

in the ability of the purchasers of their products to pay for them, eventually, in gold. Regardless of how fancy the printing, or how many optimistic claims are made for it, it is still paper of no intrinsic value. It simply starts the printing presses rolling in international affairs, and probably the result will be no different than the national inflation the printing press money has caused in the United States.

Our dollars continue to flow outward, along with our gold reserves, and an annual deficit for many years now decreased our gold supply to its lowest point. As long as this situation continues, and as long as world faith in our credit lives, there will be many countries which will see little need, or desirability, for the Special Drawing Rights.

Any loss of faith in our credit, causing a substantial demand for gold in exchange for dollars held by foreign nations would, however, certainly not be mitigated by any "paper gold" in existence. On the contrary, since the use of such a scheme is expected to enlarge the debt structure, while causing no improvement in the deficit problem, it could hasten the loss of faith and accelerate the demand of many nations for true value in metallic gold.

Gold is one of the most powerful incentives. Gold and the power it provides cause dictatorships to come into being, personal rights to be violated and civilizations to fall. Our inflation would not have progressed as it did, if it were not for the printing press money made possible by its low percentage of backing in gold. Our national debt would cause much greater concern among influential financiers, and probably would not have reached its towering height, if it were not for the "gold" represented by the interest being earned by national and international interests, which in many cases also profit from the sale of a large share of the goods paid for by the borrowed money.

As long as financial gain of those in controlling positions would be adversely affected by sound programs, we will continue to see plans similar to the "paper gold" scheme advanced as panacea for world problems. We will find such schemes generally accepted on the basis that intelligent world leaders would not be supporting them unless they were workable and beneficial.

There probably was never a dictator in history who was not intelligent, but benevolence and altruism are not virtues which must accompany high mental capacity.

Vietnam Victim Awarded Bronze Star

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Bronze Star has been awarded posthumously to Pfc. Robert L. Johnson, a young soldier from Baltimore who was killed in action in Vietnam.

I would like to include the following article in the RECORD in memory of Private First Class Johnson:

Vietnam Victim Gets Bronze Star

The Bronze Star has been awarded posthumously to Pfc. Robert L. Johnson, who was killed August 1 while on reconnaissance patrol for the 1st Squadron, 10th Cavalry, in Vietnam.

A native of Baltimore, Private Johnson was the son of Mr. and Mrs. Garnie Johnson,

of 3005 Georgetown road. He attended the high school division of Baltimore Bible College, and had planned to study for the ministry when he left the Army.

Private Johnson had been in the Army for a year. In the citation, he was praised for his versatility, bravery, and professional competence.

Counterdeterrence and the ABM

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, our Secretary of Defense has recently announced the start of work on a so-called thin anti-ballistic-missile system. This is a step forward, in spite of the fact that it is only to take into account the threat of Red China. It is my feeling that something more must be done to meet the Soviet threat. In this connection, I commend the following article, entitled "Counterdeterrence and the ABM," by Prof. James D. Atkinson, of Georgetown University, which appeared in the Washington Report of the American Security Council of August 21, 1967.

The article follows:

COUNTERDETERRENCE AND THE ABM

(By Dr. James D. Atkinson)

That trenchant observer of the American scene, Will Rogers, once observed that in the field of disarmament Americans had a tendency to scrap battleships while their opponents tore up blueprints. Something of this American tendency of an almost extremist goodwill is in evidence today with reference to the question of anti-ballistic missile defense. We talk and talk in the hope that we can persuade the Soviet Union to dismantle its present anti-ballistic missile system and to refrain from going ahead with further missile defenses. The Soviets stall in the negotiations while continuing to build and deploy their ABMs.

SOVIET CAPABILITIES AND INTENTIONS

The recent study prepared by a special sub-committee of the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council entitled "The Changing Strategic Military Balance: U.S.A. vs. U.S.S.R." has stated that "the preponderance of evidence points to the conclusion that the Soviet Union is succeeding in its massive drive toward strategic military superiority . . . (and that) the year 1967 falls in a crossover period with the U.S.S.R. estimates ranging between 16,000 and 37,000 (deliverable) megatons, to equal or exceed the U.S. estimated range of between 8,000 and 29,000 (deliverable) megatons "This study, with its graphic documentation of the Soviet thrust for military-technological superiority, has received, and continues to receive, widespread attention from leading editors and authorities in both the daily and the periodical press. The New York Times, for example, in a front page story on July 12, 1967, stated that ". . . the Defense Department did not directly contradict the study's findings, but argued that deliverable megatonnage was not an accurate indicator of 'true military capability.'" (Emphasis added.)

It has been argued in some quarters in the West, however, that Soviet capabilities as illustrated by the Soviet deployment of an ABM system need not be a cause for alarm

since Soviet intentions are peaceful and the Cold War is, in fact, over.

But are the Soviet leaders mellowing? Unfortunately, the most recent evidence would appear to indicate that storm flags are flying in the Kremlin. Some storm signals are:

(1) The official pronouncement of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union issued June 25, 1967, in a summary of 50 years of Bolshevism. It stated that, "The domination of imperialism on the world scene has ended" because of the growth of Soviet military power. The statement also singled out the United States as the "main enemy" of the national liberation warfare movement and charged the state of Israel with aggression.

(2) Appointing (for the first time since Beria's execution in 1953) the Soviet secret police chief a member of the ruling Politburo. This is Yuri Andropov, whose promotion was announced June 22, 1967. Since the KGB (the Soviet secret police) have vast responsibilities for waging unconventional warfare around the world, it would appear that giving Andropov such power indicates stepped-up Cold War operations.

(3) Writing in the official Soviet Armed Forces newspaper, Red Star, on June 3, 1967, Bulgarian Minister of Defense, General of the Army Dobri Dzhurov said: "The Soviet Union has always been and will continue to be the main political and material base of the world revolutionary process." (Emphasis added.) The general also went on to say that "The Soviet Union constitutes the main support of fighting Vietnam."

(4) Soviet escalation of the Vietnam war is another example of the Soviet's true intentions. Soviet shipping going into North Vietnamese ports has shown a marked increase this year over 1966. As of June 1967 the rate was eighteen per month with an additional 2 to 5 Soviet satellite ships per month. Indicative of this escalation is the Moscow Radio broadcast of July 28 which stated that Soviet ships "leave Odessa practically every day with cargoes for Vietnam."

(5) The recent hard-line in the Soviet press which continually attacks Israel, "Zionism," and the United States. In reporting this trend from Moscow, the Washington Post of August 8, 1967 stated that the press campaign was one which "to some senior diplomats here recall the worst days of the Cold War."

These indicators of increasingly "stormy cold war weather" indicate that Soviet strategists understand quite well that revolutionary agitation and propaganda, "peace marchers" in London and New York, guerrillas in Africa and Latin America are techniques of conflict on a par with guided missiles and nuclear submarines. But does it follow that these same Soviet strategists are unaware of the possibilities for nuclear blackmail of the West in the event that they attain strategic military-technological superiority? Indeed, one may well ask whether the present U.S. limitations on air strikes against military targets in North Viet Nam result from the steady accretion of Soviet military-technological power?

CHINESE COMMUNIST NUCLEAR WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT

Even if it were possible to disregard the evidence of the Soviet deployment of an ABM system or systems and the counterdeterrence which this poses to the announced U.S. policy of deterrence, it would be still more difficult to close our minds to the ominous developments in China.

The Chinese Communists exploded their first H-bomb on June 17, 1967. It was apparently a sophisticated implosion type in the two-to-seven megaton range. The complicated electronic triggering and measuring devices that would appear to have been required, in this and other nuclear tests, would be of great assistance to the Chinese in building an intercontinental missile. Since

October 25, 1967

the Chinese progress in nuclear weapons development has been faster and more effective than had been anticipated by Western sources, it may be that they will also develop a nuclear ICBM delivery capability sooner than the mid-1970's, which is the time phase previously estimated by Western sources. Moreover, the Chinese now possess the design capability for a multimegaton thermonuclear weapon which can be delivered by aircraft.

The possibilities of the Chinese Communists exercising nuclear blackmail against Southeast Asian countries, Japan, or, indeed, against the United States are underscored in a report released August 3, 1967, by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. The Committee said: "We believe that the Chinese will continue to place a high priority on thermonuclear weapons development. With continued testing we believe they will be able to develop a thermonuclear warhead in the ICBM weight class with a yield in the megaton range by about 1970. We believe that the Chinese can have an ICBM system ready for deployment in the early 1970's. On the basis of our present knowledge, we believe that the Chinese probably will achieve an operational ICBM capability before 1972. Conceivably, it could be ready as early as 1970-1971."

The Joint Committee then went on to sound a warning about the direct threat to U.S. national security posed by Chinese Communist nuclear weapons developments by pointing out that "Most significant for the United States is the fact that a low order of magnitude attack could possibly be launched by the Chinese Communists against the United States by the early 1970's. At present we do not have an effective anti-ballistic-missile system which could repel such a suicidal (for the Chinese) but nevertheless possible strike."

THE STABILIZING VALUE OF A U.S. ABM SYSTEM

In the final analysis, the value of a system of deterrence is that which the enemy believes about it. If the Soviets believe that the U.S. deterrent offensive force can be neutralized by their ABM systems to a point at which the Soviet war-making capability will sustain only an acceptable level of damage (and, of course, their acceptable level may be much higher than ours), then they have achieved a counter-deterrence posture which may lead them to risk—at a given crisis in international relations—a nuclear war.

Equally, if at some future point the Chinese Communists should believe (in the absence of a U.S. ABM system) that there is somewhat more of a "suicidal" element for the United States than for them in a nuclear war, they might, in a given confrontation, launch a surprise nuclear attack on America.

The evidence of the post-World War II period suggests that it has been the stabilizing factor of U.S. military-technological power which has prevented a general war. Today, under the impact of both the Soviet and Chinese Communist military-technological thrust, that stability appears to be threatened. Would the production and deployment of a U.S. ABM system—perhaps even on a crash basis as a clear demonstration of credibility—have a definite stabilizing value on world politics? That it might well do so is indicated by the thoughtful and carefully measured words of the Senate Appropriations Committee. In reporting on the Defense Department Appropriation Bill for fiscal 1968 (August 4, 1967), the Committee said: "It is the view of the Committee that the deployment of the NIKE-X antiballistic missile system should be initiated immediately, and the Committee urges the executive branch of the Government to take action accordingly."

Address by Hon. Paul A. Fino in Support of Our Boys in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this House an address given by our colleague, the Honorable PAUL A. FINO, at the conclusion of the October 22 Bronx War Veterans rally in support of our boys in Vietnam. Mr. FINO's speech, which was extremely well received, puts Vietnicks, beatniks, and their political allies in exactly the right perspective. We need more of these rallies and more men like PAUL FINO to support them. The voice of patriotism is so rarely heard these days that I agree with my colleague our men in Vietnam must know that the vast majority of Americans have not abandoned them. We do support them 100 percent. Mr. FINO's remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN PAUL A. FINO

Mr. Chairman, Admiral Clark, Reverend Clergy, Distinguished Guests and Fellow Americans:

At the outset, let me say that I am proud to be here today and privileged to participate in these patriotic ceremonies.

Whether we agree or disagree with our tactics and policy in Vietnam is unimportant and immaterial. The essential thing to remember is that our American boys are fighting and dying over there, fulfilling their duty to their country, and it is our great obligation to give our fighting men all the material and moral support they need. They must know that their sacrifice is important and that it is appreciated and that we stand behind them 100%.

I cannot think of anything that makes me more ashamed than the actions of some high officials of our land who shun patriotic parades to meet with Soviet poets; who shun flag-raising but applaud flag-burnings; and who mock the sacrifices of our young men in Vietnam while prancing around with hippies and peace-niks.

I cannot think of anything that disturbs me more than the persistent attempts by this Administration to build trade bridges with the Soviet bloc while we are engaged in a brutal conflict in Vietnam in which Red Russia is supplying our enemies with massive arms, weapons, ammunition and equipment.

I cannot think of anything that bothers me more than the demands of some of our politicians who urge that we reduce support of our boys in Vietnam so that priority can be given to domestic needs.

I cannot think of anything that makes my blood boil more than the actions of our city brass who justify the presence of ex-Communists in our poverty program and identify them as "distinguished public servants."

I cannot stand here today and say that our involvement in Vietnam is the height of wisdom, because, like General MacArthur, I believe that it was a mistake for the United States to get involved in an Asian land war but I say to you that since we are heavily involved and committed in Vietnam we have an obligation to support our fighting men over there. We have an obligation to keep the flag-burners, the Vietnicks, the draft-card burners, the peaceniks and the hippy-cod-

ding politicians from stabbing our fighting men in the back.

The purpose of these ceremonies is to show the world that we, in America, will not ignore the valor and sacrifice of our boys in battle.

We want the whole world to know that we will give our fighting men all the material support they need.

We want the whole world to know that our moral support is total.

We want our fighting men in Vietnam to know that their sacrifice is important and that it is appreciated. It is our duty as Americans to give them our fullest and complete support. That is what we pledge here today.

The Kee Report: Panama Canal Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 25, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report."

The subject discussed in this report is the proposed new treaty with Panama, governing the canal. The report follows:

This is Jim Kee—bringing you the Kee Report.

I believe the American people take pride in the fact that building the Panama Canal was one of the greatest engineering feats in history. Every school boy knows that the primary purpose in building this waterway was to shorten the distance between the Atlantic and Pacific and thus, help both our commerce and our national defense.

This marine highway has now been open to ocean traffic a little more than half a century. During this time, which included two world wars, the canal has proved its usefulness in a substantial way. Although American cargo comprises the bulk of canal traffic, the ships of foreign nations pay the same tolls as our own. This has been helpful to the maritime nations and also to the countries of South America, because much of their import and export traffic passes through the canal.

Because canal traffic is expanding at a rapid rate, experts predict that another deep-sea channel between the two oceans will be urgently needed before too long. In fact, the need is so apparent that a Federal commission is now studying the project.

Meanwhile, the Republic of Panama has complained so loud and so long, that a new treaty has been prepared governing the operation of the canal. While this new treaty is still unpublished here, its terms have been freely discussed in Panama. Several radical changes are in the making, including dual operation of the canal and much higher payments to Panama to be paid for by increased tolls. I have no wish to prejudice this agreement, but experts are warning that a heavy boost in canal tolls could hit some American industries very hard, including the coal industry of West Virginia. In recent years, the industry has enjoyed a growing export business, helped in large part by the low carrying charges of ocean going vessels. Thus, coal from our West Virginia fields is transported by rail to the Eastern Seaboard, and thence by ship through the canal to Japan.

If canal tolls are revised upward to the extent now contemplated by Panama, the coal export trade to Japan would simply dis-