

"We will continue to push, with all the vigor at our command, for the adoption of legislation to meet the problems you outlined—to eliminate from the American scene disease, slums, unemployment, poor educational facilities and above all else, discrimination.

"As an item of first priority, America must aid the innocent victims of the rioters. Certainly they deserve, at the very least, the same help the government gives the victims of natural disasters. We urge the Congress, as an immediate matter, to amend the necessary laws to give them this assistance.

"We say to the Congress: Now is not the time for the cheap humor and complete stupidity shown by those members of the House of Representatives who voted to kill the rat-control bill. Nor is now the time for a minority of the Senate Judiciary Committee to engage in a racially-inspired attack on the nomination of Thurgood Marshall to the United States Supreme Court. Now is the time for action and statesmanship by passing the poverty, housing, education and civil rights bills proposed by President Johnson and restoring full funding for the Model Cities and rent supplement bills passed last year.

"My warm congratulations to you and your colleagues on a courageous, sensible statement."

*File*  
**The Middle East: Crisis and Opportunity**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "The Middle East: Crisis and Opportunity."

This paper was approved by the Republican coordinating committee on July 24. It was prepared by the task force on the conduct of foreign relations, an arm of the coordinating committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the rosters of membership of both the coordinating committee and the task force likewise be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements and rosters of membership were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**THE MIDDLE EAST: CRISIS AND OPPORTUNITY**  
**I. INTRODUCTION**

Comprehension of the current Middle Eastern problem requires that it be viewed as having two separate and distinct facets, both with long-term implications for the United States:

First, the basic Arab-Israeli conflict which has resulted in three wars in the Middle East in less than 20 years;

Second, the historic Russian drive, constant under Czars and Commissars alike, to obtain a controlling position in the Middle East—a traditional aim conforming to Soviet tactics to create many trouble spots around the world to confuse and confound the free world.

However, in the recent Arab-Israeli war, the proponents of Middle Eastern instability (the Soviets and certain radical Arab clients) have suffered a crushing defeat. The resulting situation affords an excellent opportunity to the United States to work toward a lasting peace. This nation should not look to

others for initiative in this difficult and critical task.

The task is not impossible, but the Administration must move sensibly and vigorously with policies appealing to moderate groups in every Middle Eastern country. It is outside pressure that has generated much of the radical and irresponsible leadership in the area; the United States now is positioned to encourage moderate, responsible Arab and Jewish leaders to discard the self-defeating politics of hatred and violence and to join in the pursuit of equitable, long-term solutions.

The Republican Party recommends these proposals to meet the Middle East situation:

**II. REPUBLICAN RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. *The United States should exert its influence to secure a Middle East peace settlement which will confirm Israel's right to live and prosper as an independent nation.*

Arab refusal to acknowledge permanent boundaries for Israel is an attitude hardly exceptional in the Middle East.

Most Arab states and Israel have gained their independence only since World War II. Ever since, difficulties over new boundaries have consumed the region. Two "neutral zones" were created in the oil-rich Persian Gulf area to help separate the oil-producing countries of Kuwait, Iraq and Saudi Arabia. The frontiers between Saudi Arabia and the states on the southern periphery of the Arabian peninsula are still undemarcated, and strife afflicts Yemen and Aden and threatens south Arabia. Algeria has provoked border clashes with two of its peaceable neighbors, Morocco and Tunisia. Morocco claims the entire country of Mauritania and adjacent Spanish territories. For years the Kurds have been militantly agitating for an independent state which would comprise lands detached from Iraq, Iran, Turkey, and possibly Syria.

Clearly, a stable Middle East awaits the permanent solution of all such boundary disputes, but most important of all is the Arab-Israeli dispute. These border problems can be best resolved by the parties directly concerned, employing, if necessary, the good offices of the United Nations or other third parties. Stability and peace require the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict to agree upon permanent boundaries for Israel. Such territorial arrangements as are determined must provide security for all and permit the disengagement of opposing military forces. The United States should be prepared to join other powers in guaranteeing borders thus confirmed, in order to ensure the permanency of the peace settlement.

2. *The United States should join with international guarantee of innocent passage through international waterways, including the Straits of Tiran and the Suez Canal, as an inalienable right of all nations.*

This guarantee would help to undergird the strategic and economic viability of Israel, as well as the Arab states, and would remove a major source of conflict in the Middle East.

This recommendation reaffirms an explicit Republican view, which was clearly enunciated by President Eisenhower following the Arab-Israel war in 1956.

3. *The United States should join with other nations in pressing for international supervision of the holy places within the City of Jerusalem.*

Circumstances must be created which will provide the best protection of, and access to, the holy places so that freedom of religious worship in these places will be assured to peoples of all faiths. The holy places should not be the subject of political controversy. Their administration by a religious council comprising all directly-affected faiths is one solution that should be most carefully weighed.

4. *As an essential part of a permanent settlement in the Middle East, the United*

*States should insist on, and aid in, the rehabilitation and resettlement of the more than one million Palestine Arab refugees who have been displaced over the past 20 years.*

Since 1948, \$625 million has been spent by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) to provide simple subsistence to the Palestine Arab refugees. The United States has voluntarily contributed \$425 million, or more than two-thirds of the total. The U.S.S.R., the strident champion of the Arabs, has never contributed to this program.

Before there can be stability in the Middle East, a just and enduring solution of the refugee problem must be found. As the leading contributor to refugee support, the United States is uniquely situated to press powerfully for the permanent resettlement of all Arab refugees. Israel, as well as the Arab states, must share substantially in this effort. We, with other nations, should challenge the U.S.S.R. to prove the sincerity of its professed concern for the welfare of the Arabs by matching future U.S. contributions toward refugee rehabilitation.

5. *The United States should propose a broad-scale development plan for all Middle Eastern states which agree to live peacefully with their neighbors.*

The Republican Party would not willingly see the rehabilitation of the Middle East become a political issue in the United States. Our country's efforts to bring peace to that war-torn region should continue to be bipartisan. In this spirit we hope for vigorous Administration and widespread public support for the bold and imaginative Eisenhower Plan to bring water, work and food to the Middle East.

This constructive proposal would provide huge atomic plants to desalt sea water, the first of which would produce as much fresh water as the entire Jordan River system. This in turn would irrigate desert lands to support the Arab refugees and bring yeared for prosperity to both Arab and Israeli territories.

The Eisenhower Plan is sufficiently far-reaching to encompass all Middle Eastern states, and all should be invited to adhere. However, even if some should decline, the Plan could be initiated pending their later cooperation. The construction of the first plant would require the agreement of only two or three countries, such as Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, or Lebanon. Once the immense benefits of the vast increase in water supplies become evident for all to see, it would be difficult for any Middle Eastern leader to deny his people the opportunity to share in the prosperity being created.

6. *The United States should make a determined effort to expose and isolate the radical troublemakers in the Middle East. We should aid only those states following non-aggressive, non-Communist policies.*

Republicans oppose the continuation of past attempts to win over leftist leaders by giving large amounts of aid. We believe our aid should not reward our enemies and, in effect, punish our friends.

Nasser has received more aid (\$1,133.3 million) than Israel (\$1,104.5 million), and nearly double the aid given to any moderate Arab leader (Jordan under King Hussein, for example, has received \$572.8 million).<sup>1</sup> By contrast, the average aid given to the U.A.R. during the Eisenhower years was \$31.6 million per year. The average yearly aid to Nasser rose sharply during Democratic Administrations to \$172.1 million.

Republicans have long opposed such aid. On January 26, 1965, every House Republican voted to terminate all surplus food shipments to Nasser.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Analysis of these aid figures is a complex matter. The per capita figures are disparate—and the periods, types, and currency and payment requirements varied widely.

<sup>2</sup> *The New York Times*, January 27, 1965.

Moreover, at the outbreak of the Middle East war one-quarter of a billion dollars<sup>3</sup> was obligated for the seven Arab states which later broke relations with the United States, partially as a result of Nasser's false charge that American planes aided Israel. (See Appendix A, "The Administration Ignored Signs of Crisis in the Middle East.") Republicans believe aid should be reinstated to any of these countries until the United States decides to reestablish diplomatic relations, restitution has been made for damages to American property and people, and allegations, which falsely impugn the good name of the United States before the world, have been retracted.

7. *The United States, in furtherance of peace in the Middle East, should strive with other nations for agreed limitations on international arms shipments to the area.*

Limitation on the wasteful and destructive arms race was temporarily achieved by the Tripartite Declaration of 1950 and the Eisenhower Doctrine of 1958. However, Soviet shipments of large amounts of sophisticated weapons to the radical Arab states have thwarted arms controls. There should be unrelenting effort to obtain Soviet adherence to a workable system of arms control in the Middle East. Their cooperation could be a significant indication of Soviet desire for world peace and East-West detente.

8. *The United States' leadership and diplomacy must be alert, firm and resourceful to prevent extension of Soviet imperialism into the Middle East and North Africa.*

The U.S.S.R. has suffered a serious reverse in terms of both power and prestige in much of the Arab world. The United States should now apply its own influence toward inhibiting the Soviets from again creating disturbances in this area.

Russian aspirations in the Middle East have not varied for centuries. Their major aim has been to obtain direct access to warm water ports, and to the Mediterranean Sea and the Indian Ocean. The emergence of many new nations in the Middle East following World War II provided increased opportunities for advancing Soviet interests. In 1945-46, the Soviet army moved into northern Iran, but troops were finally withdrawn after the U.S. and the U.K. objected in the United Nations. In 1947, as in 1877-78, the Soviets attempted to gain a dominating position over the Turkish straits, and in 1946-47, they tried to overthrow the Greek government. The United States responded decisively with its Greek and Turkish aid programs.

Following the death of Stalin, the Soviets sought to by-pass the Middle Eastern countries with which they share a common border and began cultivating Arabs further to the south. Since then, Soviet aid to the radical states in the Middle East has been dispensed on a massive scale. The U.A.R. alone has received about one-sixth of total Soviet economic aid. If economic aid to Algeria, Iraq, Syria, Somalia and Yemen is added, the total becomes \$1,824 million or nearly one-third of total Soviet economic aid. In addition, Soviet military aid has clearly been on a massive scale.

Considering the traditional Russian goals and the vast Soviet military and economic aid to the area, it is not surprising that the Soviets are profoundly concerned over the results of the recent Middle East conflict.

One area of importance only incidentally affected by recent Arab-Israeli battles is the Red Sea, the vital link between Europe, Asia, and much of Africa. The Soviets are deeply involved in promoting instability along the Red Sea coasts in an effort to dominate this key passage. Via Nasser, the Soviets have supported a four-year war in Yemen; they are fomenting rebellion in Aden; they are

<sup>3</sup>This figure includes some \$200 million earmarked as aid and \$51 million in outstanding Export-Import Bank commitments.

aming Somalia to stir trouble in the critical region of the African Horn. It would seriously menace the Western position if Yemen and Aden were allowed to come under the control of hostile elements, whether Egyptian or Soviet. We believe the nation can rightly expect its leadership to have the capability and responsibility to avoid such a tragedy—a catastrophe for all the free world should Soviet designs be allowed to succeed.

#### APPENDIX A

##### THE ADMINISTRATION IGNORED SIGNS OF CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Although Republicans reject categorically Arab and Soviet claims that the United States was in any way involved in the Middle Eastern conflict, either overtly or covertly, it is apparent that President Johnson's Administration cannot avoid all responsibility, or even some blame, for the events which have taken place. In fact, it appears that the Johnson Administration was so devoid of policy ideas on the Middle East that it could not have seriously affected the situation even if it had wanted to.

The following points give some idea of how badly the White House misjudged the Middle Eastern situation:

1) For the crucial three months preceding the crisis there was no United States Ambassador to the Egyptian government. Moreover, the post of Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs was vacant from October 19, 1966 to April 7, 1967, a period of nearly six months just preceding the crisis.

2) When the new American Ambassador to Cairo, Richard Nolte, arrived on May 21 he was reported by the Baltimore Sun to have asked, "What crisis?" when questioned by a correspondent at the Cairo airport. The Sun comments that Nolte was simply reflecting the State Department's thinking, and his bland remark showed how little Washington appreciated the gravity of the situation even at that late date.

3) David G. Nes remained Charge d'Affaires of the American Embassy in Cairo even after Nolte arrived, because the new Ambassador never had an opportunity to present his credentials to President Nasser before the war started and diplomatic relations were broken. Nes, a senior career diplomat, was so disturbed by Washington's lack of interest in the Middle Eastern situation that he took the almost unheard of step of complaining to newsmen that his reports showing a crisis was developing had been totally ignored by the Administration.

4) A resume of events which Nes reported but which he claimed Washington ignored in highly instructive. Quotations are from the *Baltimore Sun*.

"Beginning in January Nes was convinced that Nasser was planning a major confrontation with Israel and the West. . . . The real tip-off to Nasser's intentions was a series of violently anti-American articles published in Cairo's authoritative *Al Ahrām* early in March at about the time (U.S.) Ambassador Lucius Battle left without a successor being named.

"Mohammed Helkal, editor of *Al Ahrām* and a confidant of Nasser, reviewed United States-Egyptian relations from 1949 to date. The Helkal articles indicated Nasser was headed for and wanted a confrontation with Israel and the West."

"Nasser apparently tested U.S. intentions in early April by precipitating the incident which resulted in the removal of the U.S. AID mission from Taiz in Egyptian-controlled Yemen."

"The final clue to his (Nasser's) intentions was his May 2 speech in which he characterized America as the enemy of Egypt."

Once the opposing sides had mobilized their troops, and even after hostilities had broken out, the actions of the Johnson Administration indicated that our efforts were poorly coordinated. Although it was per-

fectly obvious from the nature of the policy statements and military preparations on both sides that war was imminent, the Administration floundered about with a makeshift attempt to organize maritime powers of the world into a group which might convince Nasser to back down from his Gulf of Aqaba blockade.

Moreover, the Administration failed to see beyond the impending crisis and appraise the needs for a permanent settlement in the Middle East. Instead of adopting a flexible position, the President stated on May 23, 1967, that "the United States is firmly committed to the support of the political independence and territorial integrity of all the nations of that area."

This unilateral declaration even went beyond the 1950 Tripartite Declaration in which the United States, the United Kingdom and France guaranteed boundaries but only on the condition that peace treaties were signed.

During the first days of the conflict the Administration revealed its confusion by changing its stand on the war three times in one day. First, the State Department announced that the United States was "neutral in thought, word and deed." Second, a White House Press Secretary stated that this statement was "not a formal declaration of neutrality." Third and finally, Dean Rusk issued a clarification stating that by "neutral" we meant we were not going to become a belligerent, but this did not mean to imply that we were indifferent to the outcome of the war.

Beyond expressing great interest in Middle Eastern events, the Administration never said whether our sympathies were with Israel or the Arabs. By contrast, the declared Soviet position was 100 percent pro-Arab.

By subsequent action, the Administration has as much as admitted that it still has no policy for the Middle East: a special committee has been established to study the Middle East, and Mr. McGeorge Bundy has had to be recalled from private life to direct this group's work.

Republicans wish to underscore our long-established opinion that the government would do better to rely on the judgment of our professional diplomats, who are familiar with the area in question, than to organize a new committee every time a new crisis develops.

#### REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Presiding Officer: Ray C. Bliss, Chairman, Republican National Committee.

#### FORMER PRESIDENT

Dwight D. Eisenhower, 300 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

#### FORMER PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEES

Barry Goldwater (1964), Post Office Box 1601, Scottsdale, Arizona.

Richard M. Nixon (1960), Nixon, Mudge, Rose, Guthrie & Alexander, 20 Broad Street, New York, New York.

Thomas E. Dewey (1944 & 1948), 40 Wall Street, New York, New York.

Alf M. Landon (1936), National Bank of Topeka Building, 1001 Fillmore Street, Topeka, Kansas.

#### SENATE LEADERSHIP

Everett M. Dirksen, Minority Leader.  
Thomas H. Kuchel, Minority Whip.  
Bourke B. Hickenlooper, Chairman, Republican Policy Committee.

Margaret Chase Smith, Chairman, Republican Conference.

George Murphy, Chairman, National Republican Senatorial Comm.

Milton R. Young, Secretary, Republican Conference.

Hugh Scott, Vice Chairman, National Republican Senatorial Comm.

#### HOUSE LEADERSHIP

Gerald R. Ford, Minority Leader.  
Leslie C. Arends, Minority Whip.

Melvin R. Laird, Chairman, Republican Conference.

John J. Rhodes, Chairman, Republican Policy Committee.

H. Allen Smith, Ranking Member of Rules Committee.

Bob Wilson, Chairman, National Republican Congressional Comm.

Charles E. Goodell, Chairman, Planning and Research Committee.

Richard H. Poff, Secretary, Republican Conference.

William C. Cramer, Vice Chairman, Republican Conference.

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION

John A. Love, Governor of the State of Colorado, Denver, Colorado.

John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts.

George W. Romney, Governor of the State of Michigan, Lansing, Michigan.

Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, Albany, New York.

Raymond P. Shafer, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

John H. Chafee, Governor of the State of Rhode Island, Providence, Rhode Island.

Nils A. Boe, Governor of the State of South Dakota, Pierre, South Dakota.

Daniel J. Evans, Governor of the State of Washington, Olympia, Washington.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Ray C. Bliss, Chairman, Republican National Committee, 1625 Eye Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C. 20006.

Mrs. C. Wayland Brooks, Assistant Chrmn., Republican National Committee, 1625 Eye Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C. 20006.

Mrs. Collis P. Moore, Vice Chairman, Republican National Committee, Box 225, Moro, Oregon 97039.

Donald R. Ross, Vice Chairman, Republican National Committee, 1406 Kiewit Plaza, Farnam at 36th, Omaha, Nebraska 68131.

Mrs. J. Willard Marriott, Vice Chrmn., Republican National Committee, 4500 Garfield Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C. 20007.

J. Drake Edens, Jr., Vice Chairman, Republican National Committee, Post Office Box 9385, Columbia, South Carolina 29201.

PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLICAN STATE LEGISLATORS ASSOCIATION

F. F. (Monte) Montgomery, Speaker of the House of Representatives, State of Oregon, Salem, Oregon.

Robert L. L. McCormick, Staff Coordinator.

MEMBERS OF THE REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE'S TASK FORCE ON THE CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS

Robert C. Hill, Chairman, United States Ambassador to Mexico, 1957-1961.

David N. Rowe, Vice Chairman, Professor of Political Science, Yale University.

Gordon Allott, United States Senator from Colorado.

Robert Amory, Jr., Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency, 1952-1962.

John B. Anderson, Member of Congress from Illinois.

Tim M. Babcock, Governor of the State of Montana.

Frances P. Bolton, Member of Congress from Ohio.

Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of United States Naval Operations, 1955-1961.

Lucius D. Clay, General of the United States Army, Retired.

Philip K. Crowe, United States Ambassador to the Union of South Africa, 1959-1961.

Joseph S. Farland, United States Ambassador to the Republic of Panama, 1960-1963.

Paul Findley, Member of Congress from Illinois.

Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, Member of Congress from New Jersey.

Ernest S. Griffith, Dean, School of International Service, American University, 1958-1965.

Mrs. Cecil M. Harden, Republican National Committeewoman for Indiana.

Joe Holt, Member of Congress from California, 1953-1959.

Walter A. Judd, Member of Congress from Minnesota, 1943-1963.

John D. Lodge, United States Ambassador to Spain, 1955-1961.

Gerhart Niemeyer, Professor of Political Science, University of Notre Dame.

Nicholas Nyaradi, Director of School of International Studies, Bradley University.

Roderic L. O'Connor, Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State, 1957-1958.

G. L. Ohrstrom, Jr., Investment Banker.

William W. Scranton, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1963-1967.

Richard B. Sellars, Republican National Committeeman for New Jersey.

Robert Strausz-Hupé, Director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania.

Kent B. Crane, Secretary to the Task Force.

## Riots: Organized and Subsidized

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. H. R. GROSS**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in a hard-hitting editorial in its July 31, 1967, issue, Barron's Weekly points to compelling evidence to support the charge that the riots which have engulfed city after city across the Nation are less spontaneous outbreaks than carefully planned subversion. This highly respected business and financial publication also offers convincing proof that federally subsidized antipoverty warriors have been inciting and fomenting unrest.

I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

POVERTY WARRIORS: THE RIOTS ARE SUBSIDIZED AS WELL AS ORGANIZED

Marion Barry and Rufus Mayfield are angry young men. Former national head of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), Mr. Barry in August, 1965, took part in a protest demonstration organized by the so-called Assembly of Unrepresented People. He was arrested and charged with disorderly conduct while leading demonstrators onto the Capitol grounds. "Riot power and rebellion power," he was quoted as saying last week, "might make people listen now." Mr. Mayfield is a Black Muslim. Twenty-one years old, he has spent most of the past eight years in prison for various offenses, including petty and grand larceny. This month Marion Barry acquired gainful employment. He was hired as a \$50-per-day consultant by the United Planning Organization, top antipoverty agency for the District of Columbia. Rufus Mayfield, according to Rep. Joel P. Broyhill (R., Va.), will serve as Barry's "back-up man."

While perhaps more arresting than most, these are not isolated instances. On the contrary, the files fairly bulge with equally radical cases in point. Thus, federal and state investigations of New York's Mobilization for Youth, pilot project for the Job Corps, disclosed that its staff included several members of the Communist Party. LeRoi Jones, who was taken into custody during the riots

in Newark and charged with illegal possession of deadly weapons, once ran a hate-the-whites Black Arts Theater which got \$115,000 in federal funds from Haryou-ACT before police discovered an arsenal on the premises. The Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association of Selma, which the Office of Economic Opportunity recently granted \$700,000, numbers among its principals John Zippert and Shirley Mesher. Louisiana's Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities recently documented Mr. Zippert's association with radical causes, including the Kremlin-financed World Youth Festival. According to the Alabama Legislative Commission to Preserve the Peace, Miss Mesher, a former coordinator for SNCC, is "a prime participant in the Black Panther movement designed to overthrow the government . . ."

Right after Watts (Barron's, August 23, 1965), we observed: "In the name of civil rights, a small band of ruthless men has not hesitated to stir up violence, break the law and undermine duly constituted authority. The so-called civil rights revolution . . . has begun to mean exactly what it says." Since then compelling evidence, including eyewitness testimony and the findings of a Cleveland grand jury, has shown that the riots are less spontaneous outbreaks than carefully planned subversion. To judge by the record, moreover, civil unrest is not only organized but also subsidized. Thanks to the Office of Economic Opportunity, the U.S. taxpayer now has a chance to finance his own destruction. The Great Society, so Newark, Detroit and scores of other smoldering cities suggest, cannot coexist with the American way of life.

Like the poor, slums and rats have always been with us. Only the devastating riots—and the professional agitators who prepare the tinder, await a spark and fan the flames—are significantly new. The 1964 outbursts in Harlem turned up William Epton, vice-chairman of the Red-Chinese-oriented Progressive Labor Party, who taught people how to make Molotov cocktails. Mr. Epton was convicted of criminal anarchy for his part in the riots. The Rev. Billy Graham called Watts a "dress rehearsal for revolution," a description in which radical spokesmen ever since have gloried. Last year's riots in Cleveland, charged Sen. Frank Lausche (Dem., O.) were the work of a "national conspiracy executed by experts." Shortly afterward a Cleveland grand jury, after hearing the testimony of detectives who penetrated the conspirators' ranks, found that "the outbreak of lawlessness and disorder was organized, precipitated and exploited by a relatively small group of trained and disciplined professionals." In a story on the Newark riots, the current issue of Life Magazine describes its reporters' "clandestine meeting with members of the sniper organization." Finally, SNCC's Stokely Carmichael, whose subversive interests range far and wide, openly boasts of what's afoot. After a quick trip to Prague, he landed last week in Havana. There he told newsmen: "In Newark we applied (guerrilla) war tactics . . . We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas . . . It is going to be a fight to the death."

So much for subversion, which the country will ignore at its own risk. As to federal subsidy of violence, an ominous pattern has emerged. From the beginning, as radicals recognized, the war on poverty, notably the Community Action Programs, had impressive trouble-making potentials. Somehow CAP has expanded much faster than OEO expenditures as a whole, surging from \$246.5 million in fiscal '66 to an estimated \$500 million in the current fiscal year. As noted above (much of the material comes from a forthcoming book, "Poverty Is Where the Money Is," to be published by Arlington House and written by Shirley Scheibla, Washington correspondent for Barron's), some of the money funded dubious ventures and put jailbirds

and subversives on the federal payroll. Mrs. Scheibla cites other horrible examples: John Ross, member of the Progressive Labor Party, who served on an anti-poverty board in San Francisco; Howard Harowitz, member of a similar board in Berkeley and former member of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, which the FBI calls "Communist-spawned"; and a number of U.P.O. personnel in Washington, D.C., who turned out to be SNCC organizers and agitators.

Taxpayer-financed trouble has exploded in one part of the country after another. Last fall the mayor of Perth Amboy, N.J., accused the local anti-poverty leader of seeking "to foment and incite unrest, agitation and disorder," a charge which the city manager of Rochester echoed last week. Newark's police chief weeks ago warned that the city faced anarchy because of agitation by federal anti-poverty workers, several of whom were arrested during the riots. In New York City five marauding young Negroes, collared while looting stores on Fifth Avenue, worked for the anti-poverty program; one wore a sweater blazoned, after the OEO-funded agency, "Harlem Youth Opportunities Unlimited."

To fight riots with OEO grants, in short, is like fighting fire with gasoline. However, Sargent Shriver alone is not to blame. Some of the fault lies with local officials like New York's Mayor Lindsay (tapped last week to serve on the President's special advisory body), who repeatedly refused to condemn the appearance of his Human Rights Commissioner at the Black Power conference in Newark, as well as with Mayor Cavanagh of Detroit (first recipient of OEO aid and welfare state showcase), who tied the hands of the police for the first few strategic hours. On the federal level, the country should call to account the Office of Attorney-General and its three recent occupants: Robert Kennedy, who once wrote a letter to the head of an identified Communist front, seeking advice on a national service corps; Nicholas Katzenbach, who shrugged off all evidence of conspiracy; and the incumbent, Ramsey Clark, who testified against pending anti-riot legislation. The blame reaches right up to the official White House family, to Vice President Humphrey, who last summer said that if he lived in a rat-infested slum: "there is enough of a spark left in me to lead a pretty good revolt."

Law and order are the stuff of civilization; they are also the first duty of government. On the record, "liberals" of both parties, by tolerating subversion, have made a mockery of their oaths of office and forfeited the public's trust. Appeals to prayer are all well and good, but what this country needs is a political and philosophic call to arms.

### Federal Antipoverty Programs—The Wrong Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES  
Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Wrong Approach," published in the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch of August 6, 1967.

Virginius Dabney is editor of the Times-Dispatch.

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

#### THE WRONG APPROACH

Some months ago, the mayor of a large

Midwestern city came to Washington to vouch for the effectiveness of federal anti-poverty programs.

"It is a well known fact," he told members of a Senate subcommittee, that his city "has avoided the civil disorder that has beset our other major cities for the past few summers." The mayor continued:

That didn't happen by chance: it is the result of careful planning and the implementation made possible through the economic improvement act. . . . These programs contributed to an orderly community and aided in the reduction of crime.

You may have guessed by now that the gentleman who made these statements was Mayor Jerome P. Cavanagh. The city he was talking about, of course, was Detroit, which has just experienced one of the worst examples of "civil disorder" in American history.

If the secret of averting civil disorder is funds from the federal government, then Detroit should have been one of the least likely spots for an outbreak of violence. Before the riots occurred in Detroit, Washington had spent more than \$30 million on anti-poverty activities in that city. It had also pumped some \$112 million into 28 urban redevelopment projects there. Obviously all this cash didn't insure Detroit against disaster.

The trouble, says Mayor Cavanagh, who has not changed his tune, is that even these large sums were not enough. Still insisting that federal funds are the secret of urban stability, he asserted on "Meet the Press" that a "highly reactionary Congress" bore the chief responsibility for what happened in Detroit.

If Congress has been stingy, as he suggested, and more money is the answer, then how much will it take to solve the problem of urban crime and violence with dollars?

Even before the rioters and looters did \$500 million worth of damage in Detroit, Mr. Cavanagh had placed a \$15 billion price tag on the cost of rebuilding his city. If the rest of the country required similar amounts, it would take between \$1 trillion and \$2 trillion to rebuild America's cities. And that would consume virtually every cent of federal revenue for the next 20 years at present tax rates!

Obviously money from Washington isn't going to solve the problem quickly, if at all. In fact, the whole idea that there is a direct cause and effect relationship between poverty and crime is open to serious challenge.

In 1939, average per capita income in the U.S. was \$695, total government welfare spending was less than \$10 billion a year and unemployment was nearly 14 per cent. Today per capita income is four times as great, unemployment is only one third as severe and the government is spending seven times as much on welfare programs—and yet the rate of crime has doubled.

We have not only failed to combat crime with cash. We may even have aggravated the problem by this approach. All too often welfare programs have eroded not only individual responsibility and initiative, but also the desire for self-improvement—the only sure path to genuine prosperity. They have likewise raised hopes and expectations beyond the government's ability to deliver. When a promised utopia fails to materialize, there is bound to be resentment and trouble—as is now altogether obvious.

### An Important Person for an Important Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

**HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity is fortun-

nate to have as its assistant director for the older persons program a dedicated and perceptive public servant, Miss Genevieve Blatt.

Miss Blatt joined OEO a few months ago after 12 years of service to Pennsylvania as secretary of internal affairs. Her post will entail a growing workload, because medical statistics show that each generation is living longer and that the problems of dealing with the elderly will continue to increase.

In an article that appeared in the Pittsburgh Press on July 23, 1967, Miss Margaret A. Kilgore, of United Press International, described Miss Blatt as "eminently qualified" for her difficult position.

The article also pointed out that—

Miss Blatt's agency currently is hampered by a lack of funds until Congress acts on President Johnson's request to spend \$2 billion during fiscal 1967-68 on the poverty program.

I insert the Pittsburgh Press article at this point in the RECORD, both to acquaint my colleagues with a gifted friend and to point up the importance of acting favorably on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 to enable dedicated public servants like Miss Blatt to do their vital jobs properly.

The article follows:

PREJUDICE SNAGS AID TO ELDERLY: MISS  
BLATT'S JOB IS "OLD STORY"  
(By Margaret A. Kilgore)

WASHINGTON (UPI).—A community builds a recreation center for the elderly, but poor old folk won't use it because they feel inferior.

Other oldsters won't use it because they don't want to mix with the poor.

What can be done?

A myriad of problems such as this confront Genevieve Blatt, the Federal Government's new assistant director for the older persons program in the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).

"When you're dealing with the elderly you're facing a lifetime of habits and prejudices," Miss Blatt told UPI. "It's easy enough to say we'll spend money here or there, but dealing with people is another matter."

In the unnamed community above, which she cited as an example, the Federal Government and local interests built a community center where elderly persons could go, meet people of their own age group and mix socially.

It attracted a large group of educated, middle class, white persons who enjoyed it. But when community workers encouraged attendance by elderly persons from lower economic strata, they were uncomfortable. So were the newcomers. As a result, no one came to the community center.

"These are the kinds of problems we have to solve," Miss Blatt explained, "and I don't know how to beat it. But we must try."

With medical statistics showing that each generation is living longer, the problems of dealing with the elderly will continue to increase.

When Director Sargent Shriver of the anti-poverty corps named Miss Blatt to her current post, he chose a woman who is eminently qualified.

A tall, graying brunette, Miss Blatt, 53, was elected secretary of Internal Affairs in Pennsylvania in 1954, the first woman ever elected to a Statewide office in Pennsylvania.

She was re-elected in 1958 and 1962, but she lost a bid for a fourth term in 1966 to then State Commerce Secretary John K. Tabor by a margin of 67,000 votes.

A native of East Brady, Pa., and a lawyer, Miss Blatt won the Democratic nomination

August 7, 1967

A 3977

in 1964 for the U.S. Senate over organization candidate, Justice Michael A. Musmanno of the State Supreme Court. She later lost a close race to incumbent Sen. Hugh Scott, Philadelphia Republican.

Before she was named to her current job, Miss Blatt served on the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice.

Part of her job includes overseeing operation of "Foster Grandparents" program which has proven marginally successful by paying hourly wages to the elderly poor to befriend children in institutions and orphanages.

The Federal Government has spent between three and five million dollars during fiscal 1966-67 to operate about four dozen programs across the country.

She also finds it discouraging that so much of the money is being directed only to the elderly in cities with persons in the rural areas forgotten.

"Everyone assumes that in a small town, neighbors and relatives take care of you if you are old or sick," she observed. "And, fortunately, in many cases this is true. But the rural areas shouldn't be neglected in the interests of political considerations which favor the city dweller."

Miss Blatt's agency currently is hampered by a lack of funds until Congress acts on President Johnson's request to spend two billion dollars during fiscal 1967-68 on the poverty program. The Federal Government must have local co-operation, however.

In a recent speech to the 94th annual forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare, Miss Blatt urged: "I plead with every social agency, with every agency of government—Federal state and local—to pool resources, combine forces and together do, what none of them can do alone and do adequately."

She said that for too long local welfare agencies have concentrated their efforts on children and family problems without expanding their services for older persons.

## J. Edgar Hoover—Public Servant No. 1

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, at this time we commemorate the completion of 50 years of distinguished public service by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Throughout the Nation expressions of thanks are being extended to Mr. Hoover by a grateful people for his many contributions to the public well-being.

Typical of these expressions is the editorial which appeared in a recent edition of the Alhambra, Calif., Post-Advocate.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

#### HALF CENTURY HEADING FBI

The national well-being of the United States over the last 50 years has been profoundly affected by the dedicated service of J. Edgar Hoover. The half century of service which he celebrated yesterday has seen the very fabric of our national integrity and unity tested to the limit. Rock-like and unwavering, Mr. Hoover has been the voice of conscience and the enemy of crime.

Fifty years of public service are, by any standards, a tribute to selfless devotion to

duty. In John Edgar Hoover, the 72-year-old director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the nation found the right man at the right time for the right job.

And at a time when the forces of crime and anarchy constantly endeavor to assert themselves and overthrow the laws of this nation, his implacable fight against them, through the institution he leads, is our first line of defense.

Not for him the double standard. Not for him the compromise with the criminality. Throughout his public life he has been the very acme of principle and honesty, and an example to all.

The law clerk who joined the Justice Department 50 years ago today later became the acting director of the Bureau of Investigation during its important formative years, before it was "federal."

He built the FBI from a fledgling inexperienced organization into the finest law-enforcement agency in the world. He created from a few widely dispersed agents the nucleus of a crime-fighting machine which has grown to more than 6,600 agents out of a total of 15,300 employees in 57 national divisions.

The FBI is J. Edgar Hoover. He is the epitome of his department's agents. Their exploits during the years from the Twenties of prohibition to the Sixties of LSD have endured through many tests, with a dogged tenacity and commendable success.

It was Mr. Hoover who brought professionalism to police work, insisting on training and education for a job formerly and mistakenly regarded as requiring little of either.

He created the national academy which, since 1935, has been providing outstanding training for the "thin blue line" of police from all parts of the nation. It was under his direction that the national centralized fingerprint division was born, now used by all agencies. This year the giant computerized stolen vehicles section went into operation, aiding every patrolman.

The FBI has exemplified quiet, progressive efficiency and integrity. It has earned the respect of criminal and protected alike.

The strength stemmed from the God-fearing right, high moral principles, stern disciplines and unimpeachable code of ethics by which J. Edgar Hoover has shaped his life and his department.

## Hunger Politics

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include portions of an outstanding editorial which appeared in the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., on July 13, 1967, entitled "Hunger Politics." I commend its reading to all Members of the House:

#### HUNGER POLITICS

Reading between the lines of a report from Washington about making free food more readily available to hungry Americans, we detect a distinct trace of politics.

The Secretary of Agriculture's announcement of more liberal use of U.S. food stamps followed a report from a team of doctors who asserted they found hundreds of starving children in Mississippi. The story intimates that horrid white people are deliberately taking bread out of children's mouths in an attempt to drive out unwanted Negro population.

While we are not able to make unqualified denial that some people are poorly nourished in some parts of Mississippi—and no doubt in every one of the other 49 states—we are firmly of the opinion that the Southern region of the United States is one of the garden spots of the world when it comes to easy access to the necessities of life. Even those who sit under a breadfruit tree could be hungry if they lacked the energy or intelligence to feed themselves.

## Nasser's Plan for Using Poison Gas in Israel

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been disclosed that the Egyptians made use of poison gas in their war in Yemen early this year, and intended to use gas in their war with Israel.

When Nasser discovered that he was unable to defeat the small and backward nation of Yemen, he decided to use a weapon long outlawed by all the nations of the world—poison gas.

When the U.N. refused to act after receiving reports that poison gas was being used by Egypt, the International Red Cross sent a team of doctors to north Yemen to investigate these reports.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article which appeared in the July 28, 1967, issue of the Jewish Press concerning this matter.

The article contains the substance of the report issued by the International Red Cross, and follows:

NASSER'S PLANS FOR USING POISON GAS IN ISRAEL—SECRET RED CROSS REPORT VERIFIES EGYPTIANS USED POISON GAS

For the first time in modern history, a weapon outlawed by civilized nations, poison gas, was used by the United Arab Republic against civilians. This fact was recently revealed by the International Red Cross in a secret report, which is now in the files of the Jewish Press.

A Jewish Press staff correspondent who was in Israel when the Arabs capitulated on the Sinai desert had actually seen the poison gas cylinders, ready for instantaneous use.

The documented and unbiased proof of the use of poison gas by the United Arab Republic against civilians is now available to the public. It coldly and clearly reveals what the State of Israel faced from Nasser's forces and points up the narrow escape from horrible death that was the fortunate fate of tens of thousands of Jewish soldiers and civilians.

For several years now the United Arab Republic has intervened blatantly in the internal affairs of Yemen, setting up a puppet Republican government loyal to Cairo's bidding and sending in 50,000 troops to help smash the opposition Royalist forces.

At first it had seemed that a modern army, equipped with tanks and planes, could easily crush a ragged, primitive host of tribesmen. But, as the months dragged by, the Royalists continued to fight, taking a heavier and heavier toll of Egyptians. Hundreds of Nasser's troops perished and others were captured—only to have an ear or a nose cut off—and allowed to return to their fellow soldiers and spread panic.

The stalemate was not only costly to Nas-

ser in terms of money (nearly one million dollars a month) but the fact that husbands and children failed to come home from the battle was costing him popularity at home.

In addition, the humiliation of being unable to defeat a backward army was too much for the Egyptian dictator to endure.

He therefore decided to use a weapon long outlawed by all the nations of the world, poison gas! Soon Egyptian planes began regular bombing runs against Yemeni villages. In January of this year, a raid on the town of Ktaf in Northern Yemen, killed 170 people. In the first week of January alone, the Royalists claimed that gas took the lives of 493 Yemenis.

On February 15, another poison gas attack was launched, this time against the village of Beni Salamah in Southern Yemen. The continued reports were so obviously true that it led to debate in the British Parliament where Prime Minister Wilson declared that he had evidence "strongly suggesting that poison gas had been used" in Yemen.

On January 31 of this year, the International Committee of the Red Cross took the unusual step of announcing its "concern over the alleged use of poisonous gas". It took the step despite lack of sufficient evidence because it was so completely convinced that the attacks had indeed occurred.

During this entire period the Cairo authorities vehemently denied that gas had been used by their troops. Despite this, the reports continued and grew in intensity. With the failure of any governmental agency to take action, private individuals made it their business to ascertain the truth or falsity of the gas stories. A number of individuals visited the area and confirmed in their minds that poison gas was indeed being used. They immediately sent private petitions to the United Nations Committee on Colonialism. Nothing more was heard of these petitions.

On March 7, the United States and Great Britain issued a blistering attack on the Committee. Lord Caradon, the permanent British delegate declared that a subcommittee that screened petitions to the 24-nation committee on colonialism had censored the private petitions and refused to circulate them to the committee because they were critical of the United Arab Republic.

In an indignant statement, Richard Johnson, the United States representative declared that there apparently existed a double standard on the committee that permitted circulation of petitions critical of Western nations but not of Asian-Africans.

Despite this, no action was taken as the Communist-Asian-African bloc consisting of the Soviet Union, Syria, Iraq, India, Yugoslavia and Tanzania supported the subcommittee's actions. The United Nations failure to hear the charges was so blatant that even the Saudian Arabian delegate, Jamil M. Baroodi, attacked Secretary General U Thant for refusing to do anything about these charges or about the entire Egyptian aggression in Yemen where over 100,000 persons had lost their lives.

But while the United Nations refused to act, another international agency was quietly going about getting clear and irrefutable evidence.

The International Red Cross now sent a team of doctors to the town of Gahar in North Yemen following an appeal from the inhabitants who claimed to have been gassed on the morning of May 10, 1967. Their investigation was methodical and painstaking and a secret report was issued. The Jewish Press is in possession of this report.

The substance of the report follows:

The following statements were made by the inhabitants who witnessed the incident:

1. Seventy-five persons died of poison gas shortly after the raid.

They showed the following symptoms: shortness of breath, coughing, pink foam at

the mouth, general edema, especially the face; no physical injuries.

2. The undersigned doctors examined the four surviving victims and observed the following:

Subjective symptoms: burning eyes and trachea, internal thorax pain, extreme fatigue, anorexia.

Objective symptoms: dry cough, negative auscultation in two patients, sign of bronchitis in the other two, conjunctivitis, facial edema, no traumatic lesions, tympanum intact.

3. The undersigned doctors examined a corpse four days after death and 12 hours after burial.

Immediately, the common grave was opened, and well before the corpses were visible, there was a sweet penetrating smell . . . The bodies showed no traumatic lesions. The skin was pink. Advanced and general edema all over the body.

Examination of lungs: reddish-brown throughout, enlargement, consistence and fragility greatly increased, crepitation considerably reduced.

The undersigned doctors draw the following logical conclusions from their findings: . . . The cause of death in the case of the corpse examined was pulmonary edema. The over-all consistency of the ICRC (International Committee of the Red Cross) medical mission's findings shows that in all probability this pulmonary edema was caused by inhalation of toxic gas.

(Signed) RAYMOND JANIN,  
ICRC Doctor-Delegate.  
WILLY BRUTSCHIN,  
Doctor-Delegate.

Signed at town Najran, May 18, 1967.

### The ICBM Threat From China

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 7, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, there is serious concern about Red China's growing nuclear weapons capability.

As a member of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee I have felt compelled to speak out about this problem, such as in my statement to the House of Representatives June 13, 1967, on the fiscal year 1968 Defense appropriation bill, to emphasize that we must have action now to begin deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile—ABM—system.

Funding to begin deployment of the ABM system was provided in last year's Defense appropriation bill, and additional funds for this purpose are provided in the Defense appropriation bill currently pending in Congress. Secretary of Defense McNamara has, however, delayed ABM deployment.

The urgency of the situation has once again been underscored in the report just released by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Joint Committee found that Communist China may have a capability of attacking the United States with nuclear missiles within several years, possibly as early as 1970-71.

The Los Angeles Times, in a sobering assessment of the Red Chinese ICBM threat, calls for an immediate start on construction of an anti-ballistic-missile defense to counteract that threat. In

reaching this conclusion the Times states that Secretary of Defense McNamara's reasons for delay in construction of antimissile system are overshadowed by the rapid Chinese nuclear buildup.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this timely editorial for inclusion in the RECORD, because I know the subject is of great importance to the Congress and the entire Nation.

#### THE ICBM THREAT FROM CHINA

Based on information obtained from various intelligence agencies of the U.S. government, the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee now reports that Communist China may have the capability to fire nuclear missiles at the United States within three or four years' time.

Although the committee feels any Chinese attack in the early 1970s would be of "a low order of magnitude"—i.e., perhaps only two or three nuclear missiles—there is still substantial cause for concern. As of now this country does not possess an effective antimissile defense system. Even though a Chinese attack would be "suicidal" in terms of the destruction a U.S. nuclear response would involve, the committee wisely does not rule out the possibility of such an illogical move by Peking.

The committee report differs, if only semantically, from the publicly expressed views of Defense Secretary McNamara, who believes that the Chinese will not have a "significant" missile capability until the mid-1970s.

The key word is, of course, significant, by which McNamara presumably means an ICBM force of 50 or 60 missiles. This belief does not rule out the possession by China, perhaps by the end of this decade, of an embryonic missile force capable of striking the United States.

There is one view, also expressed by McNamara, that the reliability of Chinese missiles in the 1970s would not be great, thereby reducing or even eliminating their military value. There are also some China specialists who argue that Peking wants a nuclear arsenal only for defensive or deterrent purposes, and for the great power status nuclear weapons carry.

No one can say for sure that these opinions are incorrect. But what must also be kept in mind is that U.S. officials have consistently erred in estimating the nuclear potential of China—as earlier they did with the Soviet Union. And, while China may be essentially defense-minded, there have been enough examples in Peking of what are, to the Western mind, irrational behavior patterns to preclude any positive judgments about what the Chinese may or may not do.

Given these considerations, it is imperative that the United States prepare for the worst. This means an immediate start on the construction of an antimissile system capable of counteracting a foreseeable Chinese ICBM threat.

Preparatory work on such a system has already been done, and reportedly there are funds in the defense budget directly tied to production of a system. But McNamara has hesitated before, despite congressional pressure, to go ahead with even a limited antimissile defense.

There are many reasons for the defense secretary's caution, including economic and domestic political problems; for example, what areas such a system would cover. Also, the Administration is seeking agreement with the Soviets to limit deployment of what would be an extremely costly full-scale missile defense force.

These considerations, however, are overshadowed by the possible danger of a rapid Chinese nuclear buildup. American security requires a rapid start on deployment of a missile defense system adequate to meet the potential threat from China.