

October 7, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

25415

A copy of this telegram was directed to Secretary Wirtz on August 12. I asked Mr. Wirtz for "positive action in this matter." Secretary Wirtz' reply dated August 20, 1965, is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 20, 1965.

HON. JAMES HARVEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARVEY: Thank you for your letter of August 12, which was accompanied by a telegram from Vlastic Food Products.

We know that Vlastic's subsidiary in Bridgeport, Crown Pickle Co., unlike many pickle producers in Michigan, is faced with a prospective shortage of harvest labor. We are making strenuous efforts to assist the firm. Additional workers are being recruited in Louisiana and Kentucky, and among the crews leaving the cherry orchards of up-State Michigan.

In the meantime, however, I think it would be useful to point out several additional facts.

Crown Pickle refused to hire A-Teams, when they were available; Crown Pickle, instead of recruiting through the U.S. Employment Service, turned to a fee-charging private agency in Texas, with disappointing results; Crown Pickle, rather than seeking additional workers through the Employment Service, borrowed workers from another pickle packer; and finally, the day after you sent your letter, Crown Pickle refused (despite its plea for workers) to hire 75 constituents of yours, residents of Saginaw, who were seeking jobs in the pickle fields.

As you know, this situation has had my almost constant attention. If there is anything further I can do, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

Now, in a letter dated September 30, 1965, Mr. Raznick replies to Secretary Wirtz, disputing points raised by the Secretary and adding additional information. His letter follows:

CROWN FOODS, INC.,
September 30, 1965.

Congressman JAMES HARVEY,
Congressman of United States, House of Representatives, Longworth Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARVEY: Thank you for your letter of August 23 and a copy of the letter of August 20 from Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz. Please forgive me for not answering sooner, but it took time to get all of my information properly documented. There are so many statements in Mr. Wirtz' letter that are untrue and/or misrepresented that I feel it necessary to answer line by line, as follows:

"We know that Vlastic subsidiary in Bridgeport, Crown Pickle Co., unlike many pickle processors in Michigan, is faced with a prospective shortage of harvest labor." The Department of Labor continually tried to make every pickle company in Michigan believe that they were the only company short of harvest labor. Representatives of the Department of Labor would come to my office and tell me that no one else in Michigan is having any labor problems. Then, they would visit the other pickle companies and tell them the same thing. I am constantly talking to all the other people in the pickle business in Michigan, and I have been unable to find any that didn't have substantial shortages of harvest labor. I would be most interested in a list from the Department of Labor of those pickle companies in Michigan that had sufficient harvest labor

this year. I haven't been able to find any, but maybe Mr. Wirtz knows of some. Who are they?

"Crown Pickle refused to hire A Teams, when they were available." This is completely untrue as we did agree to hire three A Teams. Under the provisions established by the Labor Department we were not equipped to handle any more. However, after accepting three A Teams, the Department of Labor wanted us to take more. It was impossible for us to construct the proper facilities and train the necessary people to operate these facilities in the time we had available. Also, we knew that the A Teams would leave the fields at least 3 weeks before the crop was completely harvested. How could we complete the harvest on the farms after the A Teams left?

"Crown Pickle, instead of recruiting through the U.S. Employment Service, turned to a fee-charging private agency in Texas, with disappointing results." Only because we were not able to procure enough harvesting labor through U.S. Employment Service did we turn to every other possible method of recruiting. Enclosed are photostats of letters from different divisions of the Department of Labor throughout the country which, in their own handwriting, admitted that they would not have labor available for us. What were we to do? We thought it was commendable for us to look for help through an outside agency, but it appears by doing so we are criticized. We advanced \$20,000 to this outside agency to help us get labor to pick our crops. Enclosed is evidence where we recruited 190 workers and advanced money to these workers through the Texas Employment Commission. I am also enclosing evidence of attempts to recruit labor through individuals who promised 105 workers. We advanced them considerable funds and we have yet to receive any workers * * * or the refund of our money. We tried every way humanly possible to recruit a labor force. Is this wrong? Without harvesting labor we would have to close our plants and lay off hundreds of production workers. Is it wrong to fight for survival?

"Crown Pickle refused (despite its plea for workers) to hire 75 constituents of yours, residents of Saginaw, who were seeking jobs in the pickle fields." It infuriated me to hear that the Secretary was so naive as to believe that we would leave 75 people looking for work stranded. Surely you should have investigated why this happened. Of course, this was a totally isolated incident. We had five buses shuttling teenagers to our pickle fields. We were constantly running ads in the newspapers and we never knew how many people would show up on a particular day. On the day in question there were 75 children we could not handle, but only for the one day. During the harvest we had approximately 250 children working for us. For these 250 children we were writing approximately 800 checks a week.

You can see the turnover that we had. Also, the cost of these children was phenomenal. They would go out into fields, take about an hour to get started, and 2 hours later they decided they didn't like the work and quit. It was the saddest experience of my life.

On one farm the boys decided to ride the farmers cows. It nearly drove the farmer out of his mind trying to get his cows back and the boys off his farm. On another farm about 10 boys decided they didn't want to work any more. They went back to the buses and ate the lunches of all the other boys that were working. This completely ruined another crew. I don't entirely blame the children—because they are children and they will be playful—but this business of picking pickles is not a game.

"Additional workers are being recruited in Louisiana and Kentucky." The labor we

received from Kentucky was completely inadequate. People simply were not physically fit for the difficult task of picking pickles. The few that stayed would only pick large size pickles when they did work. After they received their first pay check they didn't return to work for 3 days. When we questioned them they told us that they needed time to spend their earnings. We suggested that they might want to send some of their money home where it was probably needed rather than spending it on whisky. They told us that, "we drank before we came, we are going to drink while we are here, and we are going to drink after we leave."

The only satisfactory labor we had this year was the Mexican family groups. Because of the competition for this small pool of efficient labor, this type of worker was most scarce. If we are to get the pickle crop next year in Michigan and operate our plants at a profit, we certainly are going to have to have more adequate labor than we had this year.

Thank you very much for your patience and help. I am most interested in Secretary Wirtz' answer to this letter.

FRED RAZNICK,
Vice President, Crown Food Products
Division, Vlastic Food Products Co.
BRIDGEPORT, MICH.

This exchange of correspondence dramatically illustrates in my mind the real need of a congressional investigation into 1965 farm labor policies and results. I do not speak for other sections of the country in urging that the House Committee on Education and Labor undertake this probe—only for Michigan.

Let us get all the facts; let us take steps now to avoid the same controversy and the same problems next year. I have written to Secretary Wirtz once again, seeking his support of a thorough study of this matter. In addition, I have formally requested consideration by the House Committee on Education and Labor of an investigation.

I understand that it has been suggested that the Michigan Farm Panel, established by Secretary of Labor Wirtz on May 7, 1965, conducted such an inquiry in Michigan. The reason given was that a congressional probe would only encourage politics. I would dispute that and I would add that this is a proper and responsible activity for a duly designated congressional committee. It was Congress that acted in 1964 to discontinue Public Law 78 and the use of foreign farm labor. I maintain that it is now the responsibility of Congress to determine the success and failure of the new domestic farm labor policies.

(Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. GROVER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

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

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. GROVER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

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

25416

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 7, 1965

SITUATION IN DOMINICAN
REPUBLIC

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. GROVER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday I addressed the House calling attention to the confusing, erroneous information forthcoming from the State Department on the situation in the Dominican Republic. As I stated at that time, since attention has been diverted from the deteriorating situation there by other major world events, the public is not being effectively informed of the truth of the tragic administration handling of the Communist uprising in the Dominican Republic.

A journalist recognized as having thorough knowledge of complications in Latin America is Jules Dubois of the Chicago Tribune. I insert in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks four articles from the Tribune of October 4 through 7, by Mr. Dubois, in which he interviewed Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin: GENERAL WESSIN TELLS STORY OF DOMINGO

[Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, anti-Communist hero of the Communist revolt in Santo Domingo last spring, has told his story of this exciting period to Jules Dubois, Latin American correspondent of the Chicago Tribune. General Wessin, now exiled in Miami, tells below the first installment of his memories of the Red revolt.]

(By Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin as told to Jules Dubois)

MIAMI, October 3.—I am glad for this opportunity to tell my Dominican story to the people of the United States—and to those in other lands who might read it—from this city where I am living in involuntary exile.

I am now living in a country that is the bastion of democracy and the defender of human liberties, liberties for which your forefathers fought and for which your loved ones have died in war, and are dying today in far-off Vietnam just as some of them died, or were wounded, unfortunately, in my homeland.

I am able to tell my story here thanks to your Constitution, to your laws, to your division of powers which enables you to elect a Congress of dedicated men and women.

I am also going to give you my opinion about the landing of U.S. troops in Santo Domingo and comment, of course, on the pressure to which I was subjected and events that preceded my being booted out of my homeland by force by American troops, acting under orders from the OAS.

I note that I have been accused of being too anti-Communist. Is it a crime to be anti-Communist? If so, then why are American soldiers dying in Vietnam? I have read books about communism and have become convinced that it is intrinsically bad in all respects. I was raised a Christian and I believe in God.

THOUGHT INJUSTICE OVER

I don't like any regime that does not respect private property, private enterprise, and human rights. Neither do I believe in wanton disobedience and lawlessness by those who claim they are demonstrating to champion human rights.

When Juan Bosch was elected president in December 1962, we who had suffered under the Trujillo regime felt that we had a government which was a result of the popular will. I thought everything bad in our country had terminated.

But under Bosch the radio stations began to operate full blast and all the Communist parties bought time. At any hour what was heard was incitement to subversion, and dramatizations of biographies of Castro and Ernesto [Che] Guevara (Castro's right hand who has disappeared).

PROMOTED CLASS HATRED

Bosch tolerated everything that smelled of communism. Schools teaching Marxism-Leninism appeared, one even flying the Soviet flag. Bosch promoted class hatred. No person who lived well could travel the poor districts of the city well-dressed or in an automobile without being subjected to abuse. Congress was a rubberstamp.

It was impossible to support any longer a government so completely lacking in responsibility, so we proceeded to depose Bosch, by the will of the people. The disgust of the people was so great that the 600,000 citizens who had voted for Bosch 7 months earlier failed to protest his overthrow.

Now this man has landed back in our country as a punishment. A humble and good people like ours has been deceived and divided by this traitor full of hate and vengeance. The misfortune of my country at this moment was planned for a long time by the Communists helped by Fidel Castro in combination with Juan Bosch. Fidel Castro played a role. Parachutists were dropped to guerrillas supporting the return of Bosch. What country other than Cuba could they have come from?

KNEW OF PLOT

Officers began plotting a revolution against the government of President Reid (Donald J. Reid-Cabral) and I informed the president of the plot a few days before April 24. And at midnight of the 23d, an army corporal came to my house to tell me that the following day, officers would start the revolution by arresting Brig. Gen. Marco Rivera-Cuesta, Army Chief of Staff.

I telephoned General Rivera to inform him of what was to happen but he said it was not true and advised me to go back to sleep. Next day he was arrested; thus the movement; that today has my country sunk in mourning, misery, and ruin, began.

The revolt of April 24 was a tripartite conspiracy in which Communists played the major role in alliance with ex-President Bosch and his agents. The Communists had a triple objective:

First, to seize the Government and restore the malleable Bosch as set forth in the Dominican Communist Party manifesto of March 18. Second, to create a diversion to the war in Vietnam. Third, to embarrass the United States and antagonize Latin Americans against Washington for any unilateral action that might have to be taken to prevent my country from becoming a second Cuba.

KEYED TO HARM UNITED STATES

I feel that my assessment is accurate because every act of the Communists is keyed to harm the United States, for they know this is the only country which, in the long run will destroy communism.

On April 24, despite the reports I had received and passed on the night before, all the army personnel were given their weekend passes, except for the necessary guards and caretaker officers and men. We did that so as not to alarm anyone and to give the appearance that everything was normal in the capital. We also recognize it was a mistake to have done it, a most lamentable mistake.

While at home for luncheon, I was informed by telephone of General Rivera's arrest. I am sure the general was involved in the conspiracy because of his refusal to take any precautionary action and for other reasons.

RUSHES TO ASSEMBLE TROOPS

I left my home hurriedly and went to my headquarters where I assembled all the troops I could who were under my command—no more than 200 at the base. I awaited developments.

Mobs, incited by the official radio Santo Domingo TV network and other stations, began to sack the city. That afternoon, Brig. Gen. Juan de los Santos-Céspedes, chief of staff of the air force, accompanied by some of his high-ranking officers, came to my office and told me not to offer any resistance because a military coup d'état had started to install a military junta and call elections in 90 days.

I told him I was opposed to a coup, to avoid a clash within the armed forces which would shatter our much-needed unity, but that my estimate of the situation differed from his. It appeared to me that what was on the march was a Communist coup because for some time I had had information about the conspiracy.

ONLY 200 MEN AT BASE

I also told the general that if he wanted to deliver himself to the revolt to go ahead but I would not and was going to defend myself. When all this was happening, I did not have more than 200 men in my base.

Due to his indecision and that of other chiefs of the national army, the Communists were able during the night of April 24 to seize an arsenal and distribute arms to the civilians and to place them at strategic points in the city. The confusion was so great that nobody knew who was his friend or his enemy.

The situation of our armed forces at the moment was this:

The chiefs of the army who were not in the conspiracy were on the run. General Rivera, being under arrest, could not issue any orders as chief of staff. President Reid was commander in chief as well as minister of defense.

The navy, with the exception of 9 of its more than 30 ships of all types, was almost totally on the other side. Indecision continued at air force headquarters.

POLICE ARE DEMORALIZED

The demoralization of the police had begun, for Col. Francisco A. Caamano-Deno, who was to emerge as military chief of the rebels, had been an important officer of police.

The only base determined to oppose the revolt was my armed forces training center and this we did the first night. I dispatched 50 infantrymen and 4 tanks to occupy the eastern head of the Duarte bridge over the Ozama River in order to deny it to the enemy. Had the rebels been able to cross it, they would have been in a position to seize the international airport and overrun the San Isidro airbase, as well as attack the training center.

President Reid issued an ultimatum to the army rebels to surrender by 8 p.m. the first day. It was ignored. Then he extended it to 6 a.m., April 25. His order was not obeyed due to the betrayal and the cowardice of a group of national army officers.

The rebels had more tanks than we did when Reid and the other civilian chief of the Government, Dr. Ramon Caceres, resigned next morning, after Reid's ultimatum had been ignored. And the police force, like the army, failed to rally to us for 3 or 4 days. The police force's chiefs were indecisive and vacillating.

WESSIN'S STORY: HOW THE REDS TOOK OVER—
USED BOSCH MAN AS SCREEN, SAYS EXILED HERO

(By Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, as told to Jules Dubois)

MIAMI, October 4.—On the afternoon of April 25, following the resignations of Br.

October 7, 1965

25417

Donald J. Reid-Cabral and Dr. Ramon Caceres-Troncoso as heads of the Dominican Republic's civilian Government, the Communists took over the national palace in Santo Domingo. They acted behind the screen of Jose Rafael Molina-Urena, Speaker of the Congress during the regime of President Juan Bosch. Molina was declared provisional President pending the return of Bosch [who Westin feels is allied with Communists].

The Communists strutted through the palace carrying submachineguns and automatic rifles with the air of victors. Among them were well-known leaders of the party.

The radio and television psychological warfare phase of the revolt which was directed and broadcast from the palace created alarm and panic. Here are some of the slogans the Communists shouted into the TV cameras and microphones, inside the palace, mind you:

"Fatherland or death. We will win. Viva the new Socialist Republic. Viva Fidel Castro. Down with the reactionaries who sell out our fatherland."

INSTRUCT MOBS BY RADIO

The same men shouted instructions to the mobs over radio and TV. They gave the addresses of families of selected officers of the armed forces and the mobs rushed to the officers' homes, sacking them and in many cases killing the occupants.

The vacillation and indecision of Brig. Gen. Juan de los Santos-Céspedes, chief of staff of the air force, continued. But officers of the force, independent of him, decided it was time to act when the Communists began to haul their families to their barricade at the western end of the Duarte bridge (Westin's troops held the eastern end) so that we would be reluctant to try to break through and clear the line of communications into the city.

The one air force man who did not voluntarily unite with us was General Santos. I forced him to support us under duress. I sent two officers with submachine guns to confront him in his office at the San Isidro air base and at gunpoint they convinced him to join us in our resistance.

ORDERS STRAFING ATTACK

They told him that I wanted the Communists out of the palace and that the most effective means of forcing them to flee was by a strafing attack. He gave that order to his operations officer.

I could not rationalize why de los Santos did not want to act other than to attribute his vacillation to irresponsibility, cowardice or failure to realize what was happening. Or because he might have been involved in the conspiracy. It did not take him long though, to realize that the revolt was Communist dominated. From that point on he cooperated with unchallenged loyalty during all our fighting.

The general dispatched his P-51 planes to strafe the palace and ordered his special troops of the air force to join my troops at the armed forces training center placing them under my operational command as we began to plan the capture of the Duarte bridge.

STRAFE INFANTRY BATTALION

Our operations were fully coordinated. The garrison of the 27th of February fort on the eastern bank of the Ozama River surrendered to our joint forces and P-51's strafed the sixth infantry battalion headquarters of the army chief of staff.

We still didn't have the navy on our side, except for 9 vessels of more than 30. The attitude of Commodore Francisco J. Rivera-Camirero, navy chief of staff, was most puzzling. I saw a message on the air force teletype announcing that he was supporting the (rebel) provisional government of Molina-Urena. This was on Sunday night, April 25.

Shortly afterward, a Latin American friend telephoned me from Washington to inquire about the situation. I told him it was very bad, that Commodore Rivera had just thrown the support of the navy behind the Communist movement. He told me he would call me right back, which he did and said that I no longer needed to worry about the posture of Rivera.

CAN'T EXPLAIN CHANGE

I don't know what happened and I can't furnish an explanation for it but the truth is that from then on Rivera supported me.

Air sorties over the palace, without the planes firing a single shot, induced the Communists to flee from it on April 26. By nightfall, Molina-Urena also fled and obtained asylum in the Colombian Embassy.

On Monday (April 26), the air force radio at San Isidro advised the civilian population to leave the Duarte bridge because it was considered a military objective. The Communist radio, on the other hand, urged the civilians to concentrate on the bridge. It also said that Juan Bosch was conferring in San Juan, P.R., about an immediate return to Santo Domingo.

Before we attacked the bridge, the air force was ordered to make a level pass over the bridge without firing. This was done and the "brave" Communists fled the scene as did the innocent civilians who had gathered there. An attack was immediately ordered with one objective: to destroy the artillery and automatic heavy weapons in that sector. Then we crossed the bridge with the small force we had and secured the western end.

CONFUSION OF TROOPS

Many persons have asked why our troops did not then capture the city that day, April 27. This is why: many innocent persons would have been killed. We didn't have sufficient troops, for the majority had not returned to their bases because they could not safely cross the city. The rebels would either arrest or kill them when they tried to reach their bases.

There was still confusion among the armed forces but we continued preparations for what was to be the final attack. Some of our troops began to trickle back to their bases through circuitous routes and the crews of tanks which the Communists seized when they took over the palace were able to steal some of them back and return them to us.

There was a tug of war between some of the military plotters of the revolt, but I didn't participate in any of their negotiations. The Communists wanted the return of Juan Bosch, while the loyalists wanted a military junta.

TALKS BROKEN OFF

On the morning of April 28, talks between the opposing military were broken off and it was decided to install a junta composed of two colonels and one navy captain. Col. Pedro Bartolome Benoit, a nonflying air force officer who had risen from the ranks, was named president.

That afternoon Benoit appointed Brig. Gen. Salvador Montas-Guerrero, a former army chief of staff, as "commander of all military operations with all the responsibilities entailed thereto." That automatically placed me under the command of Montas but he did nothing. There was no directive to regroup or reorganize for battle. He was involved in the original conspiracy and I have never been able to understand his appointment.

While we were continuing with plans for a clean-up operation on the afternoon of April 30, Msgr. Emanuele Clarizio, the papal nuncio, brushed past the sentries at air force headquarters, where Benoit had his office, and insisted on negotiating a cease-fire agreement.

REDS IGNORED CEASE-FIRE

He obtained that agreement at a meeting in Benoit's office attended by John Bartlow Martin special American Ambassador, and Jose Antonio Mora, secretary general of the Organization of American States.

It appeared to me at that moment that the destiny of my country was sealed, and I say that because all subsequent developments confirm it. While the cease-fire was observed by our troops, the Communists never respected it during that earlier period.

It was only afterwards that I learned that Bosch, apparently acting on an urgent appeal from Col. Francisco A. Caamaño-Deno, the rebel military chief, had implored Monsignor Clarizio, who happened to be in San Juan at the time, to fly back and negotiate for a cease-fire.

MARTIN IMPOSES SUBSTITUTE

Ambassador Martin decided to impose upon us another government to substitute for the military junta. Why he insisted upon that I cannot understand. His candidate was Brig. Gen. Antonio Imbert-Barrera. General de los Santos and I were opposed to the selection of Imbert to replace Benoit as president and we told Martin that.

Notwithstanding our objections, Imbert was designated president of the government of national reconstruction at the urgent insistence of Martin and his political adviser, Harry Shlaudeman.

We immediately supported Imbert and talked to our troops and explained the situation to them.

WESSIN TELLS PRESSURE ON HIM TO QUIT DOMINGO AND HIS OUSTER—GENERAL RELATES ANOTHER CHAPTER IN REVOLT STORY (By Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin as told to Jules Dubois)

MIAMI, October 5.—When the cease-fire was imposed on us last April 30, we were ready to clean up Ciudad Nueva (part of the capital city of Santo Domingo) that day. At least we would have occupied the greatest part of the city because we had the enemy demoralized and on the run despite its capture of the Ozama fortress that day.

The American troops had already landed. A detachment of marines had arrived 2 nights earlier and the paratroopers of the 82d Airborne Division landed at San Isidro Airbase early on the morning of April 30 and continued to land all day at 5-minute intervals.

I want to tell the American people as well as the people who are still free in the Americas that the day those troops arrived, all the men and women of the Dominican Republic who fight for freedom, said prayers for the welfare of this Nation and your President, Mr. Johnson. I personally ordered a mass celebrated at the chapel at my base for the health of the President and all the officers and men there at the time. About 600 attended.

WHAT A PITY

With this action by the United States, we thought that shedding of more blood had been averted and that the fall of another American republic into the Communist orbit had been prevented. What a pity that what had started out so well may have such a gloomy ending for my country.

Your Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT says that President Johnson sent the marines to the Dominican Republic because of exaggerated reports about the situation in my country. I want to tell this Senator that perhaps this has been the only time that the President has been so well informed about what was happening in the Dominican Republic.

If President Johnson had not made that decision, today Santo Domingo would be another Cuba. One had to be there, Mr. Fulbright, to realize that.

25418

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 7, 1965

Ex-President Juan Bosch (then in Puerto Rico) had used the papal nuncio to our country, Msgr. Emanuele Clarizio, to obtain a cease-fire in behalf of the rebels to save them from annihilation by us. He knew that the nuncio, as personal representative of Pope Paul VI, would be able to influence the sincere Roman Catholic spirits of our military chiefs to accept the cease-fire.

READY TO CLEAN CITY

We were ready to clean up the city. The rebels insisted on obtaining a cease-fire because they were confident that they would be able to resolve their problems through negotiations. In reality, the cease-fire gave the Communists time to reorganize, re-enforce themselves, and to train recruits in subversion and guerrilla warfare.

Proof that we were ready to clean up the city was that when we launched our offensive in the northern industrial sector we were able to rout the rebels there within a week with a minimum of casualties. As soon as we finished there, we requested permission from the U.S. commanders to cross the security corridor to clean up Cuidad Nueva but permission was denied. The Government made many such requests, formal and informal, to permit us to take the rest of the city held by the rebels. All these were turned down. Our hands were tied.

I reached the conclusion that the security corridor was established, under auspices of the Organization of American States, solely to protect the rebels. That section of the city was made a sanctuary for the Red rats while the will of the rest of the country was ignored.

DON'T BLAME U.S. OFFICERS

I cannot blame the American military commanders, for they were only obeying an OAS order, but I consider that order which prevented us from achieving a military victory a direct and unwarranted intervention in the affairs of the Dominican Republic.

Our relations with the American troops were excellent. We gave them every kind of cooperation and they set up headquarters in our military installations.

But now I shall tell you the story of the pressure to which I was subjected by American officials to leave my country. I would also like to give details of the attempts to bribe me so that I would gracefully depart.

VISIT BY AMBASSADOR

Two or three days after Gen. Antonio Imbert-Barrera assumed the Presidency, American Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., accompanied by Lt. Gen. Bruce Palmer, came to see me at the military academy. The Ambassador said that with much regret he had a mission to fulfill. He told me that I had to leave the country and that I should not worry because I was not going to have any kind of problems.

I replied that I could not turn my back on my people or my soldiers who accompanied me in the most difficult moments. I asked what would the people and my troops think if I left. I said that I had three sons, and that I could not set a bad example for them by leaving.

The Ambassador said that my departure would settle the situation. That was the reason they always gave: That my departure would help in reaching a solution of the Dominican problem and that I should sacrifice myself. They called it an act of patriotism but I knew that my departure would only bring about a breakdown of morale within the armed forces and, consequently, throughout the country.

LIST OTHER OFFICERS

I asked the Ambassador why they did not eject other generals who had not done anything for the country other than to enrich themselves? He replied that they were going to do that. I wrote in my own hand a letter addressed to Mr. Bennett in which I in-

cluded, among other things, a list of those officers.

In the same letter I said that when the situation returned to normal I would retire from the army. I did not mean immediately. The Ambassador left with the letter. I was disheartened.

One cannot possibly imagine how a general officer of a small country feels when he is unjustly pressured by the most powerful country in the world. Mind you, it was not the Dominican Government that made the precipitate announcement that I had resigned and was going to leave the country. It was the spokesman for the State Department in Santo Domingo.

VISIT BY U.S. COLONEL

The next night, Lt. Col. Joe Wyrick, the U.S. Army attaché, came to my house and asked me if I was ready to leave. He said Ambassador Bennett had kept his part of the bargain as the officers I had requested to go had already left the country.

This surprised me and I told Colonel Wyrick I had delivered a letter to the Ambassador in which I had explained everything relating to the matter. But he insisted I had to go. I wrote another letter to Ambassador Bennett in order to put an end to this pressure. I told him I could not leave the country without money because I had a family, and that I could sell my house for \$40,000. The house is not worth that much but, as I have said, my purpose was to get them to stop pressuring me.

Approximately 3 months passed. Then one day—I think it was September 1—a man came to my house and identified himself as being from the American Embassy. He had an interpreter with him. They surprised me by mentioning the sale of my house.

MAKE \$50,000 OFFER

The Embassy representative offered me \$50,000 and told me he would give me \$8,000 cash right then and the rest when I boarded the plane to leave the country. I replied that I would not sell my house to leave the country; that I would build another one on kilometer 9 of the San Pedro de Macoris Highway. He insisted that my departure would end the crisis in the country. I answered that I did not start the war. They left.

On Saturday night, September 4, David Phillips of the Central Intelligence Agency and Colonel Wyrick arrived at my house. Phillips did the talking. He offered me \$50,000 for my house. It cost me \$18,000 to build. He offered me trips as guest of honor to military installations of the United States and in the Panama Canal Zone. I was soon to be taken, precisely, to the Canal Zone but not as a guest of honor.

I told these men that I had fought in my country for the same cause for which I suppose they fight, and that I had served my country with honesty.

CALL FROM GARCIA-GODOY

Some days passed. Then President Garcia-Godoy called me to his office and told me I could have any post I wanted abroad. I asked if he thought my departure would terminate the crisis. He replied affirmatively. I told him it would not settle the crisis but would worsen it, and that I would answer his proposal the next day.

I did not do so because I was determined not to leave my country and turn my back on my people and my comrades in arms. But unfortunately, at 8 o'clock that night, I was booted out forcibly as if I was an epidemic. I had waited in my house for a visit from General Palmer. He arrived at 6 p.m. with his general staff. Also with him were Gen. Hugo Panasco Alvim, commander of the Inter-American peace force, other Dominican officers, and a large number of troops.

What I thought was a visit started out with the same pressure theme of 4 months

before. I refused and told them I would not accept a post from a government (his) that used foreign officers to eject me from my country. I told them that if they did eject me, much blood would eventually be spilled.

FAREWELL TO TROOPS

General Alvim said that the "Constitutionalists" (I would have used the word "Communists") would surrender their arms if I left the country.

Seeing that these people were disposed to boot me out anyway, I asked them to accompany me to my base to say farewell to my officers and men so they would know about my departure and also to calm them and avoid a clash between Dominican troops and those of the peace force. We left my house with my family in tears because they realized what was happening.

I addressed my men at the training center with tears in my eyes. More than 400 brave and democratic soldiers wept too. I had been a father to them.

Then General Alvim replaced me with Col. Elio Osiris Perdomo, one of the best officers in the Dominican army. Alvim told me I was consul general in Miami and asked if I accepted. I said yes but with mental reservations. I asked permission to go home and say goodbye to my family, to get my passport and some money, but the American lieutenant with me said: "I'm sorry but those are not my orders."

GRABBED MY ARM

Then he grabbed me by the arm and took me to a helicopter in which I was flown to the Punta Caucedo airport. There, a civilian came up and, almost on the double, took me to a U.S. Air Force transport.

Naturally I hold rancor for the manner in which American troops hustled me out of my country by force. Of course, as I have previously said, military men have to carry out their orders. The Americans were ordered to boot me out, an order that was issued by the famous OAS, which has served only to complicate everything in my country.

I am a general of the Dominican Army. I assumed responsibilities in my own country for what I consider the same ideal for which this country fights. And I consider the manner in which these men booted me out of my own country as humiliating.

WESSIN FEARS TAKEOVER BY REDS—DEFENDS REFUSAL TO TAKE CONSUL GENERAL POST
(By Gen. Elias Wessin Y Wessin, as told to Jules Dubois)

MIAMI, October 6.—If the non-Communists of the Dominican Republic do not arouse themselves to protest, the Republic will be delivered to the Communists by elections within 8 months.

For the first time in history this will be done under the direct vigilance of American troops in the Inter-American peace force (policing a cease-fire in Santo Domingo).

Juan Bosch (a deposed ex-president), or one of his men, will be the candidate of the Communists no matter under what party banner he may be nominated.

IT IS A DUCK

I do not think that Provisional President Hector Garcia-Godoy is a Communist. But there is a saying in my country that goes something like this: "If a cat swims like a duck, flies like a duck, walks like a duck, it is a duck."

It must be remembered that Garcia-Godoy served under Bosch as foreign minister in September 1963, but that does not necessarily mean they see eye to eye on everything. Perhaps the president feels that he owes the only opportunity he would have had to occupy the national palace to Bosch and Col. Francisco A. Caamano-Deno (the rebel chief).

October 7, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

25419

Now Caamano is, in my opinion, an instrument of the Communists. It could very well be that at this moment he is a Communist. It could also be that Hector Aristy (a close associate of Caamano) at this moment is, too, a Communist.

TWO FOLLOW AMBITIONS

I believe that their actions and affiliations are predicated on ambitions, personal ambitions, ambitions for money and for power. I don't believe they are Communists because of any convictions they might have.

I warned foreign officials (Americans) who came to my house in Santo Domingo to tell me I had to go that my departure would complicate the crisis. (Wessin was taken by a U.S. Air Force plane to Panama, being told by American officials that his departure would settle the situation in the Dominican Republic).

After being booted out of my homeland, my words are proving to be true and time will tell if I am right. I was determined not to accept the post as consul general in Miami (to which he was appointed as he unwillingly left the country).

FIGHTS SAME CAUSE

Do you think that I should serve a government that ordered me booted out in such a humiliating manner? That is what they did to a man whose only offense was to defend a cause (anticommunism) for which today the youth of the United States is shedding its blood in different parts of the world.

Commanders of the Organization of American States' Inter-American force insisted that when I left the country the Communists had assured them they would deliver up their arms.

As I finish this story, the Communists have delivered only a trickle of arms still in their possession. I estimate—and this is a conservative figure—that they have between 4,000 and 5,000 weapons.

MADE MANY MISTAKES

In my career I have made many mistakes. Who hasn't? But if I had to take an inventory, I would regard as the biggest error the type of government the Armed Forces of my country installed after the overthrow of Bosch.

If I had to do it again, I would recall an adage in my country which runs like this: "Stumbling makes one lift his feet."

When Juan Bosch fell I never thought the politicians were going to comport themselves as they did in the government of the civilian triumvirate that replaced him. If I had been clairvoyant, I would have insisted on another type of government—a civilian-military junta—and I am sure it would have maintained stability and would have led the country to free elections.

WAS GRAVE ERROR

It was a grave error not to have done that, but there prevailed in our minds at the time the best of intentions, for we had no ambitions for power as time has proved.

This ends my Dominican story, but I can assure you that the story of the Dominican Republic is far from ended.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose in addressing the House this afternoon and directing this information to the attention of the Members is the hope that it will arouse sufficient interest in the great danger facing the cause of freedom in the Dominican Republic.

I believe President Johnson was following a sound and necessary policy in sending troops to the Dominican Republic to help defeat the Communist-led revolt. However, due to State Department misdirection, our troops were in effect used to protect a Communist sanctuary

and administration diplomats have now acquiesced in a Communist-infiltrated provisional government.

The Dominican Republic can either become another Cuba, with all the tragedies that would follow, or the staunch citizens of that island, given proper leadership, can crush the Communist menace and continue their progress under free enterprise and effective government operations.

THE 1965 CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK AND A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. GROVER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a highly interesting and informative address on the 1965 Captive Nations Week observance several weeks ago our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, quoted the chief Soviet Russian ideologist, Wehail Suslov, concerning this annual event. This quotation is a most illuminating one for what it obviously indicates. For the benefit of those who still fail to comprehend the meaning and significance of Captive Nations Week—indeed, the whole captive nations movement—this eye-opening quotation should be repeated again and again. Here is how Suslov and the Russian imperio-colonialists view the week:

Especially disgusting is the villainous demagogery of the imperialistic chieftains of the United States. Each year they organize the so-called Captive Nations Week, hypocritically pretending to be defenders of nations that have escaped from their yoke.

PRIME REASON FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE

This quotation is but one among scores of vehement denunciations that have come out of Moscow since the week was provided for by Congress in 1959. Khrushchev and many lesser lights in the apparatus of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism have expressed themselves in the same spirit. It is conclusively evident from all this that Captive Nations Week is a profound thorn of truth in the side of the Soviet Russian totalitarians. It is equally evident that the annual observance and all it entails by way of popular discussion and enlightenment constitute a stubborn impediment to Moscow's deceptive policy of peaceful existence as applied to the United States and the free world.

For some time now it has been the paramount objective of Red psychopolitical warfare to bury the truth of the captive nations. Moscow and its totalitarian Red associates have steadily aimed at our acquiescence to the Red empire, at our apathy and indifference toward the captive nations throughout this empire, and even at the renunciation of our politico-moral obligations to them. In some areas of our Nation they have succeeded in this; fortunately in most they have not as yet made any substantial inroads.

Mr. Speaker, we can thwart and defeat this Red design by establishing now a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The very existence of such a committee, albeit on a temporary basis, would symbolize our determination to prevent any Russian burial of truths regarding the captive nations. In fact, the work of this committee would unravel and circulate more factual truths about all the captive nations that millions of our people still are unaware of. Much precious time has been lost in not creating this committee earlier. We can ill afford to lose more time while the Red totalitarians intensify their campaign of lies and distortions about some mythical "American imperialists" in the underdeveloped areas of the free world.

THE INTERNATIONAL SCOPE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Our far-seeing initiative in this vital respect would be in accord with and would bolster the international character of Captive Nations Week. One of the outstanding aspects of the 1965 Captive Nations Week observance was the further notable expansion of the observance in other lands. Free China, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Turkey, West Germany, Malta, and other areas are places where the week was observed by patriotic groups and organizations. For the first time in the history of any foreign nation the Parliament of Turkey passed a Captive Nations Week resolution similar to Public Law 86-90, and the move is on for other free parliaments to do likewise. One of the salutary results of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations would be the propagation of information and truth about Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism in these and other areas of the free world.

I join with my colleagues in our praise of the National Captive Nations Committee for its splendid citizens' implementation of Public Law 86-90, and to give our Members a further inkling into the activities and scope of Captive Nations Week, which the Suslovs never tire to deprecate. I request that the following items be printed in the RECORD: First, editorials and articles in Maltese papers; second, the Dayton Daily News and the Catholic Telegraph reports and editorials; third, nation and worldwide summaries of the 1965 Week in the August-September Ukrainian Bulletin; fourth, the Bergen County, N.J., observance program; fifth, letters to the Pittsburgh Press and the America magazine; sixth, an article in the Cincinnati Enquirer of July 20; seventh, pertinent resolutions of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League; and eighth, an editorial in the Free Front of the Philippines;

[From the Times of Malta, July 19, 1965]

NOBLE CAUSE

The Anti-Communist League is organizing, for the first time in Malta, the Captive Nations Week commencing from today. This is the practice throughout many countries in the free world.

In 1959 the United States passed a law authorizing and requesting the President to designate the third week in July as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with the

appropriate ceremonies and activities. The same law further authorized and requested the President to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

The Anti-Communist League's manifesto published for the occasion appeals to the people of Malta to demonstrate, during this week, their awareness of the importance of the freedom of all nations. It calls upon them to pray to the Almighty for the cause of the peoples suffering under the atheist Soviet yoke.

Malta is fortunate in belonging to the free world. The Maltese people so cherish freedom and democracy that they ardently desire all the peoples of the world to have the same freedom enjoyed by them. Truly free men must inevitably love freedom not only for themselves but for all men because so long as there are nations languishing under the Communist yoke there is a constant threat to freedom.

But apart from the threat which tyranny poses to the free world, it is the duty of free nations to assure the peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains that their resistance is not in vain. It is up to them to show that these people's struggle has the same aim as that of all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, who do not merely desire freedom and democracy within their territories but beyond their frontiers, too.

It is true that politically speaking Malta could not do much to help those suffering under Communist domination. This is not very surprising when one considers that much more powerful countries have not been able to free the world's enslaved millions. However, Malta's size has nothing to do with Malta's spirit which has always nobly risen to the occasion when called upon in the cause of freedom and justice.

As a Catholic people, the Maltese cannot be indifferent to the suppression of religion in Communist-dominated countries, and the religious persecution which has not abated in spite of propaganda to the contrary.

Just as the free world aims at winning freedom for the captive nations, so does international communism aim at conquering the free world. It would be naive to believe that Malta is not included in the Communist quest for world domination. This makes it imperative that the Maltese people should take much more than an academic interest in the activities of communism both within and outside the Soviet bloc.

Communist propaganda in the newly emergent countries is harping on the now-hackneyed theme that the emancipation of the former colonies of the Western powers is attributable to the U.S.S.R.'s efforts. This is the sort of propaganda which has reaped a rich harvest for communism in many African and Asian countries.

Malta must be on her guard if she is to preserve the ideas and ideals of freedom and democracy which have been bequeathed to her by Great Britain.

The Anti-Communist League's initiative should therefore receive the wholehearted support which it abundantly deserves. Unless all the Maltese are made fully aware of the tyranny and oppression in Communist countries, they cannot really appreciate the price at which freedom must be regained, once it is lost.

[From the Maltese Observer, July 18, 1965]

CAPTIVE NATIONS

The Communists are always the most ardent defenders of freedom, democracy, self-determination, independence—except where and when they themselves are most in a position, and in duty, bound to promote them.

For those who remember, the last war

was declared in defense of the territorial integrity (the famous corridor) of Poland against Nazi aggression. It finished with the Communist domination of a string of nations, where Communist governments were imposed and are still maintained democratically and peacefully with Russian Communist tanks.

From the Baltic to the Balkans there stretches that Iron Curtain which cordons off the biggest and most brutal concentration camp in the history of humanity—a curtain which is symbolized by, and epitomized in, the barbaric wall of Berlin.

That wall not only goes through the heart of a city, it also goes through the heart of many families and many persons, with loved ones on different sides.

Within that concentration camp lie and languish millions of human beings whose only fault is to be on the wrong side of the line, who live a life of tense terror, and who are denied the most elementary human rights.

To the east, that concentration camp is now bounded by the Bamboo Curtain, no less cruel than the Iron Curtain on the west.

Out of this gigantic prison stream thousands upon thousands of refugees, bent desperately, at tremendous cost, even at the cost of their lives, upon reaching freedom and a human existence.

The Lega Anti-Komunista is this week organizing in Malta, as is done elsewhere in the free world, Captive Nations Week, to remind us of the thousand million human beings like ourselves who live, if that word can be used in this context, in the chains of slavery under a tyranny that is the enemy of both God and man.

We speak of the church of silence, but it is we who deserve that name if we remain silent before such a barbarous reality.

When Cardinal Stepinacz was imprisoned by the Communist regime of his country, and a certain outcry was raised in the free world, his jailers were told: "Let them shout: they will forget." We must not forget.

We must not forget not only out of our duty toward our fellow human beings and fellow Christians, but also lest we ourselves be swallowed up by the all-devouring monster that is international atheistic communism. Let us not say: "It cannot happen here." Where that was said, that did happen there. Eternal vigilance is the price of freedom.

We owe the captive nations the help of our thoughts, our prayers, and our moral and material support and solidarity.

Captive Nations Week, July 18 to 24, 1965. Spare a thought for the 1 billion human beings who were born free and are now enslaved in the grip of Communist dictatorship.

[From the Times of Malta, July 19, 1965]

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK STARTS TODAY

The Lega Anti-Komunista (Anti-Communist League) in its manifesto on Captive Nations Week, July 19-25, maintains that it is dedicated to the restoration of freedom in the Captive Nations, and calls the attention of the Maltese people to Captive Nations Week which is celebrated throughout the free world on the third week of July of each year.

The manifesto adds: "All the captive people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, including the Russian and Chinese people themselves, have suffered Communist tyranny for long years. Tsarist Russia was a colonial empire based on the conquest of non-Russian people.

"A new colonial empire was seized by the Soviets after the last world war: the nations of Central and Eastern Europe have been deprived of their national independence, despite solemn Soviet treaties and agreements, while the non-Russian people, within the Soviet Union have been denied their

promised right to national self-determination. All have lost the basic human freedom—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly and, most important of all, freedom from fear.

"The captive people have never ceased to strive for freedom, actively when possible, passively when necessary; they have never abandoned hope; but the preservation of this hope and the resistance upon which it feeds depend on the support, moral and material, which these enslaved nations have a right to expect from the free world.

"The liberation of the captive people is in the interest of the whole world; there is no hope for a just and lasting peace until the basic cause of international tensions—the division of Europe into two parts, one slave, one free—has been removed.

"We, of the Lega Anti-Komunista, Malta, therefore, feel it incumbent upon us to give voice to the silent aspirations of the captive people.

"We accuse the Soviet Union of violating the solemn promises of independence and freedom of the captive nations, of forcibly depriving the captive non-Russian people within its borders of the right of self-determination, and of destroying the formerly independent states of Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and others.

"We urge the governments of the free nations to liquidate all unsolved consequences of the war in Europe on the basis of the right of self-determination, and to insist that this right be exercised by means of free elections under effective international safeguards.

"Finally we appeal to the people of Malta to manifest during the Captive Nations Week, their awareness of the importance of the freedom of all nations, and to pray the Almighty for the cause of enchained humanity languishing under the atheist Soviet yoke," the manifesto concluded.

Captive Nations Week, July 18-24, 1965. Spare a thought for the 1 billion human beings who were born free and are now enslaved in the grip of Communist dictatorship. Who is next? Take care—stay free.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News,
July 14, 1963]

CAPTIVE NATIONS

Now comes the annual observance—"celebration" is a dead-wrong word—of Captive Nations Week.

In the free world this is a solemn occasion. The bell tolls for the United States of America—and England, France, West Germany, Japan, and every other free country—when it tolls for Russia's string of satellites and for the nations Red China has overrun in Asia.

Call the roll. In Europe no light of freedom shines on Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania. In Asia no drums are beaten for freedom in Tibet, North Vietnam, or North Korea. The people are locked in bondage.

We mourn for them? How and when can we free them? That's a tougher question. We do them no good if we encourage them to revolt but lack the will and the power to support the uprising. We do them no good if, by pressing too hard, we drive Russia and China back into their old embrace. We do them no good if we bring a rain of nuclear bombs down on them. The best—and the least—we can do is to notice, to feel, to suffer. We can let our friends know that we work and scheme and sacrifice to bring a day when freedom's cause will be overpowering. When that day comes, all the prison doors will swing open.

People as brave as these can live for a long time on hope that is genuine, even if deferred. They will lose heart only if they are betrayed once too often by false promises.

they can make their own decision about how large their family should be rather than being in the position where, because of ignorance, they may have a number of unwanted children, as they often do?

Dr. STEWART. Yes. You anticipated my next sentence, which is, I don't think people can make intelligent choices unless they know, and therefore, they need to know so they can make these choices.

Now, as far as the role of the Public Health Service in this is concerned, at the moment, I believe what Dr. Price summarized is probably our role, three parts: research, because I don't know that we have the ideal ways for family planning, there is a variety of ways, and on population dynamics itself, we need more information, and in training individuals for a variety of things, and in assisting the State and local communities as we do in many other kinds of programs for information and for development programs in family planning.

Senator CLARK. This latter effort is primarily education, is it not?

Dr. STEWART. I think it would be primarily education, although some of our grant money to States is used for clinics, but principally that is in the Children's Bureau.

Senator CLARK. But you would have no inclination to sweep this problem under the rug?

Dr. STEWART. Not at all.

Senator CLARK. Thank you.

SUPPORT GROWING FOR SENATOR FULBRIGHT IN HIS VIEWS ON FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in my judgment, a consensus of informed opinion in this country is developing in support of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], both in his view that debate on foreign policy is a necessary part of our democratic process and in his further view that our activities in the Dominican Republic have brought us an unnecessary amount of trouble with nations in Latin America which should be our best friends.

I also note with dismay a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives under the leadership of Representative SELDEN, which would seem to indicate that the United States believes it has a right to intervene unilaterally, with force, in any Latin American country where, in our opinion, there is a threat of a Communist takeover.

The resolution which was adopted, so far as I can tell, without any effective opposition from the State Department, has caused a furor in Latin America almost equal to that caused by our overreaction to the Dominican Republic crisis.

I would hope that in short order the State Department would undertake to issue a statement, which I am confident a number of members of the Foreign Relations Committee—possibly a majority—would approve, which would indicate a return to the sound basis of standing firmly behind our treaty commitments entered into with our fellow members of the Organization of American States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following articles and editorials which confirm the point of view which I have endeavored to express briefly this afternoon:

First, an article entitled, "The Speechmaker," which was published in the October 2 issue of the New Republic under the byline of Andrew Kopkind, with a subtitle, "Senator Fulbright as the Arkansas de Tocqueville"; second, a column written by Joseph Kraft and published in the Washington Post of recent date entitled, "Fulbright and His Critics"; third, a column written by Walter Lippmann entitled, "Soviet-American Relations," which was published in the Washington Post on September 28, 1965; fourth, a column under the byline of Marquis Childs, entitled "Tyranny of the Majority in United States," which appeared in the Washington Post on September 27; and, finally, an editorial entitled "Defending Intervention," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch during the week of September 20-26.

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

THE SPEECHMAKER: SENATOR FULBRIGHT AS THE ARKANSAS DE TOCQUEVILLE

(By Andrew Kopkind)

For his troubles in detailing the errors of U.S. foreign policy, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT has been rewarded with a congressional resolution compounding the error and doubling his troubles. A few days after FULBRIGHT delivered a characteristically long, intelligent, and eloquent condemnation of American intervention in the Dominican Revolution, the House of Representatives passed (312 to 52) a sentimental endorsement of armed intervention anywhere in Latin America in the event of "subversive domination or the threat of it." The rebuke had the tacit approval of the State Department and bipartisan support of the House leadership.

It is not unusual for FULBRIGHT to find himself on the short side of a 6-to-1 vote, and in his own way he derives a certain moral superiority from being a minority of one. "More than a hundred years ago, Alexis de Tocqueville warned us * * * of the dangers that might be expected from the 'tyranny of the majority.' This is the tyranny that presently is growing in our country," FULBRIGHT said in a doom-laden speech on McCarthyism 11 years ago. Last week, privately, he repeated the same phrase, and predicted the same doom. He made his Senate speech not as a political leader but as an elder statesman-without-portfolio, an Arkansas de Tocqueville whose job it is not to make policy but to report it, and by reporting, influence in some small way its future course.

He has no taste for the heat of battle or the pitch of crisis. "At this time of relative calm," his speech began, "it is appropriate, desirable and, I think, necessary to review events in the Dominican Republic and the United States role in those events. The purpose of such a review—and its only purpose—is to develop guidelines for wise and effective policies in the future." Fulbright removed himself as much as he could from the onus of personal criticism: President Johnson's decision to send 20,000 troops to Santo Domingo was understandable under the circumstances. There were "No easy choices. Nonetheless, it is the task of diplomacy to make wise decisions when they need to be made and U.S. diplomacy failed to do so in the Dominican crisis."

The blame could not be placed on the President but was laid squarely on the sources of information: the CIA, State Department intelligence, and U.S. Embassy officials in Santo Domingo. The lack of reliable information—it was inadequate and inaccurate—gets congressional leaders off the hook, too. FULBRIGHT and the usual collection of Senators and Representatives concerned with

foreign policy were called to the White House during the crisis, told the President's plans, and, in effect, asked to ratify the decision to intervene. They offered no opposition, either because they agreed with the President, or (like FULBRIGHT, perhaps uniquely) they had no independent source of information on which to base any instinctive doubts.

FULBRIGHT got the opposite of help from the White House. "The whole affair * * *" FULBRIGHT said, "has been characterized by a lack of candor." He was told at the White House that hundreds or thousands of American lives were in danger, and that the protection of these compatriots was the reason for intervention. Later, he said, he knew that it was not exactly the case: "The danger to American lives was more a pretext than a reason for the massive U.S. intervention," he said. "The United States intervened in the Dominican Republic for the purpose of preventing the victory of a revolutionary force which was judged to be Communist dominated."

There was no doubt about whose bad judgment it was. FULBRIGHT conceived the Dominican episode as a "classic study" of policymaking with the "inevitability of a Greek tragedy." The antagonist was the American Ambassador in Santo Domingo, W. Tapley Bennett. It was he who refused to help the supporters of deposed President Bosch when they pleaded for a U.S. presence on April 25, the second day of the revolution, and it was he who refused U.S. mediation on April 27, when the rebels sought a negotiated settlement.

FULL SPEED AHEAD

Instead, Bennett seemed intent on helping the military junta stay in power. General Wessin y Wessin shot off a telegram to Washington accusing his opponents of being Communists. A quick check could only turn up three Communists, and Wessin was told that the reasons for intervention were not good enough. Only a threat to American lives would bring American troops. Several minutes later, thus prompted, Wessin discovered a threat to American lives. That was all that was needed; the troopships were already speeding toward Santo Domingo. It did not take long to see just how exaggerated the danger was; in fact, no American lives were lost until the marines landed. But by that time, someone found 55, or 58, or 77 verifiable Communists, some of them alive and some of them dead, some of them in the country and some of them out, some of them pro-Castro, some pro-Pelping, and some pro-Moscow, who could be associated with the revolution. Association soon became "control," and the United States had to put the country under military command.

FULBRIGHT slowly amassed these facts in 6 weeks and 13 sessions of secret Foreign Relations Committee hearings this summer, to which almost every administration official concerned with the intervention was invited. A great many came. McGeorge Bundy politely refused. Ambassador Bennett testified and was asked about those telegrams from General Wessin y Wessin; Bennett did not remember the episode, offhand. Other witnesses had better memories. FULBRIGHT was well prepared; the committee staff is one of the best in Congress, and it organized surveys and chronologies of the crisis from a wide variety of sources. So much so, in fact, that opponents of FULBRIGHT thought they detected some kind of conspiracy. "Someone had prepared a sheaf of cards. I should say 1½ inches thick," Senator LAUSCHE reported darkly of the hearings. "When the witnesses appeared, the questions on the cards were systematically asked. One question was read, and the card was turned over. Then the second question was read, and the third." The giveaway was the systematizing. LAUSCHE was not alone in catching it.

October 7, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

the consideration of the pending motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 77:

DEACTIVATION OF SIX RESERVE DIVISIONS AND OTHER UNITS OF THE ARMY RESERVE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] made an extremely important statement to the Senate on the question of the disbanding of the 750 Army Reserve units announced at a press conference by Secretary McNamara on September 30.

The reason why I felt it was so important is that it shows quite clearly to me that Congress is being ignored, to say the very least, by the Secretary of Defense. I would go further than that in this particular instance and say that the Secretary of Defense has misled Congress and the people of this country as to his relationship with Congress.

The Senator from Mississippi placed in the RECORD very specifically what was said in the questions and answers at the news conference on September 30. I should like to repeat them for emphasis. The first question put by a news reporter to the Secretary of Defense was:

Mr. Secretary, did you get as favorable a response in the Senate to this plan that you apparently got in the Hébert committee this morning?

Referring to the plan to disband 750 Army Reserve units—

Secretary McNAMARA. Well, we haven't met with committees of the Senate in quite the same way as we did with the Hébert committee this morning, but those Members of the Senate with whom we have discussed it, I think, have responded as favorably as did Members of the House. Cy, is that a fair appraisal, do you think?

Question. That presumably includes Senator STENNIS?

Secretary McNAMARA. I don't want to speak for individual members of the committee. I would rather you talk to him directly. Let me simply say we have talked to Members of the Senate, leaders of the Senate, in the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees and they have received the plan favorably.

Note that, Mr. President—"They have received the plan favorably."

I continue with the quotation:

But I don't want to speak for any particular one of them. I think each of them might put some particular interpretation on his own appraisal of it and you should get it from him.

In his statement, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] went into the names of the senior Members and leaders of the Senate in the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee and mentioned the names of Senators HAYDEN, RUSSELL, of Georgia, HILL, ELLENDER, McCLELLAN, STENNIS, SALTONSTALL, YOUNG of North Dakota, SMITH, BYRD of Virginia, SYMINGTON, JACKSON, and THURMOND.

He said he had talked with each of them, and he found that neither Secretary McNamara nor Deputy Secretary Vance had ever mentioned the plan announced on September 30 in any form to Senators HAYDEN, HILL, ELLENDER, McCLELLAN, YOUNG of North Dakota, SMITH,

BYRD of Virginia, SYMINGTON, JACKSON, or THURMOND. He said he learned that the matter was discussed with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]; that the Senator was not in favor of the plan; the same thing with respect to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]; and the Senator from Mississippi himself.

It strikes me that when there is a deliberately called press conference at which the Secretary of Defense, at least by implication, if not by direct statement, says he has done something which he has not done, we have gone pretty far in the exercise of executive prerogative in dealing with Congress. I for one think it is a shameful exhibition.

[I am delighted that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has spoken as plainly and as specifically as he has. It strikes me that this country and the people of this country should know of the deliberate efforts, made on one occasion after another, by those in the executive department to try to override the wishes of the Congress and to try to imply that they had the support of Congress when they had not even discussed it with Members of Congress.

I wanted to put that statement in the RECORD, because I think it is important, and I believe the Senator from Mississippi showed great courage in bringing it to the attention of the country. I am happy to support him.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his generous remarks.

OBJECTION TO MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS WHILE THE SENATE IS IN SESSION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if any request shall be made to give the Committee on Foreign Relations permission to meet while the Senate is in session, I wish that I may be notified, because I shall object to such a request.

FAMILY PLANNING AND BIRTH CONTROL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on September 29, Dr. William H. Stewart, whose nomination to be Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service, has been sent down by the President, appeared before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. During the course of that hearing, I undertook to ask him to indicate what his general attitude and policy in the area of family planning and birth control would be.

I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of the colloquy between Dr. Stewart and me printed in the RECORD.

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

Senator CLARK. Dr. Stewart, I am going to make a few observations on the subject of family planning and birth control, and ask you to indicate to us what your general attitude and policy in the area would be.

As you know, this matter is a somewhat controversial subject, and the winds of controversy blew around your predecessor for a good many years. But at the moment, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the National Institute for Child

Health and Human Development is spending about \$500,000 a year for basic research in reproductive biology. The Children's Bureau under the leadership of Mrs. Katherine B. Oettinger, is also doing a good deal of research. And she made what I thought was an excellent speech the other day. I would just like to quote you the last paragraph:

"Many of us here are working together at a new rapid pace as dimensions of our problem become clearer in reaching the goals of providing better health for the mothers and children in this Nation. If family planning is a useful tool in achieving this goal, it should be available on a universal basis as a right to parents without coercion with a genuine and sympathetic attention to the needs of each human being."

The American Medical Association's house of delegates, not too long ago, passed a resolution:

"That the prescription of child spacing measures should be made available to all patients who require them, consistent with their creed and mores, whether they obtain their medical care through private physicians or tax or community-supported health services."

Secretary of the Interior Udall is making contraceptive information available to Eskimos, American Indians, and Polynesians who are under his general supervision.

Senator GRUENING is holding some most interesting and provocative hearings in a subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee on a bill which would create assistant secretaries on population in both HEW and the State Department.

Our foreign aid programs under the splendid leadership of Dr. Baumgartner and various others have for some years under the Fulbright amendment to a recent foreign aid bill made technical assistance and research facilities available to countries receiving foreign aid, particularly in Latin America and Africa and Asia.

Your colleague, Dr. David E. Price, back in April made an address entitled "Action on the Home Front" to the Symposium on Population Growth and Birth Control at Boston University during the course of which he summed up the various governmental programs as follows—speaking, I guess, for the Surgeon General's office—"Our job is threefold, to continue to help States and localities make family planning available based on existing knowledge; to speed up research in all aspects of human reproduction and population dynamics so that knowledge may be improved; and to increase greatly our training of personnel so that the inevitably heavy demand for their services may be met."

I have been somewhat critical of Mr. Sargent Shriver and the Office of Economic Opportunity because of what seemed to me to be his undue timidity in this area. It is true that he has made, under some local pressure, a few grants available in the poverty program. I made a speech on the floor of the Senate the other day indicating that.

I would like to know whether you endorse these various Government programs, and what would be your general policy with respect to family planning and birth control if you become Surgeon General.

Dr. STEWART. I might answer that in two parts. First, I would like to give you my personal and professional feelings about this. I think the world population problem is a great problem. And it is going to become greater. I include the United States in the world. I believe that family planning is a way of perhaps doing something about this. However, I think that family planning should be on the individual's initiative, that they are seeking it themselves as a person.

Senator CLARK. Let me interrupt you to ask you whether you believe that every American family has the right to know the basic physiological facts and have the technical assistance available to them so that

October 7, 1965

25323

One of the six "criteria" Senator Dodd has for telling an out-and-out Communist revolution from the other kind is the systematic "pattern of the revolt itself." In his long speech opposing Fulbright, Dodd said, "Spontaneous revolutions, guided by indignant nationalists, are invariably characterized by a certain amount of bungling and amateurism. But the Dominican revolt was characterized, instead, by the highest degree of precision and professionalism."

The core of Fulbright's case was that the revolution was not controlled by Communists, even if it attracted Communist supporters:

"The administration * * * assumed almost from the beginning that the revolution was Communist-dominated, or would certainly become so, and that nothing short of forcible opposition could prevent a Communist takeover. In their apprehension lest the Dominican Republic become another Cuba, some of our officials seem to have forgotten that virtually all reform movements attract some Communist support that there is an important difference between Communist support and Communist control of a political movement, that it is quite possible to compete with the Communists for influence in a reform movement rather than abandon it to them, and, most important of all, that economic development and social justice are themselves the primary and most reliable security against Communist subversion."

From the evidence gathered at the hearings—at which all witnesses, with the exception of former Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, of Puerto Rico, were in the administration—Fulbright concluded that the charge of Communist control of the revolution does not stick. The motive behind U.S. intervention was a new dedication to preserve the status quo in Latin America against all revolutionary forces about which there is any suspicion of political instability. What happened between the coup against President Bosch in September 1963, and the attempted return of Bosch's party, the PRD, in April 1965, was a shift to the right in American foreign policy notably toward Latin America. Fulbright saw American policymakers increasingly preoccupied with the anti-Communist credentials to the exclusion of all other aspects of their roles.

The springs of the rightward surge were not clear. Fulbright senses an unwillingness on the part of State Department officials to take chances with the Latin American left after the dreadful experience of William Wieland, who fought for 5 years to regain his security clearance as a U.S. Foreign Service officer after he had the misfortune to be on the Cuba desk during Castro's accession to power. No doubt Fulbright believes Ambassador Bennett and a raft of lesser officials have Wieland's example before them.

More important, Fulbright thinks, is the loss of genuine commitment to social change which inspired Kennedy's policy, haphazard as it was, toward the Latin countries. Now, policy planners seem to conceive America's interest more mechanically, as a matter of who's with us and who's not. That sounds very toughminded, but it is often simpleminded: such a policy misses the long view of history as the politics of change. Fulbright sees the national interest coinciding more than casually with the revolutionary forces at work in the hemisphere.

His world view is an ever-changing subtly shifting abstraction, a mixture of Realpolitik and idealism unbetrayed by the demands of crisis politics. He is not obsessed by a fear of communism; he is more worried at the moment about anticommunism. He detests sentimentalism in foreign policy, on the part of the left as well as the right. He harks back to the mythological basis of America's

conduct of foreign affairs. In his first Senate speech, in March 1945, he began, "Myths are one of the greatest obstacles in the formulation of national policy." His famous speech last year concerned "old myths and new realities." He is convinced that America is captive of what he calls "the obsession with communism," and that is inevitably destructive.

"We are not, as we like to claim in Fourth of July speeches, the most truly revolutionary nation on earth," Fulbright said in his Senate speech. "We are * * * much closer to being the most unrevolutionary nation on earth." Later he added, "If any group or any movement with which the Communists associate themselves is going to be automatically condemned in the eyes of the United States, then we have indeed given up all hope of guiding or influencing even to a marginal degree the revolutionary movements and the demands for social change which are sweeping Latin America."

PAPA KNOWS BEST

He is willing to go far in his analysis of U.S. policy, but he stops short of the most unthinkable thought of all. A real Communist revolution in Latin America would provide grounds for American intervention. He hopes that there are viable "democratic left" forces available to fulfill revolutionary missions, but if there are none, as there very well may not be in many countries, Fulbright is not at all sure he could stomach one or two or four more Castroite regimes in the Western Hemisphere. And yet that seems to be a necessary corollary of his speech. He may be right about the "essential legitimacy" of the Dominican revolution, that is, its derivation from Bosch and the PRD. On the other hand, he may be wrong; the difference between his position and his opponents' on that central issue is one of method, not of philosophy. Dedication to social change and revolutionary reform means accepting nasty consequences along with beneficial ones. It requires an extremely narrow definition of "threat to the national interest." The relationship between nations must be one of equality, and intervention conceived only as a last resort when there is a clear threat and imminent danger. Fulbright still clings, perhaps unconsciously, to a paternalistic approach to Latin America. In his view, what papa knows best is left-of-center social reform. That is much better than most American papas will admit, but it may not be enough.

Fulbright's speech was the best on any subject made on the floor of the Senate during this session. It was clear, elegantly styled, and subtly intellectual. It was also received with towering hostility, by many of Fulbright's Senate (and committee) colleagues, and in much of the press. The White House is said to have responded with predictable unhappiness. The best that was heard from the administration was the guarded comment of one aid—not at all in the inner circle—who ventured the opinion that he was "glad the speech was made."

But it is the measure of Fulbright's role in the Senate that his friends, as much as his enemies, were critical. He is the archetypal loner, the most anticlub of all the Senators. He is stuck with an unwieldy (19 members) committee which he assumed is stacked against him. He may be right; it seems to be a question of how one counts the members. Fulbright counts them very much against him, at least as they stand in their pristine ignorance. Other members think that with pressure and tutoring, a majority of the 13 Democrats, and perhaps the entire committee, could be welded into a cohesive opinion bloc with a consistent point of view. It would require only minor compromise on Fulbright's part, but a great deal of effort and charm.

Fulbright apparently wants to expend little of either. He begins with an idea of the futility, if not exactly the inappropriateness, of Senate participation in specific matters of foreign policy. Crises are for executives. He admits that a strong leader could galvanize a willing Foreign Relations Committee and perhaps influence policy decisions, but at the same time he knows that he is not that man.

Neither are his committee fellows. Immediately under Fulbright is Senator Sparkman, then Senator Mansfield, then Senators Morse, Russell, Long, Gore—and so on. The ranking Republican is Senator Hickenlooper. The truth is that there are no Borahs or Cabot Lodges (Senior, of course) available, and there is no one to lead the Senate in foreign affairs in a way which might even approach the authority of the Johnson administration.

ONE-MAN SHOW

Some wish that Fulbright would try, but he will not. He did not attempt to get a report to the committee on the Dominican investigation. One of his friends on the committee asked him to see about a majority and minority report (he might have won more than half the Democrats to his side), and muttering something about "bipartisan" and "impossible," Fulbright let the suggestion go by. Only the loyal Senator Clark, among his committee friends, was on hand in the Senate to support his position. He is not worried by the dire predictions of his banishment from the White House. His influence there is already severely circumscribed, both because of the divergence of his and the President's views, and also because the President wants very much to run his own show; the executive department advisors are part of his show, but the legislators are definitely not. Even with President Kennedy, with whom Fulbright was on quite good terms, his voice was small. Fulbright's brilliant Cuban memorandum, submitted shortly before the Bay of Pigs invasion, was not heeded. Neither was his argument to the invasion planners on the eve of the crisis. Arthur Schlesinger says, in his memoirs, that he was the only one in the White House planning session who shared Fulbright's doubts. Maybe the President did, too.

The more Fulbright looks at the possibilities for effectively influencing policy decisions, the more he is overcome with that sense of futility. It is almost an existential anguish; he periodically wonders (sometimes in public, on the floor of the Senate) whether he ought not, after all, resign as chairman of the committee and be done with it. He is restrained by a sense of responsibility and a sense of history, which amount to the same thing. His speeches seem to be prepared for instant anthologizing; they are addressed to posterity as much as to the Chair.

His friends say that he is inclined to moments of petulance, which are sometimes visible. Last spring, he announced that he was through with foreign aid bills until they were put on a more rational basis. He favored authorization terms longer than 1 year (so that the President would not have the drain of a yearly appropriation fight) and moves toward institutionalizing aid in international funds. Fulbright knows that the "ingratitude" of aid recipients, which shows up in the burnings of libraries and the stonings of embassies, grows out of the unbridgeable hostility between the giver and the getter. "Shakespeare said it," Fulbright says snappishly, "loan loses both itself and friend."

But by the end of the session, Fulbright was back at his post, managing the foreign aid bill in the Senate. He tried to get other committee members—Morse, Sparkman, Church—to take it over, and for their own good reasons they refused. Fulbright even

caved in on the 2-year authorization clause in an extended conference with House Members. He did not have the power to pull it off.

FULBRIGHT's constituency, of course, is far wider than the boundaries of Arkansas. It includes much of liberal intellectual America, and more than that, educated opinion in most of the non-Communist world. Most Latin Americans in Washington last week were overjoyed at Fulbright's speech. One of the most important political leaders in South America sent him a telegram of warm congratulations. Fulbright hopes that his consistent opposition to U.S. military adventure can keep American prestige alive in Latin America, something like Labour's opposition to Suez kept Britain's prestige viable, if barely so, in the Middle East, against the distant day when new policies could be formulated. Similarly, De Gaulle's repudiation of France's long-held Algerian policy made it seem as if it were never held at all.

America as a political monolith is a more dangerous image to project than a picture of America riven with dissent, Fulbright thinks. The White House, of course, is terrified that the world will overestimate the importance of the dissenting opinions, and doubt the administration resolve. Fulbright has no such nightmares.

It is all very simple for him. He went to some hearings, reviewed the record, wrote a speech with the help of his staff, and gave it one day to a near-empty Senate. Almost that simple; he did put it off for about 3 weeks while the provisional government of Hector Garcia Godoy was installed in Santo Domingo. Then, when there was absolutely no chance of having any effect on current events, he unwound.

He cannot understand what the fuss is all about. Journalists buzz around his office searching for hidden meanings and unrecorded connections. What is Fulbright up to? Did he really mean Vietnam when he was saying Dominican Republic? (He did make one oblique reference to Vietnam in his speech; he wondered why the United States is so eager to keep "more ambiguous and less formal promises" made to Saigon and yet willing to disregard formal commitments to the Organization of American States and the Rio Treaty.) Is he bitter because he was passed over for Secretary of State? Is he frustrated by the voting demands on a southern Senator (not only against voting rights this year, but also against such liberal measures as increased minimum wage and home rule for the District of Columbia)? His claim to represent a revolutionary spirit for social reform is seriously, if understandably, flawed. Perhaps an awareness of the inconsistency of his political behavior makes his outbursts more vivid.

Fulbright advises all doubters to apply Occam's razor. The simple explanation is the true. He only appears to be a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma. He is really an uncomplicated Rhodes scholar from Arkansas interested in the price of chickens and international relations.

His own theory to explain the extraordinary outcry which followed the Senate speech has to do with the constructions of consensus politics, as well as the sensitivity to criticism generated by the continuing foreign crisis. He is not alone in worrying about the anti-Communist hysteria which seems to be building up again in the United States, as it did during the Korean war. That, too, followed a period of mild liberal nonconformity, something like the early 1960's. Senator Fulbright's speeches were heard then in lofty condemnation of McCarthyism. As always, they were cool, sensible, and well-reasoned. This time, it may take more than speechmaking to set things right.

FULBRIGHT AND HIS CRITICS

(By Joseph Kraft)

The doubts raised by Senator Fulbright with respect to this country's policy in Latin America have been intensified by the cries of his critics.

Basically, the Senator was only posing a good question. He was asking whether this country had reverted to the policy of direct military intervention in South America.

With the Dominican case before him, he sensed a new disposition to identify all social protest with Communist subversion, and a connected tendency to shoot first and think later. He pointed out that there were important distinctions between protests backed by the Communists and protests under their control. He suggested that when trouble south of the border developed next, it might be appropriate for this country to think first and shoot next.

A reasonable, and I believe honest, response to Senator Fulbright's question was available to the administration. It would have emphasized that there was no basic change in American policy; that there were matters open for debate in the Dominican record; but that the Dominican case, because of the special impact of the Trujillo dictatorship, was a special one without general application to Latin America.

The actual reaction was not unlike the stoning reserved by the high priests of primitive communities for those who question the efficacy of blood sacrifice.

For a starter there was Senator Thomas Dodd, of Connecticut, with his usual tactic of crying soft on communism. Dodd charged that Fulbright "suffers from an indiscriminating infatuation with revolutions of all kinds, national, democratic, or Communist."

Short remarks in similar vein were made by Senators Frank Lausche and Russell Long—a Member of Senator Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee who had not even bothered to attend the committee's recent hearings on the Dominican Republic. Then in defense of the American Ambassador in the Dominican Republic, Tapley Bennett, there boomed the big gun of the Senate, Richard Russell, of Georgia.

Russell had known Ambassador Bennett "as a small boy." He had known "his father and his mother." He had known "both of his grandfathers." Only last year he had had a meal "with Ambassador Bennett's father and mother on their Franklin County farm in the rolling red clay hills of northeast Georgia." With that pedigree, and that solid rural background, how could anyone even begin to have doubts?

A day earlier, the House had expressed its reaction to Senator Fulbright. It passed by an overwhelming vote a resolution that, in effect, endorsed direct military intervention by the United States in Latin America to prevent "subversive action or the threat of it."

By themselves, neither the House resolution nor the Senate statements have any practical force. But precisely because they are free of real content, they provide a good measure of the play of domestic and bureaucratic politics on foreign affairs.

At the base, plainly, there are politicians with self-interested motives for raising anew the issue of softness on communism. The original author of the House resolution, Armistead Selden of Alabama, for instance, comes from a district that is being changed by reapportionment, by Federal registration of voters, and by possible action on the poll tax. With Negro voters due to figure in the Alabama primary next May, Selden can no longer fall back on the usual theme of protecting white supremacy. Instead, he is wrapping himself in the mantle of anticommunism.

Politicians with such an obvious interest in raising the Communist issue are, to be sure, limited in number. But their strength is as the strength of 10 because the administration is doing nothing to organize resistance against them.

On the contrary, the administration has promoted inside the State Department a group of regular Foreign Service officers, heading up in Under Secretary Thomas Mann and Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations Douglas MacArthur II, who made their way in the era of unsophisticated, monolithic anticommunism. Their ideas, indeed their careers and reputations, are tied up with that era. Not surprisingly, they practically invited the Selden resolution.

Lastly, the White House itself seems to be holding anticommunism in reserve as a rod to discipline its congressional majority. Where there is a jingoist issue working, in other words, the President wants it working on his side. He has gone soft on Goldwaterism. And while he maintains that stance, it remains a question whether this country will be able to move in harmony with the vast social changes that are sweeping Latin America, and Africa and Asia, too.

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

SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS

(By Walter Lippmann)

Last week the world had a fleeting but tantalizing glimpse of what might become possible if the cold war subsided. The U.S.S.R. and the United States acting on their parallel interests in averting a war between Pakistan and India, made it possible for the United Nations to order a cease-fire. This show of unanimity discouraged the Chinese from intervening in the quarrel.

Parallelism is a long way short of positive cooperation, and there is no assurance that a settlement of the quarrel is in sight or even that the underlying hostility will not smolder on for a very long time. Nevertheless, the events of last week were a spectacular demonstration of how all hope and prospect of a reasonably peaceable world is tied up with an improvement in Soviet-American relations.

Is an improvement possible? What is there between us that now sets us against each other? It is, quite plainly, the conflict of ideology and interest, of emotion and of prejudice, over the revolutionary condition of the so-called third world—the world of the underdeveloped and emerging nations of the Southern Hemisphere—in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The revolutionary condition is an objective historical fact of this century, and it will continue to exist no matter what the Russians or we say or do about it.

The Soviet-American conflict is about this revolutionary condition. Thus, the conflict is no longer, as it was a generation ago, about what kind of social order is to exist in the highly developed countries of Europe and North America. As a matter of fact, in this whole area, which includes European Russia itself, the old argument between the Marxists and the *laissez faire* capitalists has been bypassed by events. For example, the economic philosophy of General Eisenhower and Senator Goldwater in America is as dead as the economic philosophy of Marx is among the European socialists. In the whole developed, progressive, industrial world, the prevailing economic order is a mixture in varying degrees of planning and the incentive of profit of fiscal management, and social regulation.

It is in regard to the turbulence of this third world—which was not foreseen a generation ago—that the Soviet Union and the

October 7, 1965

United States find themselves locked into what has the appearance of an irreconcilable conflict.

In its official ideology, the Soviet Union is committed to the support of the revolutionaries, to the incitement and supplying of "wars of national liberation."

In the American ideology, we are not absolutely opposed to wars of national liberation, provided they are not inspired or supported by Communists. We are very much disposed to feel, however, that all revolutions will be captured by the Communists who invariably participate in them.

Thus, Russia and America find themselves in a vicious circle. The Russians are disposed to intervene wherever there is a rebellion, and the United States is inclined to intervene to oppose as aggression the Communist intervention. In the Soviet Union there exists a prejudice in favor of rebellion as such, of rebellion against any established order. The Soviet Union is the product of a fairly recent revolution. In the United States, where the revolution occurred nearly two centuries ago, there is now a prejudice against revolution. The result is a vicious circle in which dogmatic communism and dogmatic anticommunism incite and exasperate each other.

The improvement of Soviet-American relations, which is prerequisite to an accommodation between the West and China, requires the breakup of this vicious circle. How? Essentially, I believe, by fostering the ascendancy of national interests over global ideology, by the reassertion in both countries of prudence and calculation against semireligious fanaticism and frenzy.

We had a glimpse last week of how this can happen. The hostilities in Kashmir began with an infiltration of guerrilla troops (recruited as a matter of fact from the Pakistan army though they wore different uniforms). The purpose of the guerrillas was to arouse the population and to liberate Moslem Kashmir from Hindu rule. Here was a war of national liberation which the Soviet Union, according to its theoretical doctrine, was bound to support. However, the fact of the matter is that it did not suit the Soviet Union that Pakistan, in cahoots with Red China, should defeat India, which is a tacit ally of the Soviet Union. So the Soviet Union acted in favor of peace, which is its real interest, rather than on behalf of an ideological prejudice.

At the same time, the United States, having learned something in recent months, resisted the temptation to take a lofty position against aggression, and instead, reticently and prudently, choose to work quietly and behind the scenes.

This is the way that Soviet-American relations can be improved—by encouraging the prudent and the practical to predominate over the ideological and the hot. In this country, at least, the process will require the resumption of public debate—the kind of debate which Senator FULBRIGHT has once again opened up.

For the issue which he has posed in his remarkable speech is the essential issue in our attitude and policy toward the revolutionary condition of our time. The question he posed is how to tolerate rebellion, which is often necessary and desirable, without surrendering the control of the rebellion to the Communists who will always be part of it.

There is no rule of thumb for answering this question. But there has to be some kind of accommodation, such as the Soviet Union made about the Kashmir freedom fighters and such as we made about the Chinese threat of military aggression. The discussion of this serious and difficult problem cannot be monopolized by the assorted hangers-on, often more Johnsonian than Johnson himself, who are presuming to lay down the rule that only those who conform with the current political improvisations are altogether respectable and quite loyal.

TYRANNY OF THE MAJORITY IN UNITED STATES (By Marquis Childs)

The Johnson consensus is so powerful that large areas of policy—normally in past years a subject for debate—are now off limits. The zeal of a majority President, who by temperament and conviction draws the line against dissenters, underscores the fears of a time of troubles when revolutionary regimes threaten all order and stability.

Add to this an expanding Federal Government dispensing money in old ways—the House just passed a \$1.7 billion pork barrel rivers and harbors bill—and new ways such as huge defense and research contracts. The sum total in the view of pessimistic observers is a new America with little resemblance to the give and take democracy of the past.

A case in point is what happened to Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Waiting until after a provisional government had been established in the Dominican Republic, FULBRIGHT in a Senate speech delivered a carefully reasoned criticism of how the Dominican crisis had been handled. This was based on an inquiry before the Foreign Relations Committee with 13 sessions at which all the principals testified.

Immediately the full force of administration spokesmen, big and little, was leveled against him. The voices turned up high, did not so much seek to refute the criticism as to discredit the critic. At the lowest level, as represented by Senator RUSSELL LONG, of Louisiana, the majority whip, the suggestion was that if you didn't believe Communists were about to take over in the Dominican Republic then you must have more sympathy for communism than you knew.

On careful rereading of the Fulbright speech it is hard to discover why the reaction was as though it had been an offense against majesty. He was saying that aspects of America's policy in the Dominican Republic compounded these faults. The example of a Senator soundly birched for faulting the administration raises a troubling question: Is any dialog at all possible on the great issues of foreign policy?

To put it another way: Must the power of the Executive be so absolute in view of the threat to America's security that critics should keep silent? An American war in Vietnam is rapidly expanding with reports of 200,000 troops to be committed by the year's end and yet scarcely a doubt is expressed publicly over the authority of the Commander in Chief to direct an undeclared war.

Granted the stakes are awesome and the power of the Executive great in conducting policy with proper secrecy as in the India-Pakistan crisis. Granted, too, that nothing succeeds like the Johnson successes.

Nevertheless, the domination of the majority is so all-encompassing that a fundamental distortion of the American system seems for the time being at least to have resulted. More than a century ago Alexis de Tocqueville, one of the most searching and at the same time sympathetic foreign critics, wrote in his "Democracy in America" of the danger of the "tyranny of the majority." Of the tyranny this French aristocrat considered the main evil of democratic institutions he wrote:

"* * * The smallest reproach irritates its sensibility and the slightest joke that has any foundation in truth renders it indignant; from the forms of its language up to the solid virtues of its character, everything must be made the subject of encomium. No writer, whatever his eminence, can escape paying this tribute of adulation to his fellow citizens."

De Tocqueville was writing of the majority itself but his words today might be applied to the master of the majority.

"I know of no country," de Tocqueville wrote, "in which there is so little independ-

ence of mind and real freedom of discussion as in America. Profound changes have occurred since democracy in America first appeared and yet it may be asked whether recognition of the right of dissent has gained substantially in practice as well as in theory."

Senator FULBRIGHT discovered in 1957 what it meant to go against the majority. He opposed the Eisenhower-Dulles doctrine embodied in a resolution giving the President power to use "the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary" in the Middle East and to spend \$200 million as he saw fit without congressional restrictions. The Senate majority leader then was Lyndon B. Johnson. He urged FULBRIGHT to back Eisenhower as he himself had.

Johnson has triple-starred consensus in the political lexicon. But, defined as "tyranny of the majority," consensus has another look.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 20-26]

DEFENDING INTERVENTION

The best thing that can be said of the new House resolution on intervention in Latin America is that it is ineffectual. It is not binding on anyone, and merely expresses a point of view. But what a point of view.

Subversive domination of a New World nation, or even the threat of it, the resolution says, violates the Monroe Doctrine. Therefore any Western Hemisphere nation may, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense, which could go so far as resort to armed force * * * take steps to forestall or combat the subversion.

In sponsoring this proposal, Representative SELDEN, of Alabama, argued that a new type of collective security is needed to combat a new type of aggression—that of subversion inside a country. But the Selden resolution goes far beyond collective security. It suggests that one republic may intervene unilaterally in another. It is so worded,

Representative BINGHAM, of New York, asserts, that a Latin nation could intervene in the United States if the Latin neighbor concluded that, for example, the civil rights movement were Communist-inspired.

The idea of a Latin republic intervening in the United States is so patently absurd that the Selden resolution must be read the other way around—to justify U.S. intervention among its neighbors. Indeed, the resolution seems to be an ex post facto vindication for the American intervention in the Dominican Republic.

Perhaps this explains why the State Department is so timid in its view of the resolution. The department asked Mr. SELDEN to make clear in debate that the mere threat of subversion would not justify unilateral use of force, but the resolution does not say so. And when the House had voted by 312 to 52 for the measure, after only 40 minutes of debate, a press officer lamely explained that the State Department agreed with the sentiments expressed but questioned some of the language.

Opponents of the resolution have accused the State Department of lack of backbone. The accusation assumes that the Department still opposes unilateral intervention. Does it?

BICENTENNIAL OF THE CONVENING OF THE STAMP ACT CONGRESS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, today marks the bicentennial of the convening of the Stamp Act Congress in New York on October 7, 1765. The Stamp Act Congress was the first united action of protest by the colonies in the preliminaries of the War for Independence. The Congress, assembled at the call of Massachusetts, was attended

by delegates from 9 of the 13 colonies. Voting by colonies, each colony having one vote, the Stamp Act Congress drafted petitions to the King and to Parliament, and adopted an important declaration of rights, the first platform of American principles.

The acts of this first American Congress were instrumental in bringing about the repeal of the abusive stamp tax. One of the most persuasive of the delegates in the Stamp Act Congress was Christopher Gadsden of Charleston, S.C.. Mr. Gadsden, as a delegate from South Carolina, distinguished himself by his arguments for colonial union and against recognition of authority of the English Parliament.

Mr. President, the Congress in which we now serve can truly trace its beginning to this important assemblage in New York in 1765. Our Nation owes much to the patriots who assembled there. As we conduct the legislative business of the Nation today, we would do well to remember that those who assembled in the Stamp Act Congress in 1765 met and took action for the sole purpose of protecting liberty against the tyranny of a despot. It is our patriotic duty and responsibility to carry on the precedents begun by the Stamp Act Congress.

Mr. President, down through history, assemblages, including Congresses, have earned and received names according to the actions for which they were noted. The Stamp Act Congress received its name because it met to oppose the tyrannical Stamp Act imposed on Americans by an English King and Parliament. The 89th Congress of the United States, in its 1st session, has earned and received, to a greater degree than any other Congress in history, the title "rubberstamp Congress."

On this bicentennial of the Stamp Act Congress, each member of the 89th Congress, and indeed each American, should

ask himself the question: Will Americans feel the same sense of pride in the "rubberstamp Congress" of 1965 on its bicentennial that all freedom-loving Americans have cause to feel for the Stamp Act Congress of 1765 today?

**WABASH VALLEY ASSOCIATION
RESOLUTION**

Mr. HARTKE, Mr. President, at a meeting held in New Harmony, Ind., on August 21, 1965, the members of the Wabash Valley Association adopted a resolution, a copy of which has been furnished to me. This association, comprised of members from both Indiana and Illinois who have devoted great effort to the development and conservation of water and natural resources in the valley, has been a great force through private assistance to public programs of various Federal agencies involving the region.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

**RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP OF
WABASH VALLEY ASSOCIATION, AT A MEETING
AT NEW HARMONY, IND., AUGUST 21, 1965**

Whereas the Wabash Valley Association is composed of common people of the States of Indiana and Illinois who are interested in the development and conservation of water and the natural resources of this great valley; and

Whereas the improvement and preservation of our natural resources requires long-range planning on local and national levels; and

Whereas the U.S. Corps of Engineers, the Interior Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Public Health and Welfare, the four U.S. Senators, Members of Congress, the Governors of the two States, and all interested representatives of State government have given aid and support to projects proposed by the Wabash Valley Association; and

Whereas much more is to be done and required to complete projects now in the planning stages; and

Whereas the Wabash Valley Association is thankful and appreciative of the untiring efforts, services, and devotion to the principles of the Wabash Valley Association for the total and complete development of the water resources of the Wabash River Basin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Wabash Valley Association, That we extend to the Federal and State officials who have given of their untiring efforts the complete endorsement of this organization; and further be it

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be presented to State and Federal officials who have so ably participated in this program.

PERSONAL INCOME STILL CLIMBING

Mr. HARTKE, Mr. President, the October 2, issue of Business Week presents an interesting analysis, together with a table, of the continued growth in personal income during the month of July.

Farm receipts nationally were up \$223 million in July over a year ago, and \$845 million on the first 7 months as compared with a year earlier. Only one of the 50 States, Wyoming, was below the year-ago level in personal income, but for the 7 months Wyoming was also ahead; 28 States improved their July figure more than 8 percent over 1964, and 27 are more than 8 percent ahead for the 7 months.

With a gain of 9.6 percent for July over July 1964, my own State of Indiana is well above the average and its 7-month gain ranks 15th in the list. It is encouraging to see such evidence of the continuation of our prosperity as it affects the personal income of our people.

I ask unanimous consent that the Business Week table be printed in the RECORD.

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

Measure of personal income

[Dollar amounts in millions. Not adjusted for seasonal variations]

State	1957-59 average	July 1964	June 1965	July 1965	Percent change versus year ago	First 7 months		Percent change versus year ago
						1964	1965	
Alabama.....	\$366.8	\$477.7	\$528.9	\$636.6	+12.1	\$3,293.2	\$3,648.5	+10.8
Alaska.....	44.9	72.2	78.4	81.9	+13.4	432.0	478.8	+10.8
Arizona.....	184.4	283.7	319.8	310.4	+9.4	2,046.9	2,189.3	+7.0
Arkansas.....	182.3	254.9	282.7	279.4	+9.6	1,768.1	1,880.6	+7.0
California.....	3,160.6	4,642.5	4,981.4	4,994.7	+7.6	31,724.6	33,909.7	+7.1
Colorado.....	296.8	426.0	444.2	462.7	+8.6	2,926.8	3,086.7	+5.5
Connecticut.....	551.9	740.2	807.1	799.6	+8.0	5,166.4	5,521.4	+6.9
Delaware.....	103.8	144.9	153.3	154.9	+6.9	992.0	1,070.5	+11.3
District of Columbia.....	177.9	229.0	246.0	245.8	+7.3	1,836.5	1,679.8	+5.9
Florida.....	711.9	1,064.4	1,179.8	1,202.4	+13.0	7,729.7	8,527.3	+10.3
Georgia.....	477.4	692.4	752.1	765.9	+10.6	4,740.2	5,166.0	+9.0
Hawaii.....	98.5	152.3	169.5	174.9	+14.8	1,028.7	1,139.9	+10.8
Idaho.....	93.7	121.8	133.3	131.3	+7.8	809.6	894.8	+10.5
Indiana.....	2,048.2	2,644.3	2,864.3	2,853.7	+7.9	18,205.4	19,637.8	+7.9
Iowa.....	779.9	1,027.3	1,128.4	1,126.4	+9.6	7,043.2	7,673.7	+9.0
Kansas.....	438.0	547.3	613.4	619.4	+13.2	3,853.3	4,221.4	+9.6
Kentucky.....	344.1	447.5	480.6	475.7	+6.3	3,042.5	3,179.1	+4.5
Louisiana.....	364.3	478.4	533.0	532.6	+11.3	3,322.6	3,662.4	+10.2
Maine.....	416.1	531.9	593.6	597.7	+12.4	3,677.0	4,063.1	+10.5
Maryland.....	137.8	182.9	194.8	192.8	+5.4	1,196.4	1,332.0	+11.3
Massachusetts.....	659.9	813.0	885.4	888.5	+9.3	5,531.1	6,059.7	+9.6
Michigan.....	983.2	1,294.1	1,371.7	1,365.7	+5.5	8,955.7	9,383.8	+4.8
Minnesota.....	1,414.7	1,853.7	2,079.6	2,053.2	+10.8	12,778.1	14,338.4	+12.2
Mississippi.....	537.9	686.9	782.9	778.7	+11.3	4,885.6	5,300.6	+8.5
Missouri.....	191.3	264.9	296.9	290.7	+9.7	1,845.8	1,999.4	+8.3
Montana.....	728.8	960.3	1,027.7	1,023.4	+3.6	6,545.5	6,951.4	+6.2
Nebraska.....	109.6	139.0	143.7	146.9	+5.0	897.3	966.7	+7.7
Nevada.....	226.7	300.4	315.4	323.7	+7.8	2,026.7	2,177.2	+7.4
New Hampshire.....	58.1	116.6	118.7	120.8	+3.2	795.7	801.0	+0.7
New Jersey.....	93.6	130.2	135.9	138.6	+5.5	872.9	908.7	+4.1
New York.....	1,225.2	1,667.5	1,821.7	1,828.7	+9.7	11,410.8	12,392.2	+8.6