

January 25, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A339

I choose not to talk about this in terms of an "oceanography gap," even though I'm convinced we are not preeminent in the field. But I hope we don't wait for a sharp stimulus which forces us into a competition. Perhaps we should move more rapidly because we have the capability and it ought to be done for the benefits it can provide for us and the rest of mankind. How fast we move to meet the challenge of the ocean depends in large measure on the political action we take today.

The 9,500 Fourth-Class Post Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the December 1965 issue of Postmasters Advocate, the official publication of the National League of Postmasters of the United States, devoted its cover picture to a recent historic event in the 10th Congressional District of Texas.

I refer to the swearing-in ceremonies of the new Postmaster General, Lawrence F. "Larry" O'Brien, in the little post office at Hye, Tex.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include from this issue of Postmasters Advocate a splendid editorial of tribute to President Lyndon B. Johnson, for the special recognition he gave on this occasion to our Nation's 9,500 fourth-class post offices.

The article follows:

THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT

Who said that fourth-class post offices are a thing of the past and all washed up?

Observe our cover this month; that picture was made in a post office of the fourth class—at Hye, Tex., which is located 3 miles from the LBJ Ranch, home of our President.

Yes, President Lyndon B. Johnson deliberately chose a fourth-class post office as the site for the swearing-in ceremony of the new Postmaster General, Lawrence F. "Larry" O'Brien, as a reminder that the large and the small are equally the concern of Government.

Incidentally, Hye Postmaster Levi A. Delke, who is a member of the National League of Postmasters, also is in the picture. Postmaster Delke, who has been the President's friend since childhood, showed his two distinguished guests around the combination post office, general store, bus stop, and feed-store—following a snack of crackers and cheese in the backroom.

We're thrilled that our President has emphasized the importance of rural America in his thinking. As he pointed out, both the rural post office and the country store made very important contributions in the development of the frontier lands.

We state unequivocally that the small post offices, and the postmasters thereof, will always make a significant and important contribution to the development of America.

We thank President Johnson for this recognition of the 9,500 fourth-class post offices and their postmasters.

After all, the Postmasters Advocate was originally named, the Fourth Class Postmaster. And, everyone knows, that the National League of Postmasters has long been the

champion of the small postmasters and post offices.

We hail—and salute—President Lyndon B. Johnson on this historic occasion.

The Holding Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, support for the views of Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin relative to the war in Vietnam is growing.

The New York Times on Friday, January 21, editorially declared as follows:

At the present, American forces are secure in their coastal positions and cannot be involuntarily dislodged. General Gavin's recent advice not to expand the war but to continue efforts to negotiate the peace, has the force of logic on its side.

On January 17, in an interview telecast in New York over station WNDT and reported the following day by the New York Times, Associate Editor James B. Reston, of the New York Times, took a position almost identical to that expressed by General Gavin. Mr. Reston asserted that the war in Vietnam should be pursued as one of limited objectives, that the correct way was "the middle way." This, he said would rule out both continued intensification of the war or peace on terms that would lose the country.

The United States can defend the perimeter of Saigon, Mr. Reston said, and the coastal areas where most of the people of South Vietnam live. This is very different, he added, from searching out the enemy through the elephant grass. Mr. Reston said:

We are just at the beginning of an enormous battle of Asia. That battle will go on for the rest of the century and Vietnam is not the end of it but the beginning. If we win in Vietnam, the battle will still go on and what I am afraid of is that we will try to score a great smashing victory, thinking that will end it all, which it won't. Therefore, I would limit the objective.

In an interview published in the Milwaukee, Wis., Journal, on January 16, Senator GAYLORD NELSON conceded that "there are no easy answers to the agonizing dilemma facing America in Vietnam." He continued:

But of all the grim alternatives, the wisest choice is to continue with great patience to seek a negotiated settlement, while firmly refusing to escalate the conflict further.

Senator NELSON said he believed that there was "no practical hope in achieving our aims" through escalation.

He warned that escalation carried with it "a very real possibility of an Asian-wide war in which America would waste her resources and young men in a slaughter that could achieve nothing but those desperate conditions of chaos ideal for the spread of communism."

Senator NELSON said he agreed with still another distinguished American who

has expressed a similar view: George F. Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, who recently advocated a campaign to deescalate the Vietnam war.

Since last July, the distinguished Columnist Walter Lippmann has held this basic view of the situation.

In the latest issue of Newsweek magazine, dated January 31, 1966, Mr. Lippmann again asserts this view stating that:

The holding strategy enables us to honor our commitments to the South Vietnamese, who would be lost if we withdrew precipitately from the whole country. The holding strategy, moreover, relieves our troops of the impossible task of occupying the villages of South Vietnam and keeping the Vietcong from overrunning them when we leave. The holding strategy is built upon our seapower, which is our strong right arm, not upon the ability of American soldiers fighting 8,000 miles away to make secure 2,500 villages.

Mr. Lippmann goes on to note that the holding strategy advocated by General Gavin "is now receiving wide support in the Congress and in the press."

In an identical vein in his column in today's Washington Post, Mr. Lippmann makes the point that:

It is often said by the President's supporters that his critics propose no alternative to what he is doing. If that was ever true, it is no longer true today. It is not true since the Mansfield report and since the Gavin statement. The President should reduce his war aims, which today are impossibly high in the light of the conditions described in the Mansfield report. He should alter his strategy along the lines proposed by General Gavin, making it a holding operation pending the eventual negotiation of a political settlement.

Under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I include here Mr. Lippmann's column from the January 31 issue of Newsweek magazine and the January 25 issue of the Washington Post.

[From Newsweek, Jan. 31, 1966]

THE HOLDING STRATEGY

(By Walter Lippmann)

Toward the end of the year we had arrived at a turning point in the Vietnamese war. There had to be new and great decisions about the strategy and objectives of the war. The turning has been marked by a suspension of bombing in North Vietnam and by the President's worldwide diplomatic campaign to bring about a negotiated truce.

At the sametime, just as Congress was reassembling, Senator MANSFIELD published his report, which is the first official, responsible, and adequately informed account of the state of the war. The Mansfield report was followed by the first deep criticism of the strategy of the war on the part of a military man especially competent to judge it. The judgment came in a letter to Harper's magazine from Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, who was the Army's Chief of Plans and Operations at the time when the French were facing defeat at Dienbienphu.

There was also a movement of popular opinion, which is, I believe, just under the surface of what the polls report. It was precipitated by the proven failure of the strategical decisions taken last July. After all the bombing and the multiplication of our forces, the best that can be said is that out of the impending defeat of the Saigonese forces a year ago we have snatched not a victory, nor any credible prospect of victory, but a bloody and costly stalemate.

A340

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 25, 1966

The President has three choices open to him. One is to expand the war by bombing Haiphong and Hanoi. But that opens up the possibility that the crowded harbor and city of Saigon will be bombed in return, and also that China, perhaps even the Soviet Union, will be drawn actively into the war. A second choice is to expand our ground forces for a big land war. The third choice is to concentrate the U.S. military forces along the coast, and, holding fast, try then to negotiate a truce.

UNDECIDED BASIC ISSUE

As I write this article, the President has made it reasonably clear that he is resisting the idea of a much bigger war. Thus, he has continued the pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. But the basic issue is not, it appears, decided. He has not yet adopted the strategy of restricting the American intervention to a holding operation in Saigon and along the coast.

If he does this, he will not be adopting a new idea. He will be adopting a strategy which was urged upon him last July before he escalated and Americanized the war and sent American troops out into the jungle to find and destroy the Vietcong. The President rejected the holding strategy last July. There is a strong case why he should now fall back upon it. For, as it was argued last July, the holding strategy enables us to honor our commitments to the South Vietnamese, who would be lost if we withdrew precipitately from the whole country. The holding strategy, moreover, relieves our troops of the impossible task of occupying the villages of South Vietnam and keeping the Vietcong from overrunning them when we leave. The holding strategy is built upon our seapower, which is our strong right arm, not upon the ability of American soldiers fighting 8,000 miles away to make secure 2,500 villages.

POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES

The holding strategy is what General Gavin advocates, and it is now receiving wide support in the Congress and in the press. It would be, I have thought since last July, the best of a bad business, not glorious, but the least costly way of repairing the grievous mistakes of the past.

But we must not deceive ourselves about the probable political consequences. The adoption of the holding strategy would amount to an acknowledgment that the Vietcong have defeated the Saigonese forces in most of South Vietnam. It recognizes a de facto military partition of South Vietnam. If we are indeed committed, as some people say we are, to reconquer the whole of South Vietnam and to get rid of all of the Vietcong and to establish General Ky as the ruler of all South Vietnam, then in the holding strategy we would indeed renege on our commitments.

The question is whether the American Government under any of the three Presidents who have dealt with South Vietnam ever made such an absurd, such a fantastically unreal, commitment. I do not think so, and if someone turned up a piece of paper signed by John Foster Dulles or Dean Rusk, I would feel about it as I would if they had signed a piece of paper ceding Alaska to the Eskimos. An absurd and impossible commitment is not a true commitment in law or in morals, and a commitment to make General Ky the accepted ruler of South Vietnam is both absurd and impossible.

We can with a good conscience adopt a holding strategy. If it enables us eventually to disengage our military forces from the Asian mainland and to retire to the sea and the islands where our power is at its maximum, we shall have acted honorably, humanely, and wisely.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Jan. 25, 1966]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—WELL, WHAT CAN
HE DO?

(By Walter Lippmann)

The reason why the peace offensive failed is most cogently revealed in the Mansfield report on the state of the war. Mr. Johnson has been trying to obtain by propaganda the victory which he has not been able to obtain on the battlefield—that is to say, the acceptance in the whole of South Vietnam of a government which has lost control of a very large part of South Vietnam. The peace offensive was bound to fail, and the grave decisions which the President hoped to circumvent and avoid are now before him.

If he is to make these decisions wisely, he must recognize that in international politics peace settlements are possible only as and when they reflect the real balance of power. In the World War, for example, Churchill and Roosevelt had to settle with Stalin for a Soviet political frontier in the midst of Germany and of Europe. That is where the Red army had arrived when the peace negotiations began. The same principle will hold in Vietnam. There will be no settlement until the terms of peace reflect the military reality.

The President will be disappointed again and again as long as he and Secretary Rusk ask for a settlement which in effect demands that the defeat of the Saigon forces be transmuted at the conference table into a victory for the Saigon forces. Nor should he indulge in any illusion that the informed opinion of mankind really thinks as Secretary Rusk talks merely because American envoys have been politely and sympathetically received in so many capitals.

What then should the President do? It is often said by the President's supporters that his critics propose no alternative to what he is doing. If that was ever true, it is no longer true today. It is not true since the Mansfield report and since the Gavin statement. The President should reduce his war aims, which today are impossibly high in the light of the conditions described in the Mansfield report. He should alter his strategy along the lines proposed by General Gavin, making it a holding operation pending the eventual negotiation of a political settlement.

The Mansfield report shows that Mr. Rusk's objective—the rule of General Ky or his successor over the whole of South Vietnam—is unattainable no matter how much the war is escalated. The burden of disproving the conclusions of the Mansfield report is on those who have been proved wrong about the escalation of last summer, on those who are now asking for another escalation in order to redeem their failure, on those who want to redouble the stakes in order to recoup their losses.

If the Mansfield report contains the truth of the matter, it follows inevitably that our war aims should be reduced and our strategy revised. We should put aside the hopeless task of searching out and destroying the Vietcong, and we should take our stand, as General Gavin advises, on a holding operation in the coastal cities.

This is not a policy for a glorious victory or for some kind of dazzling political triumph. It is no trick for pulling rabbits out of a hat. It is a formula for liquidating a mistake, for ending a war that cannot be won at any tolerable price, for cutting our losses before they escalate into bankruptcy, and for listening to commonsense rather than to war whoops and tomtoms.

Because we are neither omniscient nor omnipotent, we, even we Americans, cannot always win. But I cannot help feeling in

my bones that a display of commonsense by a proud and imperious nation would be a good moral investment for the future.

Draft Card Burners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a copy of a letter Mrs. Richard Shaffer, of Norwalk, Conn., wrote to President Johnson.

Mrs. Shaffer expresses a feeling that many of us have about the possibility of draft card burners and other similar types undermining the morale of our fighting men in Vietnam. I agree that it is important that our service men and women know we are solidly behind them. In the belief that Mrs. Shaffer's letter will be of interest to my colleagues, I am inserting it and a letter sent to our men in Vietnam in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letters follow:

To the Officers and Enlisted Men:

Enclosed is a copy of a letter written by me today to President Johnson. Never before have I felt so strongly that I would bother him with a letter from someone as plain and ordinary as me and I'm sure in the course of human events my letter is unimportant. But I can't think of a better way to let you know how so many millions of us feel.

Sincerely,

VIVIAN E. SHAFFER.

SHOREFRONT PARK,

Norwalk, Conn., December 10, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The publicity given to peace marches and draft-card burners is undermining the morale and spirit of our fighting forces in Vietnam and our service men and women around the world. The American forces have never been defeated and the only thing that will ever defeat them will be a complete breakdown in their morale and the inner spirit that helps to create the best trained, best equipped fighting force this world has ever known.

We know why our men are in Vietnam—our great freedom carries with it a grave responsibility, and they are carrying out our responsibility. The men know why they are there. But unless we, the plain ordinary people here at home, back them up with strong encouragement and make clear to them our appreciation and understanding for the job they are doing, they will surely be defeated, not by the enemy, but by their own broken morale caused by our seeming indifference.

We ask that you help us get the message to each fighting man this Christmas that there are millions of Americans at home backing up their efforts and their sacrifices in Vietnam. We are backing them and will continue to do so with hard work, sacrifice, and prayer. We will do whatever you ask of us to help reinforce the spirit so necessary to maintain each member of our forces.

If you take this opportunity to speak for all of us in a dramatic and forceful way, the headlines of your message and the radio and

January 25, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A351

alternate plan of development. Such non-reimbursable credit should be utilized entirely at the discretion of the affected State.

I ask you as reclamationists to weigh carefully the merit of the plan I suggest here. This plan is definitely in the interest of wise use and proper conservation of our land and water resources without imposing undue burden on any area. I urge the proponents and the sponsors of S. 1446 to join me in my effort to make a wild river bill workable and equitable.

The amendment should be written in general language to cover all dislocations in all other States where wild rivers are involved. This is simply the application of the accepted rule in water resource development that recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement are nonreimbursable items.

What is Idaho's stake in such an amendment? Let us look at some figures on S. 1446 which are used here for illustrative purposes only, subject to the refinement that proper research will provide. On the credit side of the account the Northwest will gain the preservation of a fish resource calculated by the Fish and Wildlife Service to be worth \$11,062,000 per year.

On the debit side Idaho will lose potential hydroelectric production estimated in House Document No. 531 as being in excess of 2 million kilowatts valued conservatively at \$40 million per year. Idaho will also lose the flood protection that proper stream regulation would provide. But, from a reclamation standpoint by far the most important point, is that Idaho will also lose the reclamation assistance that this hydroelectric production would provide in a total amount not less than \$400 million based on the fact that a comparable hydroelectric output at Grand Coulee Dam provides that amount of assistance to about 1 million acres of new land.

I have spent enough time at the bargaining table with our Canadian neighbors on similar water resource problems to know that Idaho has an interest in wild rivers legislation that must be protected and defended by proper amendment before the bill is passed.

To sum up: I repeat what I said at the beginning: Finances are the greatest stumbling block to Idaho's future reclamation development. There is general unanimity for such projects as Lower Teton, Lynn Crandall, for supplemental water for Salmon Falls, new water and supplemental for other vast areas on both sides of the Snake River in eastern and southern Idaho, the southwestern Idaho development project which must include also the Weiser, Payette, and pumping projects in the Bruneau and Wickahoney areas.

Idaho's reclamation future depends on developing a reliable paying partner to supplement what the water users can pay.

Idaho must look to the output of its own watersheds for this source. This is Idaho's entitlement—our resource heritage.

Before we surrender—without compensation—Idaho reclamation's potential cashbox to a National Wild Rivers System, let us be sure we know what we are doing.

Like Father, Like Son**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest handicaps any young man may experience in growing into manhood is following in the footsteps of an illustrious father. Not that dad deliberately

does anything to overshadow his son; but the fame of the father just rubs off on his son's shoulders.

One of my dear friends, and a constituent, has a son who already has made a name for himself. His father, Dr. V. D. Mattia, 340 Kingsland Road, Nutley, has capped a brilliant career recently when he was chosen to be the president of Hoffmann-LaRoche, Inc., one of the world's major pharmaceutical companies. Dr. Mattia served with distinction at sea in the Naval Medical Corps during World War II and Korea, and combining a brilliant business sense with his equally brilliant medical aptitude, has risen rapidly through the ranks to the very top of his company, and his profession.

His son, Peter, is a fine student and athlete who a few days ago was honored in his hometown as the Athlete-Student of the Year. Such an award is always worthy of praise, but this year especially so, for Peter does not attend the local high school in Nutley. And this year marked the first time in the long history of the award that the selection committee chose a young man who did not attend the local school system. This will help give an idea what a superlative lad Peter must be. But the story is better told in an editorial by the publisher of the Nutley Sun, Frank A. Orechio, in the current edition of his paper.

As you will see, in Nutley they will be referring not to "the doctor's son," but to "Peter's father" when they talk about a Mattia these days:

[From the Nutley (N.J.) Sun]

LIKE FATHER, LIKE SON

Three weeks ago a proud son with beaming eyes observed the Nation applaud the spectacular achievement of a famous father.

On Saturday night the roles were reversed. A proud father, in the company of an equally proud mother, sat silently in the audience listening to speakers extol the virtues of their honored son.

The proud father was Dr. Virginus (Barney) Mattia, who, at the age of 42, on January 1, became president of Hoffmann-LaRoche, Inc., one of the world's largest pharmaceutical companies.

The honored son is Peter Mattia, a champion wrestler and recipient of all-State honors as a linesman at St. Benedict's football team. On Saturday evening Peter was awarded the American Legion's Annual Scholastic Sports Award. Young Mattia's achievements at St. Benedict's were of such magnitude that local American Legion officials responsible for the selection broke precedence this year to name a non-Nutley High School athlete as the award winner.

It is not easy for a son to establish his own identity while living in the shadows of a famous father. His father's attainments have proven to be a stimulating inspiration for Peter. Peter has been offered 30 full 4-year scholarships to the Nation's leading colleges—overwhelming proof that his outstanding accomplishments serve to carry out his own unmistakable image.

The American Legion officials who headed up the selection committee were Vincent Donohue and William Pratt. They and their committee members are to be congratulated for developing nomination procedures which permit our community to honor our most outstanding athletes by throwing the contest open to all local students regardless of the school attended.

The Donohue-Pratt committee is also entitled to congratulations for awarding the Legion's Amateur Award to a former Nutley High School star.

Policy Statement on Vietnam**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Synagogue Council of America, in a statement approved on January 14, 1966, has added its voice to the chorus of thoughtful Americans who are asking for a peaceful solution to the war in Vietnam.

The Synagogue Council of America, which represents the united voice of Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Judaism, is an organization of the following six national Jewish religious bodies: Central Conference of American Rabbis, Rabbinical Assembly, Rabbinical Council of America, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, United Synagogue of America.

The council's policy statement explains:

Having searched our conscience, we have come to the conclusion that peace and the cessation of hostilities must remain our major objective.

The statement goes on to commend the President's current peace offensive and to urge the administration not to be swayed from this course by those who would escalate and expand the war.

I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the thoughtful statement of the Synagogue Council of America, as follows:

POLICY STATEMENT ON VIETNAM ISSUED BY THE SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA

A decisive contribution of Judaism to the morality of international affairs is the affirmation that nations, like individuals, must be guided in their actions by justice and morality.

Nations, like individuals, cannot escape God's judgment, for "He will judge the universe with justice, and nations with righteousness" ("vehu yishpot tevel betzedek, yadim le'umim bemesharim"). Because nations are comprised of individuals, it is ultimately the individual who must assume moral responsibility and moral judgment in the affairs of his country. This we must do not only because of the imperatives of our religious commitments but also because we cherish the prerogative of citizens in a democratic society to express their views.

No one course of action in this complicated situation can clearly solve the moral dilemma in which we find ourselves. The U.S. commitment to the Government of South Vietnam has created a moral responsibility which we cannot ignore in our quest for peace. Yet, having searched our conscience, we have come to the conclusion that peace and the cessation of hostilities must remain our major objective.

Along with Americans of all faiths, we confront with deep sorrow the loss of American and Vietnamese lives, both North and South, and the suffering of the civilian population in that agonized and war-torn country. Our religious conscience compels us to exert every influence so that the action in Vietnam can be moved from the battlefield to the negotiating table.

We therefore note with gratification that President Johnson has on numerous occasions committed the administration to the principle of unconditional discussions leading to

the negotiation of the cessation of hostilities and a peace settlement.

We particularly wish to commend President Johnson and the administration for the recent halt in bombing of North Vietnam. It serves as a convincing demonstration that despite pressures from some quarters for a military solution to the problem, the purpose of our military effort in Vietnam remains one that is aimed at speeding an honorable settlement. It is also a convincing demonstration of the integrity of President Johnson's public expressions of our willingness to negotiate unconditionally.

We are deeply concerned that in the event the present halt in the bombing of North Vietnam fails to elicit the prayed-for response from Hanoi and the administration feels constrained to resume these bombings, discouragement and frustration may alter the present character of the conflict as a limited war for limited goals; i.e., the integrity of South Vietnam. The danger of new pressures for unlimited escalation of the war resulting from impatience and disappointment is grave indeed. Such an escalation would not only fail to achieve our goals, but would ultimately involve the world in a war of mutual destruction.

We therefore urge the administration--

To persist in its present efforts to pursue every possible avenue, including channels of the United Nations, that may create more favorable circumstances in which negotiations can begin; and

To steadfastly adhere to the principle that there cannot be a satisfactory military solution to this problem, and until a negotiated settlement is achieved, not to permit a change in the restrained character of this conflict through military escalation.

We further recommend that the United States should consider the following suggestions:

1. Request the United Nations to begin negotiations wherever and whenever possible for a cease-fire agreement (including cessation of terrorist activities) under United Nations supervision, among the governments of the United States, of North and South Vietnam, including representation for the National Liberation Front, and other interested parties, and to convene a peace conference to explore the basis of a settlement of the long-term issues and the means to give such a settlement effective international guarantees.

2. Make clear that a primary objective of a settlement of the Vietnam conflict is the independence of South Vietnam from outside interference, with complete liberty to determine the character of its future government by the result of a peaceful, free, and verified choice of its people.

3. Declare itself in favor of the phased withdrawal of all its troops and bases from the Vietnamese territory, if and when they can be replaced by adequate international peacekeeping forces, composed of military contingents capable of maintaining order while the peace settlement is being carried out.

4. Make available, through Congress, in fulfillment of the President's proposal, immediate reconstruction assistance and long-range economic development funds for southeast Asia, preferably through an effective international organization in which the beneficiary governments fully participate.

We do not lay claim to moral certitude and refrain from moral dogmatism in this complex and agonizing situation. Within the range of religious commitment and concern, differences as to specific policies can and do exist. We recognize that those who see the need for checking Communist subversion by military means are no less dedicated to the cause of a just world peace than those who believe the United States must cease hostilities in Vietnam. We do believe, however, that the imperatives of our religious commitments call for the recommendations we prayerfully put forward and commend to

the attention of our synagogues throughout the land.

Rabbi SEYMOUR J. COHEN,
President, Synagogue Council of America,
Rabbi JACOB J. WEINSTEIN,
President, Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Rabbi MAURICE N. EISENDRATH,
President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Rabbi MAX ROUNTENBERG,
President, Rabbinical Assembly.

MOSES I. FEUERSTEIN,
President, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

Rabbi ISRAEL MILLER,
President, Rabbinical Council of America.

HENRY N. RAPAPORT,
President, United Synagogue of America.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt Birthday Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 84th birthday anniversary of the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt—one of the greatest Presidents of all time. I ask my colleagues to join with me in paying special tribute to this truly outstanding humanitarian and distinguished world leader.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call to your attention a portion of page 809 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 30, 1948. The letter published therein and reproduced below was written by the late Fleetwood Richards, Sr., of Lockhart, Tex., whose son, Fleetwood Richards, Jr., now serves as my administrative assistant in Austin. Senator Richards was one of the greatest honest-to-goodness humanitarian leaders who ever lived. He knew human nature better than any man I have known.

Few men have been more loyal to the ideals of a President than Mr. Richards, Sr., was to President Roosevelt. His letter to his lovely wife is a warm and touching reflection of the love our country held for President Roosevelt. Similarly, the letter written to the then Congressman Lyndon B. Johnson was a tribute to the love and affection he held for Mr. Johnson whose cause he supported from the first day. He recognized then, as we all do now, that Mr. Johnson, a close friend and supporter of President Roosevelt, was an unusual leader—a warmhearted man whose star was ascending and who possessed qualities similar to those of President Roosevelt.

The letter was placed in the RECORD 18 years ago yesterday by the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, my predecessor, who now serves as our great President.

Both the letter and Mr. Johnson's remarks, then as now, are fitting memorials to the late F.D.R. They are as follows:

THE LATE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON OF TEXAS. Mr. Speaker, on this day in 1882 was born a man destined to guide his country through its greatest perils. As Franklin Delano Roosevelt loved his countrymen, so they loved him. That affection of one man for the many—and of the many for

one man—bound our Nation together in a unity we have missed since he left us.

The altogether personal affection so many millions of us felt for Mr. Roosevelt was brought into poignant focus when he died. In our teeming cities, in small towns, at crossroad stores, and along lonely country trails, almost unbearable grief came to the people of America.

To those shocking words, "Roosevelt is dead," men, women, and children reacted as though the news concerned one near and dear to them. Some wept. Some were swept by black despair. Some were appalled at the unfillable gap left in the world's leadership.

In the small town of Lockhart, Tex., in my congressional district, one who loved Roosevelt found some comfort in the way so many of us find it: He told his wife what was in his heart. She was away from home, and he wrote her. I lately obtained a copy of that letter, written by Fleetwood Richards, of Lockhart.

Mr. Richards has a distinguished record of public service in our Texas Legislature. Because his letter so beautifully expressed the sorrow so many of us felt on that fateful day in 1945, and expressed it in language beyond our capacity, I have presumed upon my friendship with Mr. Richards to offer the letter today as a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

LOCKHART, TEX.,

April 13, 1945.

MY DEAREST GUSSIE: Roosevelt is dead. Sorrow and gloom shrouds the town of Lockhart and its people. Business and people are almost at a standstill. Golf has not been mentioned in almost a full day. The report of his death reached me in the Domino Hall. That is where Americanism lingers in the rough. There is where it is most typical. There is where Roosevelt is most loved and appreciated. There is where labor relaxes and recreates. The news stopped every game. No sounds were audible, except sighs. The leader of their hopes, the prince of their cause, their refuge, had gone. Silently, they went away. They walked slower, they talked less, and they thought more. It was the saddest moment in all American life. Their ship was without a rudder.

In his going, anxiety reached its greatest peak. Determination did not seem to falter or hesitate. It seemed to absorb vengeance. Hope was uncertain. It must wait. The future must build and sustain it. World peace took a body blow. It did not fall. It did not take the count. It is disappointed, and that disappointment should be, and must be, its inspiration and determination to work, to sacrifice, and to succeed. It is humanity's only hope.

In a weak and humble way, on every occasion, and at every call, I have tried to shoulder my responsibility to him and the cause that he represents. Maybe I have been a small part of a great undertaking. I feel so. I served him and his cause, and the people's cause, as I see it, with an apostle's devotion, free of selfish motive.

I say, and maybe I never could have said it before, a man is dead that I never doubted or questioned. Somehow, I followed him and his leadership with a faith and confidence, free of every doubt. He gave a part of his life's span to the cause of humanity and liberty. In it all, I think that he was conscientious. To the downtrodden, he was as faithful as Paul was to Christ. He served and saved others. "Himself he could not save."

I never committed an act or spoke a word that made his road longer or his burden heavier. I never added weight to his weakened body or his troubled mind. I tried to give him strength. I might have been, and I think that I was, a little more diligent and devoted to him, and the purposes and ideals that he championed, than I have been to myself and my own soul. In it all, I am satisfied.

Love,

FLEETWOOD.