

"disappointment, then disillusion" can be predicted among our allies.

THE UNANSWERED QUESTION

Were the dramatic and effective air strikes of last week in Vietnam merely a measured response to intensified attacks by the Communists, or did they signal the beginning of a new forward strategy aimed at a real change in the course of the war?

It may well be that the answer to both of these questions is "Yes," and that days to follow will establish that measured response in itself is a forward strategy in Vietnam.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, in his impressive television report to the Nation, described our air strikes as convincing evidence of our "will and purpose" in Vietnam. No American listening and watching was left in doubt as to the Secretary's personal sincerity or determination.

And yet—on the evidence now before us—there is doubt of our will and purpose in Vietnam.

There is obviously doubt in Hanoi, where the North Vietnamese continue to direct the forces of aggression south of the 17th parallel.

There is obviously doubt in Peiping, where the Chinese Reds speak omnisciently of open intervention in Vietnam, and where troops are reported massing along the border.

Here in the United States, there is some doubt also—as evidenced by the chorus of critical questioning over the weekend, and the clamor from peace-at-any-price quarters for immediate negotiation or withdrawal.

It is not my purpose, as a relatively junior Member of this body, to substitute my personal judgment for that of either the President or any member of his Cabinet.

No man in America is as well qualified as President Johnson to lead our Nation during this critical period of the world's history, and no President in our history has been surrounded by abler men in his Cabinet.

I have every confidence that our President will soon put to a final and decisive end the doubts and questions concerning our policy in Vietnam.

I have every confidence that the coming weeks will demonstrate, beyond any question, the American will and purpose to halt aggression in Vietnam are neither qualified by timidity at home nor discouraged by bluster abroad.

I have every confidence that our President and our Armed Forces in Vietnam and Asia will continue to command the warm and wholehearted support and trust of the American people and their representatives in Congress.

TWO CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSALS

In the spirit of constructive support of the President, I would like to conclude these remarks with two brief proposals—both of which, in my judgment, would help in a substantial way to terminate all doubts regarding our will and purpose in Vietnam.

Both suggestions are based upon the conviction that Red China and Soviet Russia—the two dominant Communist

powers, and both of them major land powers—are more impressed by military manpower than any other factor. The military writings of both of these nations abundantly support this view.

In my judgment, this Government should immediately suspend all further action to reduce our military manpower under the policies announced by Secretary McNamara in November of 1964. Regardless of what is done with reference to the basis involved, the manpower should be retained—whether in the Reserves, the National Guard or the Regular Forces. This is no time to engage in economy releases of trained military personnel.

Second, the Armed Forces should hold "for the duration of the emergency" all personnel now being released by reason of termination of enlistment or "time in rank"—seeking whatever Executive or legislative authority may be necessary for such action.

These two steps would help beyond measure to convince the Communists that we mean business in Vietnam—and that we are prepared to do what is necessary to protect the cause of freedom and American interests in Asia.

FEBRUARY 12, 1965.

HON. ROBERT S. McNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Along with millions of Americans, I have applauded your announced determination to hold the line against communism in Vietnam and southeast Asia, and agree wholeheartedly with your recent statement on television that "our will and purpose are being tested" in that area. I thoroughly agree that the United States must take every necessary step to hold our ground there, and to make clear and unmistakable the firmness of our will and purpose in the face of increased Communist aggressiveness in Vietnam.

In view of the increasingly serious situation in Vietnam, I strongly urge you to suspend immediately any further Pentagon action to reduce in any way our military forces. So long as the present situation prevails, we should do all in our power to hold in a position of readiness all able-bodied members of our Armed Forces, in either the Regular Establishment or in Reserve and National Guard units.

Department of Defense estimates supplied to the House Committee on Armed Services show a manpower reduction of 150,000 will result upon merger of the Army Reserve and Army National Guard. Additional reductions are scheduled in Air Force manpower.

The purpose of this letter is not to plead the case of any particular base or unit—and the importance of an Air Force Reserve Group scheduled to be abolished in my own district, at Davis Field in Muskogee, cannot be dismissed from my own thinking—but my major and overriding concern at this time does not involve any particular base or organizational unit. I am principally concerned as a Member of Congress with the reduction in ready manpower now in progress under orders issued by your office, and the impact of that reduction in manpower upon our position in southeast Asia.

You have eloquently stated that the United States intends to show North Vietnam and the world its determination to stand firm and do everything necessary to protect our interest in that area. Surely it must seem inconsistent with that purpose, to any observer, to continue at this time with steps to reduce our pool of trained fighting men—

thousands of men who stand ready to back our Regular military forces in the event of an enlargement of the conflict in Vietnam.

Notwithstanding your announced objectives of economy and overall improvement in defense readiness, it is unlikely that the Asiatic mind—or any mind behind the Iron Curtain—will view any reduction in armed forces as a move toward strength and firmness.

I sincerely believe it is strategically, logically, and psychologically wrong to take any further action at this time which indicates any curtailment of strength or gives any impression of reduction of effort or withdrawal.

Facing the greatest challenge to our free world leadership since the Communist march into South Korea, this Nation should give evidence at home as well as in southeast Asia of our determination and intention to meet the Communist threat and employ every resource at our command.

In that spirit I believe your decision to retain all present military forces—Regular, Reserve, and Guard included—at a maximum state of readiness so long as the present situation continues in Vietnam, would contribute in a very positive way to the maintenance of our position there. I feel certain it would also convince millions of Americans, who are today confused by the news of a drastic increase in the March draft call as contrasted with the release of Reservists across the country, that we mean business in every sense of the word in Vietnam.

Sincerely yours,

ED EDMONDSON,
Member of Congress.

TAX CREDITS FOR CERTAIN
EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES

(Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide a tax credit for amounts paid on account of tuition fees and similar educational expenses at a level above the 12th grade.

I first introduced a similar bill (H.R. 12771) in the 87th Congress. I reintroduced that bill (H.R. 49) in the 88th Congress.

The bill introduced today provides a different formula for computing the credit. The amount of the credit is 75 percent of the first \$200, 25 percent of the next \$300, and 10 percent of the next \$1,000 expended for tuition fees, books, and supplies for a student at an institution of higher education. Maximum credit is \$325.

The purpose of the bill is to encourage educational aid, not only for members of the taxpayer's immediate family, but also to other deserving students. To the extent that the needs of our students can be met by private initiative, we conserve Federal and State revenues.

The allowance of this tax credit will also relieve the pressure on scholarship funds to the extent that the tax credit can provide for tuition and related expenses. The more limited funds available for scholarships can be directed to those most deserving and most in need of additional financial aid.

Our educational system, free from Government control, is one of our greatest national assets. It is essential to

encourage the expansion of that system, and to make its benefits available to the greatest number of people. This bill will aid in the attainment of that objective.

DEDICATION OF THE ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON MEMORIAL WING OF THE ALLEGHANY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAWKINS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on November 20, 1964, an impressive ceremony was held in Sparta, N.C., a small but thriving community in the Blue Mountains of northwestern North Carolina. The occasion was the dedication of the Robert Lee Doughton memorial wing of the Alleghany Memorial Hospital.

Robert Lee Doughton—1863—1954—legislator, farmer, businessman, humanitarian, and dedicated public servant, represented the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina, from January 1911 to January 1953. His remarkable record of legislative achievement spanned more than a generation. For the last 18 years of his service in Washington, he was chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. His leadership of that great committee spanned a period of service longer than that held by any other man in American history.

In today's world, men think of retirement and enjoying a life of leisure at the normal retirement age of 65. Yet Congressman Doughton, unusual man that he was, took on new challenges in the twilight of his life and led the Congress in writing great and landmark legislation.

Mr. Doughton served his native State and Nation with distinction. A grateful and appreciative State, eager to erect an appropriate memorial for this giant of a man and the great service he rendered, made plans for such a memorial.

In 1961, the North Carolina General Assembly authorized the Governor of North Carolina to appoint a commission to plan for and to create a fitting memorial to Mr. Doughton. The act is as follows:

S.B. 444

[Session Laws, 1961—ch. 1079]

CHAPTER 1079

An act to authorize the Governor to appoint a commission to erect a fitting memorial to the late Robert Lee Doughton, former State senator and long-time Member of Congress, and to appropriate the sum of \$25,000 to aid in bearing the expense of erecting the memorial

Whereas the late Robert Lee Doughton was born at Laurel Springs, N.C., on November 7, 1863, receiving his education in the public schools of Laurel Springs and Sparta, N.C.; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton was appointed as a member of the Board of Agriculture of the State of North Carolina in 1903, serving with distinction until he was elected to the State senate from the 35th district in 1908, after which time he devoted his

energy and talents as director of the State prison from 1909 to 1911; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton was elected from the Ninth District to serve in the 62d session of Congress and was reelected for succeeding terms by large majorities with the results being that he served his district, State, and Nation from the 62d to the 82d sessions of Congress, both inclusive, in a manner unexcelled by any other public servant; and

Whereas while serving as a Member of Congress, he was nominated chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means during the 73d to the 79th sessions of Congress, both inclusive, being reinstated to that most important post during the 81st Congress, a position which he held longer than any other man in the history of the government, still finding time, however, to serve as alternating Chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton rendered distinguished service to the public life of the State and Nation through his fine, well-balanced personality, his ability to study public problems without regard to the pressures of interested groups and reach a solution in the best interest of the entire State and Nation, always with the highest degree of intellectual honesty; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton has served as a leader in the moral, religious, and civic life of the State, always conducting himself by the book of his chosen church; making his citizenship a thing of fine obligation, following no guide but integrity into the political forum; and

Whereas the general assembly is of the opinion that a fitting memorial should be erected as a memorial to his long and distinguished record as a public spirited citizen and servant of this State and Nation: Now, therefore,

The General Assembly of North Carolina do enact:

SECTION 1. The Governor of North Carolina is authorized to appoint a commission to be known as "The Robert Lee Doughton Memorial Commission" and to consist of 25 members. It shall be the duty of this commission to erect a suitable and fitting memorial in the town of Laurel Springs or at some appropriate site in the vicinity of said town.

Sec. 2. There is hereby appropriated from the general fund to the commission created by this act the sum of \$25,000 which shall be expended by the commission in the erection of the memorial herein referred to.

Sec. 3. The members of the commission created by this act shall serve without any pay or expense allowances of any kind.

Sec. 4. The commission created by this act shall have authority to accept or reject donations from private individuals or corporations to be expended for the purposes herein set forth.

Sec. 5. All laws and clauses of laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

Sec. 6. This act shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 21st day of June 1961.

In November of 1961, Governor Terry Sanford appointed 25 well-known citizens of North Carolina as members of the Robert Lee Doughton Memorial Commission. Those appointed are as follows:

[Ch. 1079, Session Laws, 1961]

THE ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Membership: 25 members.

Term: At will of the Governor.

C. A. Cannon, chairman, Kannapolis, November 14, 1961, Cabarrus County.

Fred W. Morrison, vice chairman, Shelby and Washington, November 14, 1961, Cleveland County.

Mrs. R. S. Ferguson, Taylorsville, November 14, 1961, Alexander County.

J. Harry Miller, Stony Point, November 14, 1961, Alexander County.

A. Vance Choate, Sparta, November 14, 1961, Alleghany County.

J. Kemp Doughton, Sparta, November 14, 1961, Alleghany County.

R. Austin Jones, West Jefferson, November 14, 1961, Ashe County.

Wm. B. Austin, Jefferson, November 14, 1961, Ashe County.

Mrs. Stella Anderson, West Jefferson, November 14, 1961, Ashe County.

M. Smoot Lyles, Concord, November 14, 1961, Cabarrus County.

Harold Coffey, Lenoir, November 14, 1961, Caldwell County.

Dennis S. Cook, Lenoir, November 14, 1961, Caldwell County.

Mrs. Margaret B. Moore, Lenoir, November 14, 1961, Caldwell County.

J. Gordon Bush, Lenoir, November 14, 1961, Caldwell County.

Dr. J. Sam Holbrook, Statesville, November 14, 1961, Iredell County.

Senator James V. Johnson, Statesville, November 14, 1961, Iredell County.

Joe Knox, Mooresville, November 14, 1961, Iredell County.

James A. Graham, Raleigh, November 14, 1961, Rowan County.

John Kesler, Salisbury, November 14, 1961, Rowan County.

Walter Woodson, Sr., Salisbury, November 14, 1961, Rowan County.

Leslie M. Weisiger, Salisbury, November 14, 1961, Rowan County.

Mrs. E. G. Harwood, Albemarle, November 14, 1961, Stanly County.

W. H. Morrow, Albemarle, November 14, 1961, Stanly County.

Jordan H. Winkler, Boone, November 14, 1961, Watauga County.

Robert C. Rivers, Boone, November 14, 1961, Watauga County.

Dwight W. Quinn, secretary, Kannapolis.

Under the able leadership of its chairman, another distinguished North Carolinian, Mr. C. A. Cannon, of Concord, N.C., the commission began to implement its appointed task. After appropriate investigation and planning, the commission adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the legislature of 1961 created the Robert Lee Doughton Memorial Commission and charged it with the duty and responsibility of erecting an appropriate memorial to the late Robert Lee Doughton, former State Senator and long-time Member of Congress, appropriating for this purpose the sum of \$25,000; and

Whereas said commission has been duly appointed by the Governor and organized as provided by law; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton served the State and the Nation with great distinction, making an outstanding contribution to sound business principles in government, especially as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the national House of Representatives; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton throughout his long public career stood for the highest moral and ethical principles; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton, although rising to positions of great trust and power, never lost touch with the people he served, maintaining always a democratic faith in the wisdom of the electorate, remaining at all times their good friend and counselor, their devoted and loyal Representative; and

Whereas Robert Lee Doughton in both public and private life was a man of great faith, of firm spiritual convictions, which was

proceeded into the harbor and dropped anchor where the harbor master directed. A trained investigator might have detected an undercurrent of feeling, but official calls were made and the social amenities were observed. For 3 weeks no untoward incident occurred.

Then, at 9:40 p.m. on February 15, two explosions threw parts of the ship 200 feet in the air and illuminated the whole harbor.

Reports of the disaster were received in the United States with consternation. Accusations against the Spaniards were freely expressed in certain American newspapers. Most Americans held Spain responsible, although the evidence was never sufficient to fix the blame officially. Some 2 months later came the Spanish-American War which was to mark the collapse of the Spanish Empire and the emergence of the United States as a world power.

Referring to the slogan, "Remember the *Maine*," Captain Sigsbee, the commander of the ship, later had this to say:

Therefore I conceive the motto, "Remember the *Maine*" used as a war cry would not have been justifiable. Improperly applied, the motto * * * savors too much of revenge * * * but it may be used in an entirely worthy sense. During the recent war with Spain about 75 men were killed and wounded in the U.S. Navy. Only 17 were killed. On board the *Maine* 252 men were killed outright and 8 died later—nearly 15 times as many as were killed in the U.S. Navy by the Spanish land and naval forces during the entire war. In the way that the men of the *Maine* died and suffered there was enough of the heroic to provide a sound foundation for the motto, "Remember the *Maine*."

It is in this way that we, in our observance here today, seek to "Remember the *Maine*."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 67 years ago these headlines flashed across my home State of New York, "*Maine* Blown to Atoms in Havana Harbor: Over 100 of Her Crew Killed. Three-million-dollar Battleship Destroyed by a Terrific and Mysterious Explosion While Her Men Are Sleeping."

Today, on the anniversary of this disaster, we remember that it was this news which ignited the sympathies of the American people and which pushes a long series of events toward a climax. On April 25, 1898, the United States declared war against Spain and the Spanish-American War began. And it began, said President McKinley, "in the name of humanity, in the name of civilization, in behalf of endangered American interests."

The actual cause of the destruction of the *Maine* remains now as it was then a mystery. No conclusive proof has ever been produced which could definitely fix the blame in the tragedy. But in 1898, as the news spread that 260 American officers and crewmen had lost their lives and as some newspapers freely accused Spanish agents of responsibility, public opinion, already in strong and open sympathy with Cuban patriots, crystallized into the slogan: "Remember the *Maine*."

For years, the Cuban people had sought to throw off Spanish misrule and oppression. They had engaged in a heroic but unsuccessful effort for independ-

ence between 1868 and 1878, the Ten Years' War. During that revolution the American people, though strongly sympathetic to the Cuban cause, had only given expressions of support.

But in 1895, when revolution broke out anew against the continuing corruption of the Spanish administration, the people of the United States showed increasing alarm. From the beginning, the struggle in Cuba took on aspects of ferocity that horrified Americans. Vivid accounts were reported to the public in a theretofore unprecedented era of journalistic coverage.

The extreme methods of coercion used by Gen. Valeriano Weyler—or "Butcher" Weyler, as he soon came to be called by the press—were well known. Americans watched helplessly as he, in an attempt to stamp out the Cuban guerrilla forces, ordered the entire civilian population of certain areas confined to concentration camps. There, they died by the thousands, victims of disease, malnutrition, and atrocities.

Against this background, it is not surprising that when the battleship *Maine* exploded a white-hot wave of anger gripped the American people. Within a few short months, 1 million of the young men of this country had volunteered to fight side by side with the Cuban patriots until the despotism of Spain could be removed from that island.

There are some who seek to detract from the American contribution to the Cuban cause, but, as an editorial from the Havana Post of 1959 states:

There can be no successful mutilation of the history of Cuban and U.S. allied cooperation in the war of independence. * * * One has only to see those names on the bronze plaques on San Juan Hill, just outside Santiago, to know the extent of the aid given the cause by the United States.

On those plaques, one finds inscribed the names of Americans from every State of the Union who gave for the cause of Cuba the most that any man can give for any cause. They gave their lives.

Today, we pay tribute to the idealistic and courageous young men who fought for and gave their lives for the freedom and independence of a neighboring people. We pay special tribute, also to the valor and the patience of the Cuban people who have found it necessary to struggle almost continually over the years for their liberties.

And today, a black cloud is again heavy over this beautiful Caribbean island. Its people again know the horrors of tyranny. Again, they are showing courage and heroism in their struggle against it. Today, as we remember the *Maine* of 67 years ago, let us also remember the present.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, throughout our history, America has responded to acts of aggression with a special courage, decisiveness and will to succeed which have become legendary in the annals of the defense of liberty.

Regardless of the strength of our opponents, those who have challenged us have been defeated or deterred. We have often succeeded in making allies of former enemies; individuals and governments wise enough to join in the ancient and enduring struggle for peace and liberty.

America, itself, symbolizes many things to the people of the earth. Of all these symbols, perhaps our greatest strength lies in our ability to sustain countless irresponsible acts and errors of statesmanship with patience and prevailing wisdom. However, foolishly unmindful of our determination to defend our freedom, other nations have on occasion misjudged our patience for cowardice and indecision.

Such an error in judgment led Spain into believing we would not defend our interests in the Caribbean. On February 15, 1898, the Battleship *Maine* was sunk in Havana Harbor. And before the world had time to digest the news, the United States had reacted swiftly, surely and with great strength. Our war with Spain involved some of the bloodiest and most individually gallant sacrifices in our history, yet they were in our American tradition and, in the end, our just cause prevailed.

Although some 67 years have passed, we have continued to demonstrate our strength and our determination never to yield when the price is the loss of liberty for ourselves or our allies. Those in other nations who would wish us ill had best be reminded of our willingness to bear any burden to secure liberty for all those men who seek it and who will join in fighting alongside us to obtain it.

The men who fought at San Juan Hill, at Bunker Hill, at Pork Chop Hill earned us the right to live in peace with one another and the world. We would do them a grave injustice if we failed in our historic defense of the self-determination all men seek in their hearts.

On this 67th anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, it is an honor to stand with my colleagues and fellow citizens in commemorating the heroism and the love of justice which have made our country the bulwark of freedom throughout the world.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM AND AMERICAN DEFENSE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Hawkins). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the past week has served to bring home forcefully the hard and bitter truth that our country is engaged in war in Vietnam.

It has been apparent for some time that our Government's stake in the sav-

age struggle in Vietnam is a major one, with more than 23,000 American officers and men engaged in assisting the forces of South Vietnam, at a daily cost in excess of \$2 million.

On February 6, Vietcong guerrilla forces entered an American air base at Pleiku and blasted planes, helicopters, and barracks on the base, leaving 8 of our enlisted men dead and more than 125 wounded.

The following day, the President of the United States ordered an air strike against military targets in North Vietnam, and fighter bombers from three of our carriers were involved in action more than 50 miles north of the 17th parallel, which divides North and South Vietnam.

The President proceeded to order the withdrawal of 1,800 American dependents from Vietnam, and declared on behalf of our Government:

We have no choice now but to clear the decks and make absolutely clear our continued determination to back South Vietnam in its fight to maintain its independence.

In the days which have followed that presidential announcement, Vietcong forces have engaged in another savage attack upon quarters occupied by American forces, inflicting heavy casualties and bringing the total number of Americans dead by Vietcong action to nearly 300.

In response to the enemy attack of February 9, 160 planes of the United States and South Vietnam joined in the largest aerial attack of the long conflict, striking at a series of supply depots and military barracks north of the 17th parallel.

The scope of the massive air strike on February 10, in which more than 100 planes from American carriers at sea joined fighter-bombers of the American Air Force and those of South Vietnam, spoke far more effectively than mere words of this Nation's "continued determination."

HOMEFRONT QUESTIONS

In the wake of an unquestioned escalation of military action during the past week, many Americans were asking searching questions—both publicly and privately—concerning the course of the war.

With regard to the central aim of our presence in Vietnam, the President has left no room for reasonable doubt. He has said publicly that he considers it "essential" to American interests to defeat the Communist aggression against South Vietnam. He has declared his conviction that our failure there "would convince every nation in south Asia that it must now bow to Communist terms to survive."

Notwithstanding these strong words, with their clear commitment of U.S. prestige as declared by the Nation's Chief Executive, the charge is now heard in more than one quarter that the extent and validity of that commitment remain uncertain and ill-defined.

In the New York Times for Sunday, February 14, 1965, both Arthur Krock and James Reston have voiced their protest over White House failure to "make things clear" and to advise of "plans to meet whatever contingencies may arise

from the new U.S. policy of immediate and increasingly powerful military reprisal."

Mr. Krock and Mr. Reston were chiefly concerned with the absence of information and knowledge at home concerning the depth and breadth of our Vietnam commitment.

Other competent observers, however, have been even more concerned about the effect of uncertainty in the Communist world.

Writing in the Washington Post for February 14, 1965, Donald S. Zagoria—in an article entitled, "Communists Doubt Our Will in Vietnam"—reported as follows:

The Communists have long believed that the United States would not have the patience or will to stick out the war and recent statements by influential Americans calling for negotiation and/or withdrawal almost certainly increased their optimism. They have all along eagerly seized on any American statements urging negotiation and withdrawal. In the past 6 months, several prominent American Senators, columnists, and newspapers have called for negotiations and, in the absence of a clear-cut policy, rumors developed that the administration was in favor of negotiation.

All this doubtless strongly reinforced the Communist belief that victory in South Vietnam was close at hand.

In the opinion of Mr. Zagoria, "two bombing attacks will not suffice" as sufficient pressure "to bring a reluctant Ho Chi Minh to the conference table."

They will not so easily give up at the conference table what they have fought so hard and so long on the battlefield to achieve, and at a time when final victory seems near—

Mr. Zagoria concludes.

A member of Columbia University's Research Institute on Communist Affairs and the author of "The Sino-Soviet Conflict, 1956-61," Mr. Zagoria has impressive credentials as a commentator on Communist thinking. His conclusion that the Communists question our will and determination in Vietnam may well provide the key to understanding of Vietcong policy.

Mr. Roscoe Drummond, also writing in the Washington Post on February 14, shares the view that American policy statements "have not persuaded the Asian Communists the United States really believes that turning back the aggression against South Vietnam is essential. Or that we intend to do whatever is necessary to see that this aggression will not be defeated."

The reason is—

Writes Mr. Drummond—

that actions, not words, make policy believable to the enemy. Our actions in Vietnam have not equaled our words. We have treated this as though winning it were essential to South Vietnam but not essential to the United States. We have for the most part permitted North Vietnam to practice aggression and enjoy immunity. Secretary Rusk once gave a somber cease-and-desist-or-else warning. When it was not heeded, we did nothing.

Up until the last week, Mr. Speaker, that was more or less the situation, and the plain truth about the impression which we had created in Asia concerning our policy in Vietnam. We were send-

ing thousands of men, and spending millions of dollars, but we were not convincing the Communists of our intention to do everything necessary to defeat aggression in Vietnam.

CHANGE IN DIRECTION

Now, in the words of Mr. Drummond, "something more is being done."

We have undoubtedly convinced the Communists in North Vietnam of our intention and readiness to hit, and hit very hard indeed, when American military forces in Vietnam are attacked directly by the Vietcong. We have made it very clear that North Vietnam is not a privileged sanctuary, and we have demonstrated that our forces are not afraid to cross the 17th parallel.

Without question, we have also impressed the Communists of Asia with the quality and effectiveness of American air forces—both land and sea-based—and of the rising quality and effectiveness of the air force of South Vietnam.

Finally, and notwithstanding some critics, President Johnson has undoubtedly rallied the support of an overwhelming majority of his fellow citizens in support of his policies of the past week.

In the Congress, leaders of both parties have spoken out strongly in support of the air strikes on North Vietnam.

In the press, editorial comment across the Nation has generally approved, and most have agreed with the Seattle Times that the President "has the overwhelming support of the American people."

Even Mr. Reston, in his largely critical column, declared that "very few people here question the necessity for a limited expansion of the war by U.S. bombers into Communist territory."

And yet, while there is general agreement that the situation in Vietnam has entered a radically new phase, I have not found a single authority who believes the bombing attacks of last week will result in early conclusion of the long and bloody conflict—either by military victory or the conference table.

On the contrary, Mr. Zagoria is emphatic in the belief that "persistent and heavy pressure" must be brought to bear against the North, and offers the view that "positive incentives"—both economic and diplomatic—should also be offered as an alternative to widespread destruction in North Vietnam.

Mr. Drummond is convinced that we must make it clear that we are prepared to participate in joint air strikes with the forces of South Vietnam in response to Vietcong attacks upon Vietnamese forces, as well as in response to attacks upon Americans. Such a willingness is indispensable to our relations with South Vietnam, and would make even more clear our determination to halt Communist aggression in that country.

The Drummond view on this last point is shared by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, writing from on the scene in Saigon, who say our relationship with Vietnamese forces in the field is at stake in the decision to use our planes to counter attacks upon the forces of South Vietnam.

Unless our "forward strategy" of the past week is "continued and intensified," in the view of these Saigon observers,