conference, "What could we talk about?" We have a self-enforcing kind of arrangement that can be made right now. "We will stop bombing the north if you stop infiltrating into the south." That is the easiest kind of agreement to keep. We can measure their violation if the other side does not keep the agreement. Thus, there is an obvious beginning.

Second, such a discussion could lead to agreement upon a delineating line separating North Vietnam from South Vietnam.

The outcome of such an agreement, to have two Vietnams, is not the most desirable situation in that part of the world, any more than two Koreas, two Chinas, two Germanys, or two Berlins. However, this would provide a start. It would be a place at which to begin. It would make it possible to arrive at some sort of modified cease-fire, some small degree of arrangement which would win time. There would be less violent things done, and thus, through the use of time, we would erode some of the harsher of emotions that now cloud the atmosphere in that part of the world.

To that extent, I think that it is helpful.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

During the delivery of Mr. McGEE's speech,

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

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor, and that his remarks will appear elsewhere in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Montana in recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a vote on the Williams amendment at 4:30 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have in mind the possibility of moving to amend the Williams amendment. A Member of the Senate could easily hold the floor from now until 4:30 p.m. and prevent any other amendment. Can the majority leader tell us what provision he would like to make with respect to allowing the Williams amendment to be debated and amended, if need be, so that Senators may have their rights protected?

Mr. MANSFIELD. As soon as the distinguished Senator from Wyoming completes his speech, which I am sure will not be too much longer, any Senator who wishes to take the floor to offer an amendment to the Williams amendment will be free to do so. We are trying to take this action as an accommodation to Senators on both sides.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the majority leader agree—and I do not wish to interfere with his proposal—that when any amendment to the amendment might be offered, a half hour be allowed for debate to each side, and if that results in extending the time beyond 4:30 p.m., the time should thereby be extended until such time as the amendments to the amendment are disposed of within that time limitation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would prefer to withdraw the unanimous-consent request and let nature take its course.

Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

THE U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE SUPPORTS A STUDY OF THE METRIC SYSTEM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, yesterday, April 28, the delegates to the 53d annual meeting of the national chamber, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, voted unanimously in support of a study of the feasibility of adopting the metric system in this country.

I am delighted that such a nationally prominent organization occupying a leadership role in our country and representing businessmen the length and breadth of our land, support, this idea and the efforts that Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER and I have been making in urging such a study.

The chamber's declaration noted that—

> Most of the world embraces the metric system of measurement. Adoption of the system in the United States is worthy of study, on the theory that adherence to the system might assist fulfillment of our international responsibilities and our goal for increasing sales of U.S. goods abroad. Because of the problems of conversion, however, actual adoption of the system should not be considered until there has been a comprehensive study of the feasibility of adopting the system generally, or in specific fields, in the United States. Such a study should determine clearly the costs and economic advantages and disadvantages of conversion. The chamber encourages the conduct of such a study by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. President, my bill S. 774 would accomplish exactly what the chamber supports in its declaration. I am hopeful that other equally prominent groups will now lend their support to such a study,

We should protect this bastion of personal privacy right down to the last ditch.

When members of the National Association of Letter Carriers must cooperate in operating a mail cover, they feel sullied and besmirched by what they have to do. They are so imbued with the philosophy that a personal letter is sacrosanct, that it goes against their conscience, and every instinct they have. They do not like to do it.

I don't blame them one bit. In cases involving the national security, there is some justification for this practice. There is also some justification when the safety of the mails is involved. But the practice should be restricted to those two categories—and should be restricted as much as possible within those two categories. This is a practice that should be used most sparingly and most cautiously, because it endangers one of the most precious principles in our democratic way of life.

"Confederate Air Force" Protests Unauthorized Use of Its Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mercedes, Tex., is the headquarters of an organization called "the Confederate Air Force," which is composed of former World War II pilots who dedicate themselves to the preservation and exhibition of World War II aircraft.

Last year, I was fortunate to visit the headquarters of this group, and I was very impressed by its dedication to its purpose and the pride it has in its organization. These men own some very rare World War II aircraft, and fly them at their own expense, at air shows over the Nation.

It is not surprising that the "Confederate Air Force," of Mercedes, Tex., was disturbed by the unauthorized use of its name by airplanes which dropped leaflets on civil-rights marchers in Alabama; and the group has registered a protest against such misrepresentation.

So that the denial of any connection between this action and the "Confederate Air Force" may be given wide distribution, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I received about this matter, along with a telegram sent to me, and an article published in the March 23, 1965, issue of the Valley Morning Star, of Harlingen, Tex., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, telegram, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARTER, STIERNBERG, SKAGGS & KOPPEL,
Harlingen, Tex., April 5, 1965.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: You will remember that on one of your visits to the valley last year I took you by the headquarters of the Confederate Air Force at Mercedes.

This organization is nonprofit in character and is composed of former World War II pilots. Their only purpose is the preservation and exhibition of World War II aircraft.

In connection with the Selma, Ala., civil rights march, the national press recently reported that certain leaflets were dropped by an aircraft on the civil rights marchers. These leaflets, apparently threatening economic reprisals against the marchers, were signed "Confederate Air Force."

The local members of the Confederate Air Force have issued various statements, and I enclose a clipping explaining their position. They would greatly appreciate it if it were possible for you to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of their denial of implication in the Alabama incident.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JACK SKAGGS.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH:

The Confederate Air Force emphatically denies any connection with the dropping of leaflets today in Selma or any place else, for that matter. We would like to locate the pilot or get the aircraft numbers of the plane used, and we will file charges against the pilot for falsely representing himself as a member of the CAF. We have but one purpose, and that is the preservation and enshrinement of World War II aircraft and the pilots that flew them and helped keep this Nation free. We are a patriotic organization; we are nonpolitical in nature and have no affiliation whatsoever with any of the white supremist groups. We do not have a single member in the Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi area, nor do we have any aircraft closer than 1,500 miles from Selma. The Confederate Air Force deeply regrets its implication in this issue.

Col. BOB KENNY,
Public Information Officer, Confederate Air Force.

[From the Harlingen (Tex.) Valley Morning Star, Mar. 23, 1965]

DENY "RAID"—CONFEDERATE AIR FORCE ANGERED BY UNAUTHORIZED USE OF NAME

MERCEDES.—Angry denials flew from Rebel Field, headquarters of the Confederate Air Force, Monday, after it was reported a Confederate Air Force plane "bombed" civil rights marchers in Alabama with white supremacist leaflets.

"We're attempting to get the license number and name of the pilot, who is liable for suit for misprepresentation," Col. Bill Adams, Rousseau, Minn., newspaper publisher and a CAF public information officer, said.

"A stigma could be attached to the CAF. We don't desire any publicity of this sort."

Col. Lloyd Nolen, of Mercedes, pointed out emphatically the valley-based organization "is a patriotic group of volunteers dedicated to establishing a permanent flying museum of World War II fighter aircraft."

Nolen said the CAF name is copyrighted.

"We've got our attorneys checking into it," Nolen added.

Adams noted members specifically are forbidden to use CAF planes in political or business activity.

He said the CAF has no members in the Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia area and also has no light planes such as reportedly was used in dropping the leaflets.

"All of our planes are fighter planes of World War II," he said. "Someone has taken it upon himself to misrepresent the CAF."

U.S. Censorship Policy in Viet Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern over the effects the administration's censorship policies regarding news from Vietnam will have. This could create a very severe problem in conduct of foreign affairs, as nothing can so quickly weaken the resolve of a country as lack of confidence in the actions its government is taking.

This lack of confidence can quite easily grow out of a lack of information on just exactly what the United States is facing in southeast Asia.

The following column by David Lawrence, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 27, 1965, points out the fact that there is a clear distinction to be made between withholding military information that could benefit our enemies, and a policy of censorship that seems to seek to stifle press coverage on all aspects of the Vietnam situation.

U.S. CENSORSHIP POLICY IN VIET ASSAILED

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Editors at their annual meetings in New York and Washington in recent days have been discussing the policy of the Johnson administration in dealing with the news emanating from the battle areas in Vietnam.

What seems to have aroused most of the criticism is the clumsy way the administration has been handling the problem, rather than the objectives sought. For everyone agrees that, when American lives are being risked in a war, the press should cooperate in withholding any information which might possibly get to the enemy and impair the effectiveness of this country's military operations.

Both in World War I and in World War II there prevailed what was called a "voluntary censorship," and the press effectively withheld military information that could possibly benefit the enemy. The press was fully acquainted with the dangers of letting the other side know anything about plans, including the departure of planes or ships to secret destinations.

There would be no difficulty at all today if the administration here were to allow these matters to be handled solely by the military, so that only information relating to troop movements or air and naval operations would be temporarily suppressed. What seems to have stirred up the controversy is that the administration has put in the hands of a propaganda-agency officer the task of acting virtually as a censor.

Not only is he permitted to withhold information about certain diplomatic activities but he also seems to be able to prevent the newspapermen from covering the Vietnam war in the places where they ought to be permitted to go.

In the major wars of history, our military authorities have always provided facilities for war correspondents. These newsmen spend much of their time with the fighting forces,

but do not send out dispatches which could possibly transmit any important information to our adversaries.

The assigning of a member of the staff of the U.S. Information Service—established by Congress as a propaganda organization—to deal with the press at Saigon and to withhold military information is not in line with historical precedent or custom. It is not surprising, therefore, that newspaper editors have severely criticized such a procedure.

Secrecy is of the utmost importance, but it should be confined entirely to military matters. The press should be free to make its own comments whenever it wishes, provided it does not disclose military plans. But even the news of military operations should not be permanently suppressed.

There comes a time, after the event, when it is proper for a disclosure to be made so that the American people will know what has really happened. The timing of such an announcement might well be within the discretion of the military authorities, but to hold it back indefinitely contradicts basic American practice in dealing with the press during a war.

It has been argued by some of the newspaper editors that they cannot comment effectively on military operations if they are not permitted to get the facts of what actually is happening. Thus, sometimes equipment will be unsatisfactory and certain types of guns or planes will have been used which are not suited for the operations in which they are employed. All this is something which can better be examined, perhaps, by committees of Congress, though critical articles written on the spot in war areas often point up the necessity for such investigations.

Perhaps the whole controversy would not have reached the climax that it has in recent weeks if there had not been a prelude; namely, an era of so-called managed news at the Pentagon. This has left an unfortunate blemish on the record. For when the only news given out is designed to accomplish a political purpose, confidence on the part of the public in the accuracy of what is printed is bound to wane.

Fundamentally, there is no sound reason for suppressing the news of military operations altogether. The only issue is when such announcements should be permitted. Also, criticism of military operations should be carefully weighed by newspapermen, lest they disclose data which the enemy should not be allowed to get.

There have been sharp comments from Government officials concerning the dispatches written by correspondents in Vietnam who have been merely exercising their right to express opinions on the diplomatic aspects of the war. There has been, to be sure, a lot of news from various countries on the delicate subject of peace negotiations, and this, in some instances, the administration would probably have preferred to see handled with more caution. But the right of the press to discuss nonmilitary news is inherent in a system such as has long prevailed in America during war and peace.

Water Quality Act of 1965

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, we come this afternon to the close of a debate which has certainly been a distinct compliment to this House. This bill has received the unanimous support on both sides of the Committee on Public Works, and is a piece of legislation which reflects with great credit upon the Committee on Public Works and its distinguished chairman. However, Mr. Chairman, this is a piece of legislation that reflects with great credit upon the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, JOHN BLATNIK, the father and the foremost exponent of clean water in America.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased, coming from the State of Ohio, to add my support to these needed amendments to this program and to note with pride the splendid spirit of bipartisan unity that made the amendments to the original S. 4 bill possible.

Mr. Chairman, we have shown by amendment and by the remarks here during the debate this afternoon that there seems to be agreement that the Federal Government in its attack upon water pollution must proceed cooperatively, with State and local governments and with the vast American industry as well as in cooperation with every agency throughout the land interested in winning ultimately the fight for clear water.

This bill is void of any accusatory tone and is, indeed, a constructive, intelligent approach which has already brought a response from State governments. Now at the moment of the adoption of this bill I am proud to announce to the House that there is in the Great Lakes region, about to be reconvened a five-State regional conference of State Governors to join with the Federal Government in streamlining America's program for clean water. I am proud to participate in this debate and to support this bill.

Inventors Sign Away Patent Rights Before They Invent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in relation to H.R. 5918, a bill which I have introduced that would make it unlawful for an employer to require a patent assignment from a prospective employee as a condition of employment, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article in the Los Angeles Times of April 13, 1965. This article, written by Mr. Richard L. Vanderveld, takes an objective look at the situation today's employed inventor finds himself in.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting the text of the article at this point in the Record:

INVENTOR GRUMBLES GROW OVER SIGNING AWAY OF THEIR RIGHTS

(By Richard L. Vanderveld)

Scientists and engineers are beginning to raise voices against gun-to-the-head renunciation of patent rights.

Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, is pressing for greater Government control of inventions conceived under Government-funded programs.

Industry argues all will lose if its creative energies are repressed.

These are the main sides to a question—who should get the fruits of invention—that is exciting warm debate in the councils of labor, industry, and Government.

As matters stand, industry is in the driver's seat.

Although patents are issued only to individuals, it's reckoned that about two-thirds of all patents these days wind up as corporate property through contractual assignment of rights by employees.

Also, the Defense Department, the biggest bankroller of research programs, has followed a policy of letting private firms in its hire take title to inventions and requiring only a royalty-free, nonexclusive license for the Government.

Some other Federal agencies, including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, have not been so liberal toward industry on the patent question. The result has been confusion and some agitation for a unified policy.

A number of the country's leading legal minds in the patent area gathered recently at Lake Arrowhead and plunged into trends and issues affecting the employed inventor.

Gerald D. O'Brien, head of the NASA patent section, sounded the keynote of the conference with this observation.

"The current trend toward the acquisition by the Federal Government of exclusive rights in inventions made under Government-sponsored research and development contracts tends to diminish markedly the traditional incentives which serve as stimuli to the employed inventor."

Other speakers, expressing much the same idea, may have felt obliged to please their hosts, but the barking was too loud and articulate to be wholly devoid of bite.

The conference was sponsored by the Council of Engineers and Scientists Organizations—West under the auspices of the UCLA Institute of Industrial Relations. The council represents five independent unions of engineers, scientists, and technicians in southern California.

This group is supporting legislation which would make it illegal to have employees sign agreements relinquishing rights to inventions as a condition of employment. This is viewed as an extreme position—subject to compromise.

The sponsor of the bill, Representative GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., Democrat, of California, was present at the Arrowhead conference. He said it stood little or no chance unless its beneficiaries got behind it.

COMPANY TAKES RISK

Industry insists contractual assignment of patent rights is justified. Its reasoning is that when a company hires a man to do inventive tasks and gives him the tools it's taking all the risks and the man is only doing what he's been paid to do when he invents something.

Any compensation beyond salary for an invention in this situation is strictly out of the goodness of industry's discretionary ("ex gratia" in legal parlance) heart, it's explained.

Industry also claims technical types by and large don't aspire for wealth anyway, that they're more than happy to be left alone

A great French diplomat and historian, André François-Poncet, wrote recently, in Le Figaro of March 11: "No one will be able to convince us that it is a good bargain for France to exchange American friendship for Soviet or Chinese friendship."

By the same token, no one will convince Americans that anything which undermines what M. François-Poncet called "the sacred tradition of the age-old bonds between France and the United States" can be less than a disaster for both countries.

We stand at a crossroads of history where we dare not, if we still cherish human freedom as our principal value, allow considerations of short-term profits and prides to take precedence over the age-old imperatives of our common cause.

Every American schoolboy knows a wise statement made by Benjamin Franklin, an unflinching friend of France, as the Founding Fathers gathered in Philadelphia to sign the immortal Declaration of Freedom. "We must all hang together," he said, "or assuredly we shall all hang separately." That warning is as relevant for the free world peoples today as it was for the 13 American colonies in 1776. Our freedom is indivisible, and only the shortsighted or the frivolous would knowingly take part in its division.

What Americans call "isolationism" has become an anachronism in the shrunken, interdependent world of our times. Let us be clear on the fact that it is no less anachronistic for France than for the United States.

The View From Abroad Regarding the Employee Inventor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, during the recent symposium held on April 8, 1965, celebrating the 175th anniversary of the U.S. patent system, some of the most pertinent remarks dealing with the problem of the employed inventor and his legal relations with his employer were made by Dr. Fredrik Neumeyer.

Dr. Neumeyer, who is a citizen of Sweden, is one of the leading patent scholars in Europe, and has been making a special study of the employee-inventor's status for a number of years.

Formerly the head of the patent department of the Swedish State Telephone & Telegraph Administration, he has written on the subject in various European and international periodicals, and lectured on it in several European countries. In 1962 the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary published a study prepared by Dr. Neumeyer in the form of a committee print entitled "The Law of Employed Inventors in Europe."

In view of this extensive background, I am sure that my colleagues will find Dr. Neumeyer's remarks at the symposium related to the employed inventor to be most illuminating. Dr. Neumeyer is currently spending 1 year in the Department of Economics, Princeton University, as a visiting fellow. He is now working on a study concerning the legal and practical situation of employed inventors in the United States.

The text of his speech on April 8 is as follows:

I was asked to say some words about the view from abroad regarding the employee-inventor. I have to start out with some very short remarks as to the general situation in this country which always will have an impact on all of us in the Western World.

Every reader of a newspaper in this country knows what gigantic amounts of money are now spent by Government, industry, and universities, to keep scientific research going. We hardly react when we read that the President estimates Federal expenditures for the coming year at more than $15 billion (of which $6.9 billion will be spent on space projects). Industry-financed research and development was already in 1961, up to $4.6 billion (with more than $870 million spent in chemical and electrical industry each).

If we have a look upon who is going to carry out this work and to create all these new weapons, machines, vehicles, products, and systems for new power, more speed, better food or medicines, we see that the Federal Government (in 1962) employed totally more than 144,000 scientific and technical personnel, of which more than 50,000 were so-called R. & D. personnel. Private industry occupied at the same time totally more than 850,000 scientists and engineers, of which more than 303,000 were R. & D. scientists and engineers.

When we learn that by far the largest share of research performance in industrial firms is devoted to projects "advancing new scientific knowledge with specific commercial objectives" and to the translation of research findings into actual products and processes, we understand readily that there must be a steady stream of engineering innovation, often in the form of inventions which can be protected by patents.

Now, it is just as obvious that the vast majority of all these creative persons are employees of some kind. They work either for a Government agency, for an industrial corporation, or for a university as employer. The mutual relations between the employer and the inventing employees are not regulated by Federal statutory law in this country (except for certain specific rules regarding Government employees) and there exists an almost unlimited freedom of contract in the field (limited only by the Statute of Frauds or eventually by the antitrust laws).

In spite of the fact that the research activities in which inventions can be created do not have the same size in Europe as they have in the United States, European countries have laid down considerable efforts to regulate the legal relations between employers and employees making inventions. These efforts go in certain countries back to times before the turn of the century and the basic problems have been observed since the early days of industrialization. More than a dozen countries had promulgated legal provisions regarding rights and obligations of employed inventors. I would say that we have five different main systems which have been used to solve these problems in Europe.

I

The first and historically the earliest system was the insertion of provisions concerning employee inventors into patent law. This solution was adopted by Austria, Finland, the Netherlands, Italy, Canada, and Japan (in chronological order). A similar form of regulation was adopted by the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries through the enactment of laws regulating inventive activities based, of course, on the socialist economic system. Laws following the general principles of the Soviet concept of labor and of the place of inventive activity in planned industrial production were issued in Yugoslavia in 1948, in Bulgaria, Rumania, and the German Democratic Republic in 1951, in Poland in 1951–52, in Hungary in 1953, and in Czechoslovakia in 1957.

II

The second type of system was that adopted in Switzerland, where provisions concerning employee inventors were inserted into the law concerning contracts and the employer-employee relationship, the so-called law of obligations.

III

The third method consists in passing a special law devoted exclusively to the rights and obligations of employee inventors and their employers, and the legal problems arising from these relations.

The first modern law of this type was issued by Sweden in 1949, followed by Denmark in 1955 and the Federal Republic of Germany in 1957. In the course of the unification of law which is being carried out in the Nordic countries special enactments regarding employee inventors, based on the Swedish and Danish models, are being prepared in Finland and Norway.

IV

The fourth type of legal solution relies mainly on precedents established by courts and by official boards specially instituted to give guidance in the matter. This method, which is exemplified by the United Kingdom and the United States, must naturally be based on individual cases of legal conflict, either between two private parties or between a private party and the Government. Hence it cannot cover the whole field consistently and comprehensively, since the rules originating from these decisions depend necessarily on a number of accidental circumstances. From a detailed study of common law and judge-made law it is, however, possible to distinguish certain basic principles applicable to employee inventors, in the United States, akin to the principles operating in other countries.

V

Finally there are some countries where the relations between employee inventors and their employers are regulated by collective agreement, in some cases alongside one or other of the four methods outlined above, but more typically in countries where there is at present no specific legislation on the subject (e.g., in France). Collective agreements are, as a rule, concluded only for a limited period and may vary from one industry to another.

The oldest regulation by patent law (of the classical type) was in Austria. The Austrian Patents Act of June 11, 1897, contained the following provision:

"Workmen, salaried employees and civil servants are considered to be the authors of inventions made by them in service unless otherwise stipulated by agreement or by service rules. Any provision in contracts or service rules by which a person employed by an enterprise, or a civil servant, is deprived of the reasonable benefit of an invention made by him in service is without legal effect."

The Swiss legislator has brought the problems of inventions made in the course of employment under the law of contracts, which in turn is part of the Swiss federal commercial law. In 1911 the first Federal Law of Obligations, which had been promulgated in 1881, was basically revised and reissued as Book V of the Swiss Civil Code. In title X of this book we find a section 343 regulating inventions made by employed persons. This section provides as follows:

"Inventions made by an employee in the course of his work belong to the employer if inventive activity is comprised in the service duties of the employee or, where this

is not the case, if the employer has expressly retained a right to them.

"In the later case the employee is entitled to reasonable special compensation if the invention is of considerable economic value.

"When assessing this compensation regard must be had to the assistance given by the employer and to the use made of his property."

This single provision within the framework of a very extensive law leaves a number of problems untouched; some of these may be solved by the general law, which in Switzerland may mean the individual laws of 22 different cantons.

No statute concerning employees' inventions exists in the United Kingdom. Since, however, Great Britain was among the first European countries to establish the modern factory system in which the question of employees' inventions arises and to enact a law for the protection of inventions, the earliest judicial decisions regarding the origin, ownership, and use of inventions produced by employee inventors and their compensation date from the beginning of the 19th century. Disputes had to be brought before the courts for decision according to common law and the principles of equity. Many of the early questions in this field were answered according to the rules governing relations between "master and servant" and conditions of labor contracts (express or implied) as deduced from the judicial decisions of many centuries' standing.

An early British court problem (1825, 1834) concerned, for instance, the authorship of an invention where it had to be decided whether or not the servant was merely carrying out the instructions of his master, being no more than a tool for putting his master's idea into the tangible form which is the subject of a patent. Another basic question analyzed and decided by the courts was: Who is a servant? A skilled chemist, although his employment involved manual labor, was held not to be a servant. A contractor, being a person who has entered into a contract to execute certain specific work, is subject to the orders of his employer only to the extent that the terms of his contract so provide. He is not under the control of his employer.

Within this short program I can only add that practically any existing European law or court in this field, as a rule, considers seven questions as basic ones:

1. To which group of employed individuals (what category) does an employee belong?
2. What type of intellectual work has been produced by employees?
3. Has title or part of the title to inventions been acquired by the employer?
4. Which principles of compensation for such inventions have been used?
5. Which category of employee-inventions does apply?
6. Is it stipulated how controversies and differences of opinion in this field are to be settled?
7. What rules apply to inventions made by employed inventors after their employment has finished?

With these remarks I may just have opened the view through a small window, a view known more or less to experts in American corporations and Government agencies with wide international connections and interests. There is more to study and think about for people interested in an increased output of employee inventions and better labor relations everywhere.

President Makes Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, most military experts agree that with the current international balance of power between the Soviet Union and the United States, that a nuclear war could now only start by mistake or miscalculation. There perhaps is another way. If the Soviet Union commits itself indelibly to the North Vietnamese; and if North Vietnam is committed to the Vietcong; and if the United States remains committed to the people of South Vietnam, it could happen that a second nuclear war could be precipitated, not by the great powers, the United States and the Soviets, but by minor political segments in southeast Asia who are too inculcated with the stubborn mandarin personality to envision the results of this action extending beyond the Gulf of Tonkin.

My hometown paper, the Vallejo Times Herald, recently editorialized on this matter as follows, and pointed up the need for the U.S.S.R. and the United States to negotiate on their own terms forthwith.

PRESIDENT MAKES SENSE

President Johnson's speech to the world this week on the Vietnam situation reflects good sense. In effect, the Chief Executive was summing up what he considers the goals of the United States and the free world in that section of the globe. He also recognized the inescapable fact that the free world is destined to coexist with the Communist world or neither will exist.

The far-reaching suggestion by the President that the Soviet Union join with the United States in helping to develop this backward region of southeast Asia is a bold step. From a coexistence viewpoint, he is asking the other major power in the world to assist in insuring the freedom and development of southeast Asia and at the same time he has widened the breach between the Russians and the Chinese. His failure to specifically include Red China in his proposals indicates that he believes the Chinese are not yet ready to sit down and talk as a mature, sensible nation. These Chinese activity in Korea, their vilification of the United States and their growing criticism of the Soviet Union makes them a suspect participant in any peace talks.

President Johnson demonstrated the determination of the United States to carry on the war against the Communists if peace talks could not bring about a settlement in that area. He cited the U.S. position that the maintenance of Vietnam as a free and independent state is essential to the peace of Asia. He made it clear that the United States, under no circumstances, would withdraw from that area—only if a peace settlement with built-in guarantees can be reached.

The President and the rest of the Nation are wary of warfare, but the Nation generally is convinced that retreat in the face of Communist incursion can be fatal. Since former President Truman laid down the guidelines for containing Communist encroachment in all parts of the world, the United States and the free world have followed this no-retreat policy successfully.

Mr. Johnson, in reiterating this policy, has made it clear that in peace or war, the U.S. position in southeast Asia will remain firm.

An American Basketball at Moscow University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read a United Press International report today from Indianapolis, Ind., that the U.S. All Stars defeated the Soviet Union Nationals by a score of 78 to 73 in a basketball game that attracted nearly 14,000 fans. It was also noteworthy that last night's victory gave the American team a 4-to-1 edge in the five games played with the touring Russians.

I call this to the attention of my colleagues because of a pleasant experience which developed from a meeting I had with an American student at the University of Moscow when I was in Russia last November on a study mission with the Europe Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I enjoyed a pleasant conversation at the Prague Restaurant in Moscow with Mr. Edward Milton Ifft, of 239 Alameda Road, Butler, Pa., a member of the University of Moscow basketball team who informed me that the pleasure of his association with the university team was alloyed by the fact that the team played with a basketball produced in Red China.

Upon my return to the United States I related this experience to Mr. John B. Colt, export manager of A. G. Spalding & Bros., Inc., Chicopee, Mass., who agreed with me that it is not fit and proper for an American to be playing the American game of basketball with equipment produced in China and he thereafter forwarded as a gift a "Made in America" basketball to Mr. Ifft.

This week I have received from Mr. Ifft a very interesting letter which gives evidence that this basketball is being worked into a game of goodwill which could, ultimately, lead to possible exclusion of Red Chinese-made balls from the basketball courts of Moscow. I presume that in the current series of exhibition games here between Russian and American teams American-made equipment is used exclusively and I suggest that Russian coaches should be encouraged to advocate greater use of American equipment in practice sessions.

Given a choice I would prefer to play ball with the Russians than with the Chinese under American rules and with

Percentage increases of food supply needed during 1958–80 to meet anticipated requirements in various regions of the world

Regions	Percentage of projected population growth, 1958–80	Per capita increase of food supply to provide a minimal satisfactory present diet	Total increase of food supply, 1958–80 required to meet present food requirements and population growth	Rate of annual increase needed, 1958–80	Recent annual rate of increase in food supply
Underdeveloped countries	56	33	107	3.4	2.7
Latin America	85	5	94	3.1	2.5
Far East	55	41	86	2.9	3.0
Near East	62	17	90	3.0	3.1
Africa	36	28	55	2.0	1.3
Developed countries	28		28	1.2	3.6
World (average)	48	14	69	2.4	2.9

POPULATION BILL FILED BY REPRESENTATIVE TODD

Third District Congressman PAUL TODD, JR., Democrat, Kalamazoo, has introduced a bill to focus attention on the population explosion problem. His bill calls for Assistant Secretaries in the Departments of State and of Health, Education, and Welfare to coordinate Federal research and information dissemination efforts. The bill also authorizes President Johnson to call a White House Conference on Population Problems.

Now in the hands of the Government Operations Committee, TODD's bill is drawing support from some Michigan Republicans, notably National Committeeman John B. Martin, and praise for his courage from Representatives ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, of Bay City, and JAMES HARVEY, of Saginaw.

Warsaw Ghetto Uprising: A Commemoration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, April and May this year mark the 22d anniversary of a great and tragic event. It was during this period in 1943, from April 19 to the end of May, that a few thousand Jewish survivors of the Warsaw ghetto staged a desperate last-ditch resistance to the Nazi campaign of extermination and for a brief time and against overwhelming odds demonstrated a type of courage and heroism that the world has not very often seen.

When the Nazis and Russians moved into Poland at the opening of World War II, Poland was divided for another time. Forthwith the Nazis rounded up the Jewish population and forced many of them into the Warsaw ghetto, swelling its numbers to about 450,000. In the summer of 1942 the Germans began their campaign to exterminate the Jews. And during July and August of that year they systematically removed the Jews from the ghetto, placed them in prisons, and eventually destroyed them in their crematoriums.

As the numbers of the imprisoned Jews dwindled, the survivors were determined to stage a last-ditch resistance against the Nazis. Open resistance began in January 1943, but on April 19, the eve of the Jewish Passover, the Nazis attacked en masse and in desperate fury, and with tanks, artillery, and troops, they set out to destroy the ghetto completely. For a month the battle raged and even in the summer token resistance could still be detected, but the ghetto was reduced to rubble by the end of May and most of its inhabitants either killed or shipped off to concentration camps.

It is well for us to commemorate the anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising; for here is a tragic demonstration of man's courage in the face of a fearful and overpowering enemy. But more important, Mr. Speaker, such commemorations can serve as a continuing reminder to us all of the extremes to which man can go when his soul has become filled with racial prejudice and racial hatred.

In recognition of this fact, the Essex County Warsaw Ghetto Commemoration Committee has arranged a memorable commemoration for Sunday evening, May 2, at the Weequahic High School Auditorium in Newark, N.J. The event is being sponsored by 55 Jewish and non-Jewish organizations and will be attended by 2,000 persons, including State and local officials and representatives of religious groups. Among the distinguished speakers will be Dr. Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress; Mr. I. Goldberg, director of the New Jersey Service Bureau for Jewish Education; and Mr. Kenneth Gibson, cochairman of the Business and Industrial Coordinating Council. Three local choral groups will participate. There will be a dramatic presentation of "The Witness" followed by a candlelighting and memorial service.

As we mourn this tragedy, may we be inspired to a greater dedication to our Judeo-Christian ethic.

Our Continuing Struggle in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, today it was my sad duty to write a letter of condolence to the widow of one of my constituents killed recently in Vietnam—Capt. Kenneth L. Dean, Jr., U.S. Army.

This morning, Captain Dean was laid to rest at his alma mater—the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He was killed on April 20 as a result of gunshot wounds while accompanying a Vietnamese Army unit engaged in a fight with the Vietcong. When he attempted to move a Vietnamese soldier, he was hit by hostile small arms fire. At the time of his death, he was a first lieutenant and was recently posthumously promoted to the rank of captain. His widow, Mrs. Sheila Dean of Dobbs Ferry, has received two Government citations—one from the President and an Army Honorary Service Award.

Captain Dean died defending freedom and honoring our commitments to free nations to protect them from the spread of world communism. While his death is a deep loss to all of us, his widow and other Americans can find some comfort in knowing that he did not die in vain. His life, and those of other American servicemen killed in Vietnam, were given to afford the people of Vietnam the opportunity to once again become free from intimidation and harassment by the forces of aggression. He died so that one day the Vietnamese will be able to decide their own future.

His tragic death could have been prevented if the Vietcong and the Chinese Communists had accepted President Johnson's offer to achieve peace in that strife-torn area through unconditional negotiations. The gauntlet has been tossed and for the moment it appears that world communism will accept nothing less than the total destruction and control of their smaller and peaceful neighbors.

The President, in his speech at Johns Hopkins University earlier this month, placed the responsibility for the quest for peace squarely upon the Communists. Their failure to respond clearly indicates their desire for continued hostilities. These forces have been accurately identified as the perpetrators of continued bloodshed in Vietnam and their unwillingness to discuss this matter at a bargaining table demonstrates their continuing desire to establish a totalitarian empire in southeast Asia.

There is so much which can be done in this area to assist all peoples to gain a healthier, better educated and more prosperous and peaceful life. As I stated in this distinguished body earlier this month, this war certainly grows as much as anything from the frustrations of hunger and deprivation. The responsibilities of all nations in southeast Asia, and most particularly in Vietnam, are to build rather than destroy, to educate rather than subvert, to heal rather than wound, to cultivate rather than plow under. The quest for peace is the goal for which we are all fighting.

Mr. Speaker, let us never forget the sacrifice of Captain Dean and the other gallant Americans who have shed their blood in this quest for peace. All Americans, and all the peoples of the free world, should stand in honor to Captain Dean and his comrades and pay tribute to their enduring contribution to world peace through the giving of their lives.

The United States Stands Firm in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us can be proud of our President in his determination to protect the people of South Vietnam until the aggressors agree to sit down at the peace table.

We cannot and must not allow the North Vietnamese Government to conquer her neighbors because of our failure to defend their right of self-determination. Abandonment of our policy in Vietnam would be submission to the will and whim of the Chinese Communists everywhere.

Those who demand our withdrawal in the face of aggression recognize this fact in their refusal or inability to offer an alternative to our present policy.

The following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of April 28, 1965, supports the position of our Government in what is truly a war that we do not want, together with an article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, of the same date demonstrating the support the President has with regard to our policy in Vietnam.

The articles follow:

THE PRESIDENT'S REPLY

President Johnson set out yesterday to answer the vociferous critics, both at home and abroad, of his policy on Vietnam, and also the Communist aggressors, who seem not yet to believe he means what he says. He did so clearly and convincingly.

He upheld his decision to bomb North Vietnam by explaining that his previous policy of restraint was misconstrued as weakness and therefore served to encourage the Communists in their attacks. He replied to criticism of the bombings by pointing out that air attacks were restricted to legitimate targets such as bridges and munition dumps, thus to reduce the power of the Communists in the north to take the land and the lives of those who are resisting them in the south.

He recalled some of the lessons of history—the lesson of Munich, where retreat encouraged Hitler to advance; and the lessons taught by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, who stopped aggressions by standing firm. These evidently had receded in the mind of President de Gaulle when he went before the television cameras almost at the same time President Johnson did. The French leader declared himself against foreign intervention in the internal affairs of another state, yet he refused to endorse the American effort to turn back intervention.

It should now be doubly clear, following Mr. Johnson's speech at Baltimore, that the United States will not retreat; that it will continue to hit the enemy both in the north and south, without recourse to nuclear arms; and that it will continue to fight until the Communists are convinced that armed attack will not yield domination over others.

Once convinced of that, they may be ready for a negotiated settlement. And when they are, they will find the United States ready. The President extended to any of their governments (as distinct from the rebel Vietcong in South Vietnam) another invitation to come to the conference table at any time and any place.

They can have peace if they want it; or continued war and punishment if they insist on them before they are persuaded that they have nothing to gain by their present course of aggression.

FIRM POLICY BACKED—PRESIDENT MAINTAINING HIS CONCENSUS ON VIET

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—There is every reason to believe President Johnson will widen and hold a decisive consensus in support of a strong policy in Vietnam.

He has one special asset. He is occupying his usual stance at the center. His policy is wedded to neither extreme. He rests on two pillars: clear determination to defend as long as the aggression continues; clear willingness to talk whenever Hanoi will start talking.

There are other factors which contribute to the President's support:

The Gallup poll shows that the minority which wants Mr. Johnson to step up the war more than balances out the minority which wants him to quit.

His senatorial, newspaper, and professional critics can offer no acceptable alternative. They are prepared to accept Chinese Communist domination of all southeast Asia. This is an alternative the American people will not accept without trying to do something about it.

The President has the backing of many Democrats in Congress (his offer of "unconditional discussions" won the approval of the ADA) and most Republicans. His Republican support runs the whole gamut from Barry Goldwater to the GOP leadership in Congress, including Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN and Representative GERALD FORD.

Despite the honest, emotional student pickets and the college teach-ins, this leaves Mr. Johnson in a strategic position. And here is the evidence:

The Gallup poll finds that 29 percent of the country would like to see the United States withdraw completely from Vietnam, stop the fighting whatever the effects, and start negotiations whatever the outcome. It also finds that 31 percent of the country favors stepping up military activity, and going the full distance of declaring war.

The President embraces neither extreme. He does not propose to withdraw or even cease defending. But he will start talking even while defending. He does not seek a solution by military means alone, but he will use military means until Hanoi is willing to use the conference table.

Where does this leave Mr. Johnson with respect to a public consensus? To obtain further evidence of the public's attitudes toward the handling of the situation in Vietnam, Dr. Gallup put this question to the people in the same survey cited above: "Do you think the United States is handling affairs in Vietnam as well as could be expected, or do you think we are handling affairs there badly?"

The result was that by a ratio of more than 2 to 1 the Amercan people approve of the Government's handling of the situation. As the air raids on the North have become more intense, public opinion has remained firm in its support because 2 months ago support for the President was at the same 2 to 1 ratio.

If there is any threat to the President's expanding and holding this consensus on Vietam, it would only come, I think, from any sign of weakening in his policy.

Republican support is crucial to the Johnson consensus. The President knows it. This is why he has been so appreciative in private and on the telephone for what Senator DIRKSEN has done in his behalf. He wishes that some Democrats were even half as helpful.

But the President knows that at any sign of appeasement, intended or accidental, Republican support would vanish like a rocket into outer politics. As they did to President Truman over Korea, the Republicans can never call this "Johnson's war," but they could fight and possibly win election if it ever turned into "Johnson's appeasement."

The President is determined that it won't.

Law Day, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, our American history has been marked by a valiant struggle for equal justice under law and the preservation of individual liberty and dignity.

Recent events throughout the world and within our own borders make it clear that this struggle is far from over—that our commitment to the concept of individual liberty and freedom under law is constantly being challenged.

The American legal profession, of which I am proud to be a part, is making an outstanding effort to give citizens a deeper awareness of this continuing challenge and to alert us to our responsibilities as free, law-abiding people.

One means of doing this is the annual observance of Law Day, U.S.A. on May 1. The theme of this year's observance, "Uphold the Law—A Citizen's First Duty," is designed to direct public attention to the rights and duties of citizenship.

As Americans, we enjoy wide freedoms, guaranteed by law, which distinguish our society from a totalitarian system. But with these rights and freedoms go individual responsibility which all Americans must exercise.

While we enjoy the right to equal protection of laws, equal justice in the courts, and the right to be free from arbitrary search or arrest, we are bound to obey the laws which give us these rights and to respect the rights of our fellow Americans.

We are privileged to be able to choose our public officers in free elections, but as members of a democratic nation, we are charged with the responsibility of voting in elections.

We are indeed fortunate that we live by a government of laws, where legislation is subject to the perfecting process of judicial review.

The eighth annual observance of Law Day, U.S.A. will focus national attention on our rights and responsibilities as citizens of the greatest Nation in the world—a Nation whose greatness stems from our dedication to rule of law.

The legal profession is to be commended for its work in helping Americans to understand more fully the value of our system of liberty under law. As we observe Law Day, let each of us commit ourselves to the fulfillment of our responsibilities as beneficiaries of that liberty.