

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A161

"stargazers" have indeed been fortunate to have had him for so many years.

The January 2, 1966 issue of the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser in Honolulu carried a story on Edwin H. Bryan's astronomical pursuits, which I submit for inclusion in the Record. The article follows:

FOR 42 YEARS HE MAPPED ISLE SKY

Edwin H. Bryan, Jr., curator of collections at the Bishop Museum, and one of Hawaii's foremost scientists, is retiring from an extracurricular public service that began 42 years ago.

Since 1922-23 Bryan has prepared for the Advertiser and later for the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser, a series of star notes and charts that has appeared regularly each month.

The series was started as a result of Bryan's interest in astronomy—he was a charter member of the American Association of Variable Star Observers—and is today one of the oldest continuous features to be published by a newspaper in Hawaii.

The series is the "bible" of star-gazers in the islands.

Because of increasing pressure of other duties, Bryan has turned over preparation of the material to George Bunton, astronomer and manager of the popular Kilolani Planetarium and Observatory at the museum. Bunton's first star notes and chart appear today.

Those who know Bryan as an astronomer, through this series and through his popular booklet "Stars Over Hawaii," published in 1956, may be surprised to learn he is also known as botanist, entomologist, geographer—for whom maps and mapmaking hold an endless fascination—historian and bibliographer.

He was first associated with Bishop Museum in 1919 as part-time assistant in entomology.

Upon his graduation from the College of Hawaii (now the University of Hawaii) he turned to full-time work at the museum.

Although there have been many interruptions—studying at Yale and Stanford Universities, teaching at the Kamehameha Schools and at the University of Hawaii, serving in the U.S. Army, and participating actively on collecting and survey expeditions to many Pacific island groups—he is known as a man who thrives on multiple jobs.

In addition to his scientific publications and the articles and book reviews in various scientific journals, Bryan has contributed many articles to newspapers in Honolulu and other Pacific cities.

He assisted in organizing the First Pan-Pacific Scientific Congress held in Honolulu in 1920. He is a member of the Hawaiian Academy of Science, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Explorer's Club, and many other local and national scientific organizations.

Although his scientific interests are widely diversified, Bryan has nevertheless focused them on two main objectives: To make science comprehensible to readers of the popular press, and to make available to scientists all over the world the rapidly accumulating masses of data about Pacific geography, natural history, and the study of man in the Pacific.

In addition to his duties as curator of collections, beginning in 1927, Bryan has concentrated heavily in recent years on the development and expansion of the Pacific Scientific Information Center, which is supported in part by the National Science Foundation.

First organized in 1960 with an "office" consisting of a table and two chairs, the Center now occupies half of the ground floor of Paki Hall, one of Bishop Museum's research and office buildings.

South Jersey Troops in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, during my Christmastime tour of Vietnamese fighting areas, I was fortunate in meeting a number of fighting men from several services. The high state of their morale and training, their understanding of their mission, their respect for the Vietnamese people, and their eagerness to do the job they are in Vietnam to do was, I found, typical of all the American military men—officers and enlisted men of all services—with whom I spoke while in Vietnam.

Therefore, I feel it might be of interest to my colleagues to read of the reactions of the soldiers, sailors, and marines from New Jersey's Second District, which I enumerated in a news release which I have sent to newspapers and radio stations in my district. The news release reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Servicemen from the Second District fighting in Vietnam, visited by Representative THOMAS C. McGRATH, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, at Christmastime, "were all in high spirits and grateful for letters of encouragement and gifts from the folks back home," the Congressman said upon his return here.

During his tour of the fighting areas last month, Representative McGRATH visited installations of the 1st Air Cavalry Division, the 3d Marine Division, the Rung Sat Special Zone River Attack Group, a special forces fort near the Cambodia border, flew with the Air Force, and went aboard the nuclear carrier USS Enterprise in the South China Sea.

"At each stop on my inspection tour I looked for men from Atlantic, Cape May, and Cumberland Counties, and did locate eight of them and narrowly missed two others, for whom I left messages," the Congressman said.

"Without exception, I found them all in fine health and at the peak of training, their morale was high, and they were, to a man, fully aware of the reasons they were in Vietnam and eager to do their part to end this terrible warfare against the Vietcong," Representative McGRATH declared.

Serving with 3d Marines at Chu Lai, the Congressman talked with Sgt. Larry Mullin, son of Mr. and Mrs. George Mullin of 124 East Edgewater Avenue, Pleasantville, and Sgt. William B. McLaughlin, son of Mrs. W. McLaughlin of 224 North Dudley Avenue, Ventnor, and husband of Mrs. Diane Gruhler McLaughlin of 520 Broad Street, Pleasantville.

Sergeant McLaughlin said that since his unit, the 4th Marine Regiment, landed at Chu Lai in early August, "we can see a definite improvement in the situation." Sergeant Mullin told the Congressman, "There's no question that we're doing a lot of good here."

Lt. Larry Letzer of 341 31st Street, South, Brigantine, had just arrived in Vietnam when he encountered Representative McGRATH at Tan Son Nhut Air Base near Saigon. Serving with a photo reconnaissance outfit, Lieutenant Letzer noted that he and all the other members of his unit had volunteered for duty in Vietnam. "It's a job that has to be done," he told his Congressman.

McGRATH met Aviation Machinist's Mate 3c James B. Hill, son of Mr. and Mrs. James S. Hill of 412 Mulberry Avenue, Pleasantville, who has been aboard the "Big E" for 2½ years and has been aboard the "Big E" for 2½ years and was spending his fourth consecutive Christmas season away from home.

Attached to a reconnaissance attack squadron, Hill said "our morale has taken an upward turn in the past month or so, and we realize now that the draft card burners in the States are just a small group of immature adults."

Marine Pvt. G. M. Sorg, Jr., of 807 White Horse Pike, Egg Harbor, was on patrol when Representative McGRATH visited the 4th Marine Regiment at Chu Lai, but the traveling Congressman left a message for the home district fighting man.

Two Infantry sergeants from Cumberland County, both serving with the 1st Air Cavalry Division at An Khe, were awaiting Representative McGRATH when he arrived at that well-fortified enclave guarding Highway 19 from the coast to Pleiku.

Sgt. Frank C. Giordano, of 510 Oxford Street, Vineland, a squad leader in the 1st Platoon of C Company, 1st Battalion, had served 3 years with the Marines before joining the Army 3 years ago. He told his Congressman "there's plenty of fighting here, but it's not as bad as I'd imagined it would be."

Sgt. Paul J. Maines of Bridgeton, although he has no address there at present, is serving in C Company of the 2d Battalion, at An Khe. He told Representative McGRATH that "we're doing a job that must be done and getting it done the best we can."

"He told me he feels the main thing is to give the Vietnamese a chance to live the way we do," the Congressman recounted. "Sergeant Maines said he's sure the Vietnamese will build a great democracy and they're very curious about life in the States."

Another Vineland, Marine Pvt. Eugene Lewis of 506 North Third Street, was on duty when Representative McGRATH toured the Chu Lai installation and, here, too, the Congressman left a message for the leatherneck.

Lt. Col. James D. Kennedy, son of Mrs. Irene E. Kennedy, of 1022 Maryland Avenue, Cape May City, was in Saigon on a supply mission for his special forces unit when Representative McGRATH met him. Colonel Kennedy is with an Army concept team, doing research and development work on concepts and equipment used by the special forces all over the fighting area.

"Jim said he thinks the military situation is improving in Vietnam, and the morale of the Army of Vietnam (ARVIN) forces has gone sky high recently due to military successes against the Cong," the Congressman said. "He added our own soldiers are learning how to fight this strange type of war, and the planning and crash work which has gone into better preparing U.S. forces for this kind of warfare amazes even an old soldier like him."

At Chu Lai, Representative McGRATH met Marine Pvt. G. A. Defero of 1400 West Glenwood, Wildwood, who serves with the 4th Marine Regiment. Defero told the Congressman many men in his unit have been receiving anonymous mail from antidraft people in the States and added many of his buddies would like to go to the States and tell them off.

"I was tremendously proud of the job the men from our district are doing in the various branches of the military service in which they're serving in Vietnam," Representative McGRATH said upon his return.

"As 'Christmas gifts,' I gave each of the fellows I met from home, and lots of other U.S. servicemen with whom I talked, ballpoint pens and urged them all to write home and tell their folks and friends just what the war is like in Vietnam and what we're doing for them. I also gave some people

A162

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

January 17, 1966

stateside read a great deal about opposition to our involvement in Vietnam and I said they'd be happy to know the morale among our troops is so high. They all seemed eager to write home," Representative McGRATH said.

"I was sorry I couldn't meet more of our second district fighting men, but at some of the installations I visited there were only a handful of American advisers, and none from our district among them.

"It struck me that if every American could see, as I saw, the conditions under which they're fighting, and learn first hand some of the civil complications and the psychological problems of the Vietnamese, our efforts to maintain the freedom of South Vietnam would have even greater support here," he added.

Representative McGRATH visited Vietnam during the Christmas holidays at his own expense, and while there toured some of the U.S. installations in the midst of Vietnam territory. While leaving the special forces fortress at Minh Thanh, the helicopter carrying the Congressman sustained two rifle hits from Cong guns, narrowly escaping injury or worse.

"Compared to what our troops face every day and night, my close call was nothing," he said. "It only served to make me more proud and more appreciative of the job our men are doing there," he declared.

Testimonial to Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Wausau Record-Herald in my congressional district, contained a timely and thought-provoking editorial on January 10, 1966, entitled "Testimonial to Opportunity," which should be of interest to every Member of this House.

The editorial deals with a letter written to the editor of the Milwaukee Sentinel by a Menominee Indian housewife and eloquently speaks for itself.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert the editorial, entitled "Testimonial to Opportunity," at this point in the RECORD:

TESTIMONIAL TO OPPORTUNITY

Opportunity is omnipresent in this great land for all who will grasp it, but seldom have we seen it expressed more simply, more sincerely than by a South Milwaukee housewife who wrote a letter to the editor of the Milwaukee Sentinel last week. The letter reads:

"I reside in a lovely, quiet neighborhood. I am a Catholic by choice.

"Respect for both person and property is practiced by everyone in the neighborhood.

"Cleanliness of self, abode, and surroundings are of paramount importance to them.

"Everything that I possess was not given to me nor did I expect it to be. Much hard work and self-sacrifice were necessary to arrive at my present condition.

"I did not expect the Civil Rights Act to turn me white overnight as my color was no bar in the performance of downright hard work.

"Demonstrating, marching, and singing are appropriate in their place but they do not help much in performing necessary household duties, furthering education, and earning respect.

"I am a first-class citizen. I am a Menominee Indian."

After all that has been written and said about the problems of civil rights (and, of course, problems do exist) and about the dire needs of the Menominee Indians in Menominee County (and they do have dire needs), this simple but significant testimonial to American freedom and opportunity from one whose skin is not white comes as a breath of fresh air on the troubled world scene.

Children to Children Foundation Founded
by Jeane Dixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable women of our age lives here in Washington, D.C. I am speaking of Jeane L. Dixon whose prophecies have proven startling and correct. Her gift, which she attributes to God, has given this woman a prominent place in our society. This she has unselfishly used for the betterment of mankind.

In 1964 she founded the Children to Children Foundation based on her experiences in working with individual children and their families during the past 25 years.

In Mrs. Dixon's own words: "Our purpose is to beautify the souls of children—to help children discover their own purpose and talents; to help children learn to learn so they may grow to 'earn'—and lead useful lives and make their contributions to humanity."

EACH ONE—TEACH ONE: A TREE FOR EVERY SEASON

Spring: the maple tree. Summer: the fruit tree. Fall: the nutrimint tree. Winter: the evergreen.

Because the evergreen tree symbolizes the Christmas season, the Children to Children, Inc., Foundation has chosen it to represent winter.

Each of the other trees—the maple, the fruit, and the nutrimint trees have been chosen for their meaning to children during their respective seasons.

A tree has been selected for each of the seasons to symbolize the foundations concern for children on every day of every season throughout the year. The tree symbolizes the foundation's concern for future generations.

The primary aims of Children to Children, Inc.: First, to help children attain a continuing spiritual growth; second, to help children find their true talents and achieve their full mental and physical development; then they will know the true meaning of love, which is the first and great commandment, and is all important; third, to help children develop the means of self-help and, in their maturity, to strive to help others.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter a letter signed by Jeane L. Dixon as president of Children to Children, Inc.:

DEAR FRIEND: My lifelong dream of a charitable foundation, with the help of others, to help children, has now been realized. You will forgive me if I take this opportunity to tell you about it.

foundation, dedicated to helping children of

all nations to help themselves. The everyday necessity of bringing up a large family can be applied throughout the world, let each one teach one.

The future of the world rests with the children of today. The foundation hopes to establish a better understanding within our own borders and between the peoples of all nations by helping to teach the children to help themselves.

Children to Children affords a vehicle for sustaining, encouraging, and promoting the natural understanding between the children of all nations. It is in youth that this feeling of friendship, mutual respect, and knowledge of the customs and beliefs of others can be seeded for the future peace of the world. As the twig is bent so will the tree grow.

The foundation will encourage, sponsor, and facilitate cultural exchanges in the arts, crafts, sciences, music, drama, literature, and health by every possible means. Exchange hostels, fellow scholarships and conference travel will be encouraged. Small family-style homes will be established. Schools will be given assistance. Ships will be fitted and equipped to help children living near the sea. Land and airborne vehicles will be utilized to meet children's needs in the interior. This foundation is set up to cooperate with all civic and governmental institutions to promote the spiritual and mental and physical growth of children.

Contributions: The foundation will devote its entire resources to help children throughout the world. Your contribution made payable to Children to Children, Inc., 1144 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., 20036, will be used to teach children to help themselves. There are no deductions from the donors contribution for expenses. Sponsoring contributors will meet operating expenses. Your contribution is tax exempt.

Give while living: Children to Children is a long-range program. Contributions are needed now in cash or in kind. Your tax consultant or bank can best advise you on tax-exempt giving. Your attorney can assist you in estate giving by naming Children to Children in your will.

We welcome all contributions, however large or small.

Faithfully yours,

JEANE L. DIXON, President.

Another Berlin Wall?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, almost incredible are the efforts of President Johnson and his bunkhouse boys to control and meter out news to the press and the public.

Equally as incredible is the failure of a large segment of those occupying the field of communication—press, radio, and television—to vigorously and publicly protest these efforts of the President and his henchmen to establish a full blown censorship for the purpose of managing news at the White House.

Too little attention was paid in the past to the efforts of Secretary of Defense McNamara's manipulation of the news through his subordinate, Arthur Sylvester. Too little attention was paid to

leak. That had for its purpose, the

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A158

"Now, just a minute," said the Government man.

"I reckon you're right, Jud," said Maude, frowning thoughtfully. "Take the gun. But, my it's hard to make choices about things. I'm right glad we don't have many to make."

"Please," said the Government man, "I was just using a figure of speech. We're going to send the guns to Vietnam."

"See, Jud," said Maude, "I told you to take the butter. We'll take the butter and thank you kindly."

"I'm sorry," said the Government man, "there isn't any butter. I was . . ."

"Whoa, there," said Jud. "First you take our gun and now you took our butter."

"Exactly," said the Government man.

"That's what I'm trying to say. In order to support our fighting men in Vietnam, we're all going to have to give up things we want. Like butter. Naturally, the first thing the Government's thinking of cutting back on is the war on poverty. After all, we can't fight two wars at once."

"Nope, I guess not," said Jud.

"So we're going to have to ask you folks to make a few sacrifices this coming year. Do with a bit less. Tighten your belts. But it's for your country, your flag and our boys over there."

Jud squared his shoulders. "You tell the President he can count on us to do our part," he said. "Whichever war he wants to put first."

"It sure makes a man proud to serve his country," said Jud later over supper after the Government man had gone.

"And I was so proud of you, Jud," said Maude, reaching across the table to squeeze his hand. "Course, it don't seem fair somehow. I mean when it comes to doing without, they always seem to ask us poor folks first instead of the rich."

"Well, I don't know," said Jud philosophically, as he spread a little surplus lard on his grits. "You got to admit, Maude, when it comes to giving up butter, it's a sight easier for us than them."

HUBERT GOES AWAY TO COME BACK

It's time for another chapter in that nostalgic series, "Where Are They Now?" So let us ask ourselves as always, where now is that all-time great liberal, the beloved, the unforgettable Hubert Horatio Whatshisname?

Oh, there's joyous news today for the millions of fans who never lost faith in Whatshisname. For though he retired to the humble obscurity of the Vice-Presidency, he is now making a game comeback.

Not only has Mr. Johnson sent him abroad, which is where Vice Presidents go to make a name for themselves, but Newsweek reports he is studying a new PR analysis designed to revamp his image.

He must, it says, engage in more "physical action." Such as: "moving, traveling, visiting, climbing, worshipping, hunting, fishing, sailing, boating, hobbling, reading, studying, thinking, sitting, gazing, looking, working, shirt-sleeving, gardening, flying, and cooking." On a scheduled basis.

So what a busy, happy scene we can envision in the humble cottage at No. 7 Memory Lane (a dead end street). Muriel his loyal wife, is helping him pack.

HUBERT (head bowed). Praise be to him from whom all blessings flow. And Mrs. Johnson, too.

MURIEL (holding a watch). That takes care of worshipping. Now, let's see, you're going traveling, visiting, flying . . .

HUBERT. As I sit here in my shirt sleeves, gazing and looking at Mr. Johnson's portrait, I cannot help thinking our beloved President

MURIEL. Oh, Hubert stop talking. HUBERT (surprised). But Maude . . .

MURIEL (checking her schedule): I know dear, but it's time to start moving.

HUBERT (jumping up and down). I get so excited when I realize how generous our wonderful President was to send me on this trip to such touchy trouble spots as Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines. Oh, I sleep better just thinking of those extra glands in the White House.

MURIEL. I think that's Mr. Valenti's line, dear.

HUBERT. But imagine our President entrusting me with the job of handing out his very own initialed ballpoint pens in Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines. And he even said he didn't care how often I got my picture in the papers. In Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines.

MURIEL. Isn't there some other little trouble spot out there, dear?

HUBERT. Well, there's Vietnam. Of course, it's not on my itinerary, but I've been saying so often lately what a wonderful war he's waging that he may relent and even let me go there. Incognito.

MURIEL. Wonderful. Now, let's see, you've already been climbing, hunting, fishing, sailing, boating, reading, gardening, and cooking this morning. So that leaves just—

HUBERT. I know. And I just want to say, friends, what a wonderful, marvelous President we have, whose wise, humane administration . . . adminis . . . admin . . .

MURIEL. Oh, I was afraid of that. All this physical action has got you run down. Turn around, dear, and let me wind you up. Whatever would the President say if he learned you'd stopped working?

THE STATE OF ELBIE JAY'S UNION

Howdy there, folks. How y'all? Time for another teevee visit with the rootin'-tootin' Jay family, starring ol' Elbie Jay, who humbly enjoys nothin' more than a good, long rousin', drama-filled old fashioned political speech. As long as it's his.

As we join up with ol' Elbie today, he's just a-comin in the door, all happy and wrung out. That's his pretty wife, Birdie Bird, puttin' down her seed catalog to give him a hug.

BIRDIE BIRD. How did it go, dear?

ELBIE. Why, it was the best speakin' I ever did attend. I told them Congressmen right out what the state of the Union was and exactly what I planned to do with it. And they darn near brought down the ceiling with their roaring, shouting applause.

BIRDIE BIRD. Marvelous, dear. How did you do it?

ELBIE. Well, I kind of warmed 'em up by telling them how I was going to cure the sick, enrich the poor, wipe out slums, clean up pollution, stop the population explosion and bring world peace.

BIRDIE BIRD. That's nice, dear, and which of your points brought on the roaring, shouting ovation?

ELBIE. When I told them I was going to let them run for Congress every 4 years, instead of every 2. My, it sure is nice to know those fellows feel deeply about something.

BIRDIE BIRD (hesitantly). Did you speak to them about—you know.

ELBIE (frowning). Yep. I told 'em again about how they'd only have to campaign every 4 years, so's they'd have something important to think about. And then I spoke right out on Vee-yet-nam. I told 'em how it was going to cost us billions and billions of dollars. And how all the things I'm going to do at home is going to cost us billions and billions of dollars too. 'Then, just when all looked blackest, I told 'em not to worry 'cause I had a plan to finance the whole shebang.

BIRDIE BIRD. Of course you did, dear. But how?

ELBIE. Why, by restoring the tax cut on

BIRDIE BIRD (absently)—Yes, you explained that to me last year. If you cut taxes, that stimulates the economy and brings in more revenue. Oh, I'm sure cutting taxes on telephone calls will bring in just billions and billions.

ELBIE (irritably)—No, this year, I'm going to restore the tax to bring in billions. You never did understand high finance.

BIRDIE BIRD (baffled)—But if you cut taxes to raise more money and now you restore taxes to raise more money—really Elbie, I don't see how anyone can have confidence in you.

ELBIE (smiling foxily)—Confidentially, honey, I'm going to use the tax to beautify our highways.

BIRDIE BIRD (clapping happily). You're wonderful, dear. I have every confidence in you.

ELBIE (with a wink). I guess I just know how to appeal to folks. With one thing or another. And now, honey, shall we see if I'm on tee-vee? Or shall we just have a quiet family night and sit around looking at my scar?

Tune in again, friends. And meantime, as you mosey on down the trail of life, remember what Elbie's ol' Granddaddy used to say:

"Talk is cheap. So use plenty of it."

Vietnam—Neither Escalation Nor Withdrawal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, my visit to the battle zone in Vietnam in December convinced me that escalation of the conflict would give no more assurance of a successful end to the fighting than would an unconditional pullout by our forces. The Washington Post in an editorial January 16 said that "Escalation might simply move the war to another and larger theater. Withdrawal also would be likely to move the conflict to another theater in another country."

Under leave to extend my remarks I ask that this editorial, entitled "After the Pause" be included at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 16, 1966]

AFTER THE PAUSE

The President very wisely has put no terminal date on his peace offensive or on the pause in air operations against the north while the peace efforts go forward. Since there has been no known response from Hanoi, either affirmative or negative, it is too early to say whether there will be any results. Sooner or later, if there are no negotiations at all, consideration will have to be given to the next military moves.

There is a powerful impulse in the Congress, in the country, and in some places in the Executive Department, for a resumption of air activity and for an initiation of full-scale warfare against the north to put a speedy end to a disagreeable war. Powerful as this impulse is, and strong as the support may be for the use of more military muscle, it is to be hoped that the President will reject the counsels of those who wish to escalate the war. There is not much reason to believe that an unlimited air war would

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A159

achieve decisive results. North Vietnam does not present the kind of industrial targets that are peculiarly vulnerable to mass bombing. Even if the United States were indifferent to the moral arguments against mass bombing (and it is not indifferent), the practical results probably would not be any more decisive than were the results of area bombing in World War II. While stepped-up interdiction of communications might further diminish the ability of North Vietnam to give logistic support to a conventional military invasion, there is not much hope that it would stop infiltration of troops in small units. And even if the bombing succeeded in all these counts, the Chinese Communist support of North Vietnam might make the results indecisive. As long as air operations are directed at North Vietnam (and not China), we are embarked upon the task of kicking the cart until the horse cries for mercy.

The unconditional withdrawal of U.S. forces is a course for which there is little responsible support in the country. And the primary reason is that no one can give any assurance that this policy would be any more successful as a means of ending the war in southeast Asia than the policy of escalating the conflict. Escalation might simply move the war to another and larger theater. Withdrawal also would be likely to move the conflict to another theater in another country.

To continue or expand the present offensive against the Vietcong in the south, by the employment of the tactics now being pursued, is going to involve a heavier commitment than we have so far made if it is to have any reasonable prospect for success. Such an expanding commitment, accompanied by rising commitments of North Vietnam and China and Russia, might easily produce another stalemate at a higher level.

The facts of the situation seem to argue strongly for a somewhat different application of the military power we feel we can appropriately commit to the area. No doubt it is an alternative that already has been explored—and perhaps even rejected. But it can be argued quite persuasively that in the next phase of the war, the United States and its allies might wisely alter the character of the war in the direction of a more economical and efficient deployment. At present, we are engaged in an offensive-defense, employing both ground and air forces in the hot pursuit of Vietcong elements into terrain offering the greatest advantages of concealment and the most serious hazards to pursuing forces. To seek out and destroy a guerrilla force by such tactics, overwhelming force is required on a ratio of at least 10 to 1. The present ratio, counting all South Vietnam and American and allied forces is 820,000 to 230,000 according to the Mansfield report—and the rate of North Vietnam infiltration is on the order of 1,500 a month. So the possibility or feasibility of achieving anti-guerrilla ratios like those in Malaysia and the Philippines is remote.

If it is difficult or impossible for us to annihilate the Vietcong without a military investment that looks excessive, it can be made impossible for the Vietcong to achieve their objectives without a deployment beyond their means. Were our tactics to alter from pursuit to a take-and-hold basis, the burden for the offensive could be shifted to the Vietcong. It is our purpose to deny North Vietnam the fruits of a war of national liberation, and we can do that by successfully holding the areas now occupied and slowly and persistently enlarging them by territorial sweeps instead of jungle pursuit. The American and South Vietnam forces, while steadily expanding the occupied areas and pushing out their defense perimeters, would be chiefly engaged in garrison operations. These, of course, are wasteful in terms of manpower employed but economical in terms of man-

power expended. They are less hazardous and more feasible for a country in command of air power and thus able to maintain communications with scattered garrisons than they were for the French. Within the areas occupied by the South Vietnamese and by our forces, a program of rehabilitation and reconstruction could be pushed forward, once it becomes possible to afford the peasants and villagers security.

The military priorities under such a strategy would be (1) securing of areas already held, (2) expansion of that territory only as rapidly as we are prepared to take and hold new real estate, (3) pursuit operations only where they can be carried out with greatest economy of force, (4) air operations chiefly in close support of territorial enlargement, and, as indicated, against large and vulnerable enemy concentrations, (5) air interdiction of routes from the north, scaled to the degree of infiltration, (6) no air attack on North Vietnam for the time being or unless surveillance discloses massing for offensive operations against the south.

This is no quick and easy formula for an offensive military success in conventional military terms. It contemplates neither the annihilation of enemy forces, the crushing of the enemy's will to resist or the solid gains of invasion and quick occupation. It projects the steady, slow and patient pacification and reconstruction of South Vietnam. It must be acknowledged that success will consist of denying the victory of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong in all the territory we are prepared to take and hold and then rebuilding that occupied area and providing the inhabitants with a higher standard of living. The forces required will be quite large; but the losses in combat should be much smaller with the defending forces enjoying the advantages of well-equipped men in strong defensive positions. It will cost more money; but it should cost fewer lives. It will take more time—but we should not be in a hurry.

Away from the combat areas, the strategy has the virtue of making it clear to the world that our role is purely defensive. The war in South Vietnam will come to a stop if the forces of the National Liberation Front quit their attacks. Every dispatch from the war areas will make it plain that it is the Communists who are responsible for loss of life and destruction of property. In the absence of negotiated peace there can be, under this formula, a tacit peace, whenever the Vietcong wish it.

This is no blueprint for either victory or peace in a hurry. But it is a blueprint that involves the surrender of no principle; it makes possible the deescalation of the conflict; it contemplates the confinement of the war to the area now involved. It does not have the simplicity of "victory" or "surrender." It plainly looks forward to an admittedly remote date when enough of the territory of South Vietnam will be secure so that there can be normal elections under which the people can pick a government of their own choice—and decide for themselves whether they wish to affiliate with North Vietnam or retain their independence.

The Valachi Memoirs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the

January 9, 1966, edition of *IL Progresso Italo-Americano*, expressing the opinion that the Government should not give permission to publish the Valachi Memoirs. The views expressed in the editorial have long been my views on this very subject.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent, I include herewith the editorial:

THE VALACHI MEMOIRS

Startling announcements out of Washington are not new these days. One expects the dramatic and the sensational out of the Nation's Capital which is the center of activity for the preservation of world peace, the crusade for civil rights, the war on poverty, and the promotion of human welfare, among other things. But we were nonplussed to learn that Joseph M. Valachi, the notorious gangster who told the Senate investigators a lurid tale of underworld activities and of the ramifications of the families dominating all segments of crime in America, has been given Government permission to publish his memoirs.

And what is the ostensible reason for this unique departure from an inflexible rule, since he is the first Federal prisoner known to receive permission from the Government to publish the story of his life of crime? A spokesman for the Department of Justice declares, presumably with a straight face, that the exception was made because Valachi's disclosures might alert the public to the crime syndicate's activities and benefit the law.

What a ridiculous and childish explanation. Were it not for the fact that those responsible are involved in the serious problem of crime detection and crime prevention, it would indeed be a laughable one. What on earth could be accomplished by permitting the public to buy a reshaped, if detailed, version of the disgusting "Valachi show" which the people of America watched on TV in 1963? We can just picture the great masses throughout the land queuing up to pay their hard earned money to read the story to recapture some detail they missed during the TV circus, and then run to the Justice Department with some tidbit which escaped those worthies.

"It was felt that Valachi's writing—declares Information Director Jack Rosenthal of the Justice Department—would bring out intelligence information beyond what he had recounted in interviews." This astounding revelation cannot possibly come to fruition. Joe Valachi has voluntarily given the authorities, according to their own version, the most exhaustive and imaginative account of the structure and modus operandi of the crime syndicate. He filled thousands of pages with his depositions and other information was elicited from him by the inquiring Senators at the TV hearings. What more can he add that would not be a repetition of the oft-repeated history of organized crime. Would it not be in keeping with traditional procedure to have the Valachi memoirs read by experienced Department of Justice agents—experienced in separating facts from fancy—rather than by the general public?

At any rate the original purpose of the Valachi hearing was to aid law enforcement. It is well known that Justice Department officials were disappointed at the reaction caused by the hoodlum's testimony at the TV hearings. They had hoped that public opinion would be outraged at Valachi's narration of the crime syndicate and its operations, but the public reaction apparently evaluated this performance as that of an unreliable small-fry gangster whose testimony was mostly hearsay and added little to the Department of Justice's knowledge of the crime syndicate.

Certainly no useful purpose can be served by the publication of this material.

January 17, 1966

ported liberation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia when in 1940 the Russians moved their military might into those small liberty-loving countries.

What a mockery of justice and what a prostitution of common decency was that illegal act of a mighty nation in swallowing up a small suffering war-torn one. Significant as was the savagery of the initial act of occupation, but it was to be exceeded by even more ruthless acts of Communist oppression. It was the forerunner of suffering, injustice and a shocking loss of life. But it gave advance warning of the rule of terror, the forced subjugation of proud people and the mass deportation of loyal citizens.

I am proud not only that my country has continuously condemned the atrocious act of the Russians in their illegal annexation of Lithuania and her sister Baltic States, but that the United States has been steadfast in refusing to recognize any Soviet interests in these states.

I am proud that I have been permitted to introduce and support legislative measures to secure remedial action through international tribunals.

I continue to join with those who today seek to obtain consideration of this tragic problem by the United Nations. I plan to discuss with the distinguished Ambassador to the United Nations, Hon. Arthur J. Goldberg, certain positive approaches which should be made to accomplish maximum results from any United Nations action.

For 25 years your kinsmen and your friends have suffered at the hands of their Communist slave masters. But in spite of deprivations, in spite of the loss of self-determination, the people of Lithuania, of Estonia, and of Latvia with your help and encouragement, have preserved an undying desire to live as free men. They have nourished and kept vibrantly alive a national spirit predicated on the dignity of man. But they need our encouragement to carry on. They need the help of the free and independent countries of the world to help them to preserve the ideals which they hold dear and to preserve for posterity the culture and traditions which you and they value almost as much as life itself.

They need more radio broadcasts by American facilities to give them in their own tongue by their own countrymen a continuous program of truth and factual information to offset the effects of a Communist-controlled press. They need the maximum in our continued flow of gifts of food, medicines, and clothing. These vital essentials of life must get to them without the loathsome tax which you might now pay before shipment and delivery to the addressee can be assured. I am asking our Department of State to give this matter priority attention. America can be grateful for the glorious contributions made to this country by those who were successful in fleeing the oppression of both the Nazis and the Reds. You, through whose veins flow the proud blood of Lithuania have enriched America by your industry, your culture, your art, and most significantly your passionate love of independence.

I am proud that only a few weeks ago it was my honor to serve as Chairman of the Whole House on the State of the Union and guide our great immigration bill through to successful enactment. I rejoice that this country can now extend the hand of welcome to those who like so many of you, can and will contribute greatly to America's growth and success.

I feel it is important to remind you that we who can enjoy unfettered freedom should rejoice and be ever grateful for it. Whenever we as Americans start taking our liberty and our independence for granted, even then freedom may begin to vanish. Whenever we become complacent about the rights of freedom to our fellow men, regardless of national

ity or race or color, and whenever we cease to fight all types of enslavement and oppression, even then we are guilty of a devaluation of our own freedom.

It is important for all Americans and particularly those of us assembled here today to be reminded of what our great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, said with regard to our precious commodity, freedom, and our personal responsibilities for the preservation of liberty.

Speaking before a distinguished group assembled on Liberty Island to witness his signing of the historic new immigration bill, the President stated, "When the earliest settlers poured into a wild continent there was no one to ask them where they came from. The only question was: Were they sturdy enough to make the journey, were they strong enough to clear the land, were they enduring enough to make a home for freedom, and were they brave enough to die for liberty if it became necessary to do so."

It is important that every American ask himself time and time again the President's questions: "What am I doing to make a home for freedom?" And, "Am I brave enough to die for liberty if it becomes necessary to do so?" All of us can rejoice that millions of Americans can and do answer both of these questions in the affirmative.

It is important that your fine Lithuanian American organizations and those serving Latvian and Estonian interests as well as so many of you as individuals are dedicated to the task of restoring independence and sovereignty to the country of your birth. I am sure that Americans everywhere are impressed by your devotion to the cause which you espouse. America recognizes, too, the depth of your loyalty to this your adopted country. As one of these Americans I congratulate you on your great work and on your zeal to have a massive wrong righted. To the maximum extent of my ability I pledge to support your efforts and the efforts of others to achieve independence and the opportunity to enjoy a democratic way of life for all peoples who today are enslaved.

May God grant us all the wisdom and will to erase soon one of the horrible blots on the pages of history. With His help may we bring to the saddened and discouraged grownups and to the eager aspiring youth of your homelands the golden light of freedom. May we return to them the glorious vision of a land of opportunity and hope for themselves and their children, and may we forever help them to banish the blackness and despair of perpetual night and live again in the light and warmth of independence.

(Mr. BINGHAM (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BINGHAM'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

LET US STOP ALLIED SHIPMENTS TO NORTH VIETNAM

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last April, following the President's historic address at Johns Hopkins University, I called for a greater commitment in southeast Asia by our allies, especially Great Britain and France. Not only have our allies failed to make such a com-

mitment, but they have been unwilling to make shipments of cargoes essential to the economy of North Vietnam.

I am certain that all Americans want a meaningful and honorable peace to be achieved in Vietnam. I believe the President has made a supreme effort toward that goal. However, the fact remains that we are at war with North Vietnam and American boys—husbands and fathers—are being killed in increasing numbers in that war.

Although allied shipping to North Vietnamese ports has declined during the past year, from 7 to 15 British-flag vessels a month land such vital supplies as oil at Haiphong and other ports. More than half the free-world ships which sent cargoes to North Vietnam in the first 6 months of 1965 were British.

This deplorable situation must not be permitted to continue. I am well aware that allied shipping to North Vietnam has declined steadily and that U.S. diplomats are continuing their efforts to effect further reductions. But this is not enough. As long as American soldiers are fighting and dying in Vietnam, no nation of the free world must be permitted to send supplies to their killers. It takes more than diplomatic representations, even if it takes an outright embargo on allied shipments to North Vietnam, then we must take that step. If the lives and safety of Americans mean anything to the administration, it will take the necessary steps to stop allied shipping to North Vietnam at once.

I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in requesting President Johnson to put an end to the free world supply line into North Vietnam.

IMPROVING THE SMALL BUSINESS LOAN PROGRAM

(Mr. CORMAN (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the small businessmen of our Nation are now facing a grave crisis in securing credit to expand and strengthen their firms.

The action of the Federal Reserve Board in raising the rediscount rate is already resulting in higher credit costs for small businessmen. Ordinarily, some relief would be available through the programs of the Small Business Administration. However, the SBA has been forced to resort to the drastic alternative of not accepting applications for loans either under the regular business loan program or loans under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This crisis has been precipitated by the drain on loan funds caused by the earthquake in Alaska, the Mississippi River floods in the Midwest, and Hurricane Betsy. Certainly everyone would agree that disaster loans should continue to be available in areas where they are needed. But, the extension of disaster loans should not be permitted to cause a breakdown of the regular loan programs throughout the Nation.

Therefore, I am pleased to join with

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

337

of Economic Advisers, in place of Mr. Otto Eckstein.

The hearing will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building. The nominee will be present. Any persons who wish to testify or to submit a report should write or telephone Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, 5300 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., CA 5-3921.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 125) extending the date for transmission of the Economic Report.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

Statement by him on the Brooklyn Public Library preschool program.

Article entitled "School of the Arts Established To Foster Creativity, Offer Professional Training," published in the New York University Alumni News of December 1965.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

An article entitled "Job Corpsman's Mother Writes Christmas Letter," published in the Trinity Weekly Journal of Weaverville, Calif., on December 23, 1965.

By Mr. CASE:

Telegram sent by him on the occasion of the testimonial dinner to the Honorable Julius Foster, Jr., and a press release in connection therewith.

ATTACK ON HON. J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I had intended, during the morning hour on last Friday, to discuss this subject, and to put in the RECORD a letter dealing with it. However, I was not on the floor when the Senate suddenly adjourned and I did not reach the Chamber quite in time.

The information contained in the letter did leak out in some way, however. For the RECORD I wish to do now what I had intended to do last Friday.

About 10 days ago, I received a scurrilous anonymous letter, mailed from Baltimore, alleged to contain a photostatic copy of a letter which was alleged by the writer of the anonymous letter to have been written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to Walter Jenkins.

The alleged photostatic copy of the letter is so scurrilous and putrid that I do not intend to put it in the RECORD.

I sent the anonymous letter to Mr. Hoover, for his information and for whatever aid and assistance it might be.

Mr. Hoover wrote me a letter, stating that he had received the anonymous letter with the alleged copy of a letter which he was supposed to have written, according to the anonymous letter.

He states categorically that he never wrote such a letter. For the information of Senators who are present, perhaps I should read the letter into the RECORD, instead of merely putting it in the RECORD.

The letter is dated January 11, 1966, and reads as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1966.

Hon. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MR. DEAR SENATOR: This is to acknowledge your request for the complete facts as known to this Bureau concerning the anonymous letter you received containing what purports to be a copy of a personal letter to former White House aid Walter Jenkins over my signature.

I am pleased to comply with your request and will begin first by stating without any equivocation that I never wrote such a letter.

The letter you received is one of many anonymous mailings sent to various Senators, Congressmen, and other prominent Government officials within the past week. They are part of a concerted Communist smear campaign which was launched a year ago.

The campaign began in January 1965, when several letters of this type were received by individuals who also brought them to my attention. Several more were brought to my attention by individuals who received them in April 1965.

Upon examination, the copy of the letter supposedly signed by me was determined to be a crude forgery. Comparison of all the letters disclosed they had all been prepared by the same person or persons. Further comparison with other letters circulated in the past in this and other countries by the Soviet Disinformation Department proved irrefutably that this was a Communist scheme.

You may recall that the nefarious schemes of the Soviet Disinformation Department were exposed in a report prepared by the Central Intelligence Agency last year. The details of that Agency's study were printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 28, 1965.

The study revealed that the Soviet Disinformation Department of the KGB, the Soviet Committee for State Security, wages a broad-scaled propaganda offensive against U.S. agencies and pointed out that I and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are priority targets for attacks. It also disclosed that the overall objective is to discredit U.S. agencies here and abroad and emphasized that a preferred instrument used by the Soviets in their attacks is the forged document.

Typical of the tactics used in such efforts was the circulation of letters in South America in the summer of 1964. In that case, too, my name had been forged on the letters. They were designed to make it appear that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency had something to do with the Brazilian revolution of April 1964. The intricacies of that Communist scheme became further apparent when we determined that my signature has been forged from a letter stolen by Cubans in Havana in 1960.

I trust that in making these facts available to you I have satisfied any and all questions which the scurrilous anonymous communication you received may have raised. If not, do not hesitate to call on me again.

In conclusion, I would like to express my appreciation to you for bringing the letter to my attention. It provides another link in the chain of evidence being put together

to complete the picture of this Soviet smear campaign, which amounts to character assassination.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me conclude by saying, with respect to the suggestion in Mr. Hoover's letter that I might have some question about this matter, that, the letter was so crude and so scurrilous that on its face it was a forgery. At no time have I had any question as to the truth or falsity of the letter. It is false on its face. I merely wish to clear the matter up so that all may know that these things are constantly going on as attacks are made against our law enforcement agencies.

VISIT TO SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to supplement briefly the remarks which have been made by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Let me say, first, that the mission which was undertaken under the leadership of the Senator from Montana met with courtesy and hospitality everywhere the group went, even where the country visited took exception to our position in southeast Asia.

The Senator from Montana is greatly respected around the world. This was quite apparent, previous to our call at Cambodia. When the announcement of our coming was made, the Senator from Montana was described as "a man of great justice."

As I have stated, we had been hospitably received everywhere, but I believe that all of us were unprepared for the warmth of the reception which we received in Cambodia, the government of which is headed by Prime Minister Sihanouk, who relinquished a kingdom to take a position which he felt would be more helpful to his people.

Prime Minister Sihanouk did not mention some of the complaints which have been attributed to him in reports which have been spread around the world. He is more concerned over trespassing on the area of Cambodia by others. If there is trespassing, I would say that it probably is not confined to one side of the South Vietnamese controversy. Any such trespassing, I would presume, is done without the consent of the Government of Cambodia.

As the Senator from Montana has stated, Prime Minister Sihanouk has requested that the International Control Commission do what it can to control the situation and to enforce respect for the boundaries of his country.

Prime Minister Sihanouk has also requested inspection by others of the charges which have been made against his government that the country harbors

the Vietcong and others who are hostile to us.

It was quite apparent to me that the Government of Cambodia desires, above all else, to be let alone, not to be dragged into anyone's war, not to be dominated by any country either within Asia or outside Asia. As I see it the fear of domination exists not only in this country, but also in all the other countries of southeast Asia as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. AIKEN. One thing that is very much apparent is that Chinese propaganda is blanketing most of southeast Asia. The Chinese are not inhibited by the truth. It is quite apparent that they concoct stories to spread all over southeast Asia with the purpose of keeping the people disturbed and to incite them, if possible, to hate Americans and everything connected with America.

As I have stated, Cambodia gives full credit for the assistance we have given it in the past. We have been advised that Americans will be welcome to come to Cambodia at any time, to visit that country, I believe that American visitors would be perfectly safe in going there, and would be well received.

But, carrying on their business and holding on to their neutral position, where they have resisted communism in spite of the many pressures which have been placed upon them, is not easy for them.

Cambodia has plenty of resources for its people. It is making economic progress. It has shown no inclination to go Communist. We were pleasantly surprised at the turnout of the people who came to welcome our group. The capital of Phnom Penh looked almost like Constitution Avenue on Inaugural Day and it appeared to me that their welcome was quite sincere.

MORE SCHOOLCHILDREN WANT MORE MILK, BUT SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM IS BEING CUT BACK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this is another in a series of statements I intend to make in the Senate as a result of the action of the Bureau of the Budget in prohibiting the Department of Agriculture from spending appropriated funds for the special milk program for schoolchildren—an action which means no real saving of tax dollars.

Today, I examine the great increase in program participation that has taken place in the past, and the even greater increase we could expect in the future if the Federal share were not being ruthlessly cut. Of course, a cut in the Federal share means that the State, the local school district, or the child will have to assume the added costs. This will not only dampen program growth but may even lead to a program cutback in many States.

In 1955, 41,094 outlets participated in the school milk program. Over 449 million half pints were distributed. In 1964, program participation had increased to 91,890 outlets—in other words, over 100 percent—while more than 2,917 million half pints were distributed—a phenomenal increase of almost 650 percent. The 1965 estimate is for 94,000 outlets distributing 3,093 million half pints. In 1966, the figures estimated are 96,000 outlets distribute over 3,278 million half pints.

What has the Bureau of the Budget done in the face of this unprecedented growth? Despite a projected growth of 6 percent in half pints distributed in fiscal 1966, the Bureau has cut back program funds by 3 percent. Every penny of this cut means less money to the States. Not one cent, according to the budget estimates submitted to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees last year, will be absorbed by decreased Federal operating expenses in Washington.

If we follow the Budget Bureau's logic, I suppose that a projected growth in enrollment in public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools of more than 6½ million students, or almost 14 percent between 1965 and 1975 will mean a cutback of at least 7 percent in the school milk program. I profoundly hope, Mr. President, that the Bureau of the Budget does not continue to apply this twisted logic. Certainly if it does, Congress should speak out in no uncertain terms, as I am doing today, and intend to do on this floor for as long as it takes to get a policy change.

Let us never forget, Mr. President, that this cutback is a phony, fake, paper economy. Federal funds not spent on school milk will be spent under price support laws to buy and store the same quantity of milk.

THE PRESIDENT'S HARD DECISION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Walter Lippmann, the great and internationally admired columnist, in Newsweek of January 17, wrote an excellent column regarding our situation in Vietnam. These are important conclusions of facts I feel should be brought to the attention of American citizens and to all Members of the Congress who may not have read his exceedingly important and factually correct statement. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this column may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

WALTER LIPPMANN ON THE PRESIDENT'S HARD DECISION

After his most recent trip to South Vietnam, Secretary McNamara ventured to say that, as a result of our efforts, we have stopped losing the war. Perhaps he was referring to the fact that at the beginning of 1965 not only had the Saigonese army lost control of the countryside with the exception of five or six cities, but the government in Saigon was disintegrating and was on the verge of making a deal with Hanoi.

During the past year there has been no significant improvement in the military sit-

uation. Once the American soldiers retire, the villages which are recovered from the Vietcong are quickly lost again. The balance of military power has not been changed in our favor. For as we have increased our own army, the adversary has increased his army, both by stepping up the infiltration from the north and by greater recruitment in the south. The one real change has been that the government in Saigon is now a dictatorship of four generals who are fully aware that personally they have every reason to avoid a truce and to continue the war.

So, the President finds himself no nearer, and almost certainly further away from, his avowed objectives in Vietnam. He has been confronted with what he now describes, quite correctly, as "hard decisions." What are the hard decisions? At bottom, the President has to choose between a bigger war and an unattractive peace. He must decide either to launch a big American war in Asia, a war which could easily be bigger than the Korean war because it could so quickly involve both China and the Soviet Union, or to cut our losses by reducing his political and military objectives.

EXTEND THE WAR, OR SETTLE FOR LESS?

This is indeed a hard choice. A long war means heavy casualties. It means the disruption of the lives of another generation of young men. It means that the Nation will be distracted from the attempt to solve its own problems—such as the problems of the cities and the problems of the Negroes and the problems of industrial peace. It means once again, for the fourth time in this century, that the Nation will turn its attention from its own urgent affairs to a war abroad. It means also that this country will be diverted from the development of the Americas and from its vital national interests in Europe and Australasia.

The other choice open to the President is also a hard one, especially for a proud man who wants to be universally popular. For there is no disguising the fact that a negotiated truce can be had only by settling for a good deal less than a victory, and this means that the President must expect to be denounced by many, and to have his pride wounded. It takes great political strength and a high degree of moral courage for the head of a state to make the kind of peace which may now be possible in the Vietnamese mess. General Eisenhower, the victorious commander of the allied armies, was able to make a settlement in Korea which President Truman would never have dared to make. General Eisenhower had at that time an invulnerable prestige.

An even more pertinent analogy is to be found in the way General de Gaulle liquidated the messy war in Algeria. The President would do well to study and ponder what happened, how General de Gaulle extricated France from a war which she had not lost but could not win, how he negotiated with his adversaries in the field, the Algerian counterpart of the Vietcong, and made with them a "peace of the brave," how he outwitted and defied the extremists at the risk of his life—and how, having devoted himself unflinchingly to the true interest of France, which was peace with Algeria, he won the gratitude and esteem of his countrymen, including almost all of those who voted against him in the recent election.

PAYING THE PRICE

The hard decision the President has to make is whether he can accept the political and psychological risks of dealing with Vietnam as General Eisenhower dealt with Korea and as General de Gaulle dealt with North Africa. For President Johnson will have to pay a heavy price for the historical mistake of involving the United States in a land war against Asians in Asia. The alternative to

January 17, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

339

paying a price for peace is to pay the enormous price of a great war which threatens to expand into a world war.

The President has made it quite clear that he realizes the hard choice which is before him. Naturally enough, he is looking for some easier way out of his dilemma. If only he could find one. But by his decisions in 1964, he rejected the warning by men in a position to know that there was not much time left to negotiate an arrangement. He has come very near to locking and bolting the door. He has raised the stakes so high that easy solutions are most improbable and only the hard choices remain.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of this morning there appeared an extremely noteworthy news article entitled "Gavin Says Hanoi Bomb Could Bring in Peiping Units," reporting on a letter of Gen. James Gavin which will appear in the February issue of Harper's magazine.

General Gavin, former chief of Army research and development, is one of our Nation's most outstanding military officers and a former Ambassador to France. The article reports General Gavin's warning that a massive buildup of U.S. forces in Vietnam may cause the Communist Chinese to send troops there and reopen the Korean war as well.

It is interesting to note that General Gavin disagrees with former Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Curtis Lemay, and other war hawks who are urging the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong. General Gavin, who was chief of U.S. Army plans and operations at the time of the French military disaster at Dienbienphu, certainly speaks with as much—and I for one feel a great deal more—authority than do those militarists who demand expansion and escalation of our fighting in Asia without giving consideration to the consequences involved. His statements also discredit the so-called domino theory, which has no validity whatever.

I believe that General Gavin's comments are of great importance and ask unanimous consent that the article reporting them be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

GAVIN SAYS HANOI BOMBING COULD BRING IN PEIPING UNITS

NEW YORK, January 16.—Gen. James M. Gavin declared today a massive buildup of U.S. forces in Vietnam may prompt Red China to send troops there and reopen the Korean war as well.

The 58-year-old former chief of U.S. Army research and development suggested that America concentrate instead on holding major bases along the South Vietnam coast while diplomats seek an end to the fighting.

In a letter appearing in the February issue of Harper's magazine, Gavin said:

"To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the South.

"Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese volunteers and the reopening of the Korean front.

ESCALATION SEEN LIKELY

"This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on."

No. 5—7

Gavin said the 190,000 U.S. troops already in the Vietnam theater would suffice "if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks on North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

He asserted that an attempt to make all of South Vietnam secure from the Communists "would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam"—and risk a fresh outbreak of Red Chinese aggression in the Korean pattern.

"I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next stop would be Walkiki," Gavin said. "The Kra Peninsula, Thailand and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand."

Emphasizing that he spoke "solely from a military-technical point of view," Gavin recalled that he was chief of U.S. Army plans and operations at the time of the French military disaster in Dien Bien Phu.

He said Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, then Chief of Staff, "directed that we go into the situation quite thoroughly in case a decision should be made to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi delta."

"The more we studied the situation," Gavin wrote, "the more we realized that we were, in fact, considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical, and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh.

"If we would be, in fact, fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage."

Gavin said southeast Asia is no place to take on Red China in military combat.

"Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex, coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its war-making capacity," he said. "There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged, if at all."

SHOWDOWN NOT YET DUE

Gavin added that if Red China continues aggression and arms itself with nuclear weapons "the time may come when China will bring upon herself a nuclear war. But that time is not here yet."

Gavin, a paratroop commander in World War II, retired from the Army in 1958 because of differences with the Eisenhower administration over modernizing the Armed Forces. He was a particularly strong exponent of more aerial mobility for ground troops.

Gavin called this "the sky cavalry concept, which we are now employing in South Vietnam" and commented.

"When I retired in 1958, I said that I would be happy to serve as a private in the Army if it were the kind of an army that I wanted it to be.

I think it is that kind of an army now * * *"

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider two nominations which are at the desk. It will require unanimous consent, because they have not lain over for a day, but by unanimous consent they can be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the first nomination will be stated.

ROBERT C. WEAVER, SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert C. Weaver, of New York, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, let the Record show that the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which the nomination was referred, has unanimously approved it. History is made today as the Senate of the United States, with no opposition—indeed, with unanimity—will seat as a member of the Cabinet of the President a distinguished American citizen, a Negro, whose labors in the Federal Government thus far have stamped him as one in whom Members of the Senate who have dealt with him have complete respect and faith. I congratulate Dr. Robert C. Weaver on the great challenge he now faces to help in improving urban America.

The leader of the Republican Party in the Senate, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has publicly expressed his approval of the nomination. I rise to say that, not merely the leader of our party in the Senate, but the Members of the minority party on the committee who participated in the hearing and the rest of us shall shortly join in approval of the nomination of an able fellow citizen to vast new responsibility.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I take only a moment to express my support of the nomination of Robert C. Weaver to be head of a department that will be concerned with urban problems. I have known of his work on a good many occasions. It was my privilege to have him as a member of the delegation which went Peru for the inauguration of the democratic President, Mr. Belaunde. It was my privilege to serve as chairman of that delegation during that trip to Latin America. I came to know Mr. Weaver even better than I had known him before.

I congratulate Mr. Weaver, but congratulations are even more due to the President. I not only congratulate the President, but highly commend him for his wise selection of a great American to head an important post which will deal with domestic problems, related to that post, in the years ahead. The President could not have made a choice that demonstrated greater wisdom than the selection of Mr. Weaver to be the head of that Department.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, together with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], had the privilege of appearing before the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I was a member, 2 years ago, to urge confirmation of the nomination of Dr. Weaver for this post. The Nation is fortunate to have produced such a son, who, at long last, has been chosen to sit in the Cabinet of the President.

I had the privilege of being a member of the cabinet when Mr. Harriman was Governor of New York. I was attorney general. At that time, Dr. Weaver was a member of the cabinet on housing. Because of his skill, competence, and