

September 26, 1968

played in the creation of the United Nations. The objective of the resolution is to request the President of the United States to issue on October 24, 1968, a proclamation recognizing the significant part which Mr. Truman, as President of the United States on October 24, 1947, played in the formation of the United Nations.

It should be recalled that October 24, 1947, is the date which was chosen to enter the Charter of the United Nations. My No. 1 constituent will be recorded by historians as a great President for many reasons. One of the most outstanding actions of his career, however, as President, was to recognize the importance of the United Nations as a peacekeeping organization. Many of us today may not be in full and complete agreement with everything that is said and done in the United Nations, but I think the great majority recognize that it has served as a valuable tool in the preservation of peace in the world. Until something better comes along that will be accepted by the nations of the world, we should support the U.N.

I commend my colleague, Mr. BOLING, for the introduction of this resolution and I am confident not one voice of protest will be raised against its adoption. Former President Truman deserves recognition for his contribution to the birth of the United Nations.

#### THE FAA SCHEMES AGAIN

(Mr. FRIEDEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of a "Master Plan Report—Washington National Airport." I understand that this has been under preparation since 1965 pursuant to a contract between the Federal Aviation Administration and Vincent G. Kling & Associates. I am advised that the contract cost the taxpayers of this country \$300,000. This is outrageous.

Early in the 90th Congress I introduced H.R. 2798, which would prohibit the Federal Aviation Administration from improving or expanding any airport owned and operated by the Federal Government if the cost of improvement or expansion would exceed \$50,000. Anything over that would have to have specific authorization by Congress. This Kling report underscores the need for such legislation, for in the report there are four schemes proposed with total costs as follows:

Scheme F-1	\$192,440,479
Scheme F-2	193,622,525
Scheme F-3	136,988,139
Scheme F-4	163,024,588

Some scheming.

Across the Nation there are many places where airport improvements are urgently needed. It is a crying shame that the one place which does not need to be expanded should be chosen for dumping \$300,000 down the drain.

Incidentally, for some reason the report is encased in a book which measures 18 inches by 13½ inches. This is a little awkward for Congressmen to carry around in their side pocket, so I do not

have it with me. I am not sure my file cabinets are large enough to accommodate it and it costs so much I just hate to throw it away. If any of you want to see it, I will keep it in the office at least for awhile. I have the feeling that Mr. Thomas, the Acting Administrator, will be glad to give away all of his copies if you want to get one from him.

A number of us have been telling the FAA formally and informally for years that the overuse of Washington National is ridiculous in the face of the underuse of Dulles which has over \$200 million invested in it, and the underuse of Friendship International, so conveniently located between Baltimore and Washington.

I do not know what more we must do to get this message across but I am perfectly willing to keep at it until it gets across.

I think that Congress is entitled to an immediate and complete explanation as to just how the FAA decided to spend \$300,000 for this purpose. I question their right to do this. If they have such discretionary right, it should be removed.

I would have thought that their judgment would have led them away from such an adventure. I regret that it did not. I will exert my efforts to have them up just as soon as possible to determine what additional restrictions we should put on their authorizations. Among these I would hope would be the one set forth in H.R. 2798.

#### COMMUNIST INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the ruthless Communist Russian aggression in Czechoslovakia should warn us once again that there is no real difference in the Communist objective. Their goal is conquest of the free world. The Communist goal in Southeast Asia is world conquest. The Communist goal in Europe is world conquest. The Communist goal in Cuba is world conquest. All Communists are united in their sinister design to liquidate from the face of the earth those who believe in private enterprise, property rights, a Christian faith and individual liberty.

The Red Communist invasion of Czechoslovakia was ruthlessly designed to eliminate one little spark of freedom—one faint hope of the Czechoslovakian people to be free. The Russian Communists greatly feared this small taste of freedom would spread and the Iron Curtain would crumble. The Iron Curtain was designed to prevent the Russian people from finding out the truth. We can now expect more Berlin walls and barbed wire to prevent the Czechoslovakian people from escaping to freedom. Further, this ruthless aggression without warning was coldly calculated to directly aid the Communist aggression now in progress in South Vietnam.

There is no real Russia-China rift on the question of world conquest by the Communists. Communist pressure is

mounting in the Far East, in the Mediterranean, in Europe, in the Caribbean, in the streets of our own country, in Mexico City, and in other free cities throughout the world. We must become united in the common cause of freedom or all free nations will be destroyed. We must strengthen our military—whatever the cost—and win the race for the conquest of space. Should Russia win control of space, it will be for conquest and slavery.

Mr. Speaker, today I have joined my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], in a bipartisan attempt to place this Nation on the offensive against Communist tyranny and aggression. This resolution would express the sense of this Congress "that the President should impose a selective moratorium on all American trade, air travel, diplomatic contacts, cultural exchanges, and other relationships existing between the United States and the Soviet Union and its satellites until such time as the Soviet Union and its satellites withdraw their troops from Czechoslovakia and permit that nation to express its national aspirations and conduct its own independent self-government without harassment from the heavy hand of occupying military forces of the Soviet Union and its satellites."

#### THE CRISIS IN EASTERN EUROPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the events of the last 5 weeks in Eastern Europe opened the eyes of all idealists and optimists about the evolution of Russian communism. We are a nation desirous of peace, balancing our national interests in our foreign policies with the common good of the international community and are ready to conclude reasonable compromises in international disputes. Respectful of national sovereignty of others we find it hard to accept that another world power, possessing the key to horrendous nuclear destruction, may want to return to the days of irresponsibility, aggression and totalitarian suppression of allied peoples. Yet this is what the Soviet Union has done on August 21, 1968, and continues doing in Czechoslovakia ever since, while threatening the same course of action against Rumania and Yugoslavia.

There was not even a conscious attempt to create a situation containing factors which could give at least an ambiguous justification to the treacherous invasion of an allied country not guilty of any breach of treaties in the military or economic sphere. The move of half a million troops without warning, the arrest of the highest officials of the Czechoslovak Government, rescinded only in the face of unanimous resistance of the populace and the party, display the same cold-blooded, cynical disregard of international law, sovereign equality of nations as did the Soviet attack on Hungary in 1956.

For in Hungary, too, man's search for freedom and dignity broke through the

visible and invisible walls of oppression and totalitarianism in 1956 and sought a return to democratic conditions enabling Hungary to regain control of its own destiny. Twelve years ago the brave Hungarian freedom fighters' elite found death on the streets of Budapest and other Hungarian cities, or in the camps of the Ukraine and Siberia. It was reform Communists like Premier Imre Nagy and Geza Losonczy who later shared the martyrdom with the same youth who wanted to rid Hungary from Communist dictatorship. Soviet imperialism could tolerate neither its national adversaries nor their nationalist ideological friends. The fate of Hungary was indeed a tragic one, the oppression of the Hungarian people a harrowing experience for the freedom-loving, pro-Western population, but the Hungarian revolution has still dealt the deathblow to monolithic communism. It awakened the West to the dangers of seeking a detente with the Soviet Union that is not based on Russian acceptance of generally observed norms of international law and the sovereign equality of nations. It is no exaggeration that without the events of 1956 in Eastern Europe there would not have been a Sino-Soviet dispute so soon and there would hardly have been American armies committed to the defense of South Vietnam. The heritage of the Hungarian revolution in Eastern Europe was the persistent yearning for more democracy and individual freedom. Though after Budapest it was realized that such developments must be achieved within the existing international framework keeping the skeleton of Communist Party rule intact in order not to incite Russian military intervention. It can be said that there is a direct linkage between the ideas of Imre Nagy, Joseph Dudas, Istvan Bibo in 1956 on the one hand, and Dr. Eduard Goldstuecker, Joseph Dubcek and Frantisek Kriegel on the other though the constitutional and philosophical frameworks might have been different.

When Secretary Antoni Novotny was removed from office and replaced by the Slovak Otto Dubcek, an era of democratization has begun in Czechoslovakia. Press censorship was abolished, first informally then by law, people were again free to express their ideas, the sins of the Stalinist era were revealed, compensation promised to its victims who were permitted to form their own organization. Economic reforms, too, were more intensively implemented, trade with the West was sought and the National Front was to be transformed into a working coalition of different parties. Finally, the Parliament recovered some of its democratic prerogatives and a new party congress was to be held to ratify the reforms.

The short-lived, cautious liberalization ended abruptly with the arrival of Soviet armies supported by token units of the four East European allies still commanded by the Russian military. The outcome is no longer in doubt despite the persistent attempts of the Czechoslovak leadership, left in office in order to emasculate its own reforms, that the repressive measures are temporary in character until the departure of Soviet troops.

In entering the country by military aggression the Soviet Union has violated the public law of the United Nations Charter and international law in at least six instances, according to Herbert Reis, U.S. delegate to the Special Committee on Principles of International Law of the United Nations. These include violation of the most basic U.N. principle: the respect for the sovereignty of a member and its right to treatment as a sovereign equal of any other member. This principle was, of course, also violated in the case of the Russian invasion of Hungary and was denounced in many U.N. resolutions between 1956 and 1962. Second, the Soviet Union violated the principle that members of the United Nations are bound by the charter to fulfill their international obligations in "good faith." Can there be any doubt that clandestine attack on an ally is not in accordance with the "good faith" provision of the law?

Third, the Soviet Government ignored the Charter stipulation that all members are obliged to settle international disputes in such a manner that peace, security, and justice are not endangered. The Russian invasion and subsequent troop concentration on the Soviet-Rumanian border led to a warning of the President of the United States that further invasions would be regarded with concern by the United States and that "the dogs of war should not be unleashed," certainly not a contribution to peace and security by the perpetrators of this international crime.

Fourth, Moscow disregarded the prohibition of the threat or the use of force in international relations. This was done both against Czechoslovakia and Rumania.

Fifth, the invasion, political control and occupation of Czechoslovakia violated the principle of equal rights and national self-determination of peoples, a tenet of international morality, if not international law.

Finally, there is no legal question that the Soviet invasion constituted intervention in the internal affairs of Czechoslovakia against existing treaty obligations between the two countries.

The Czechoslovak Government was forced to sign the Moscow accords which should more aptly be called surrender terms. The 14 points signed away Czechoslovakia's sovereignty and any possibility of that country's people to decide their own political future. The key point is the requirement that Czechoslovakia's political course "be changed in accordance with the Soviet type of socialism." A literal interpretation would mean turning back the clock in Czechoslovakia at least half a decade. For there was more freedom in Prague toward the end of the Novotny period than there is now in Moscow.

There is little ultimate difference between the Moscow demands of August 28 and the demands parroted by the Kadar group in Hungary in November 1956. The tactics used in Hungary in and after November 1956 are being repeated in Prague with the difference that the old leaders have been temporarily left in power. The old "salami" tactics—forcing the leaders

to dismiss "objectionable" colleagues until they themselves are isolated by the new appointees and turned out of office—are being successfully applied. Undoubtedly the purge will ultimately extend to President Svoboda, Party Secretary Dubcek and Premier Czernik as well.

Simultaneously, the meaning and place of the January-to-August events in Communist ideology are constantly redefined. While Dubcek and Czernik consider liberalization a progressive element in communism—after all it did not reject Marx, Lenin, or party primacy—Soviet, East German and Polish newspapers agitate for the removal of "counterrevolutionaries" and their physical punishment. The process will last 3 to 4 months. Thereupon, the new leadership will declare the "liberal" period an era of "counterrevolution" and personnel cadres will be rewritten. The best that can be hoped for is that passive resistance may avoid massive killings of post-1956 Hungary and cushion the sufferings of those who have believed that free speech might be practiced in any Communist country.

What can we do that would help the downtrodden Czechs, the restive Hungarians, and the still seminational Rumanians? War is out of the realm of possibility; even the Czechs did not resist the Russian occupation. Loans for industrial modernization, and hence for economic independence from the Soviet Union have been "negotiated" last week in Moscow out of consideration. But we still can keep the fire of moral indignation burning under Moscow especially during the U.N. General Assembly session that has commenced on the 24th. The first two bargaining levers could be the resolutions submitted in the Security Council in August by the United States and Canada for a withdrawal of Russian troops and the dispatching of a Committee of Observers by the Secretary General. In addition, our delegation in the United Nations could dramatize anew the basic issues of Soviet colonialism and denial of self-determination, issues of great importance to the underdeveloped countries which are not members of the two blocs. A continuing injury to Soviet interests there might help impel the Kremlin toward a less extreme course in Czechoslovakia.

The most obvious way of raising related issues of suppression and occupation would be a reopening of the question of the presence of Soviet troops in Hungary. This is both a violation of innumerable U.N. resolutions, based on a treaty made before regaining sovereignty by the Hungarian Government, and a source of danger to the peace and security of the area. For Hungary was used as a staging area for the attack on another country and the pro-Moscow Government even forced participation by token Hungarian units in the aggressive acts of the Soviet Union against Czechoslovakia. There are two ways of procedure: One would be asking the Secretary General to implement General Assembly resolution No. 1857/XVII of the United Nations that empowered the Secretary General to take such initiative as he deems necessary in regard to the Hungarian question. The second would

September 26, 1968

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

be to place the question on the agenda on the basis of Hungarian participation in the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia and of the use of Soviet troops stationed in Hungary for the attack.

While our Government must be and is attempting to safeguard our national interest and the interests of freedom and national self-determination abroad, there are many voices who would like to denigrate our reputation by comparing our valiant efforts to secure independence and self-determination to the non-Communist South Vietnamese in face of civil war and external aggression with the Soviet rape of Czechoslovakia.

In the New York Times of Sunday, September 15, 1968, there appeared a half-page ad—page 4e—stating among others:

Moreover there seems to be a growing rhythm of international immorality. Soviet leaders have invaded Hungary and Czechoslovakia so they can impose their type of "socialism" while the American leaders invade Vietnam and the Dominican Republic to impose their form of democracy. . . . we urge Americans who almost unanimously challenge the Soviet right to place its tanks in Czechoslovakia to reassess their own position on Vietnam. Isn't this what our government has been doing? Haven't too many of us who are now critical of Mr. Brezhnev been tolerant of the same type of deception and crimes when practiced by our own leaders?

Mr. Speaker, this advertisement and similar voices which can be occasionally heard are an insult to the intelligence of the American people, to the integrity and peace-loving attitudes of the U.S. administration, and to the bravery of the American soldier in Vietnam. They are strongly anti-American, factually incorrect and small wonder that the signers of the statement read like the blue book of the American professional bleeding hearts, a mixture of Communists, socialists, fellow travelers and pacifists. We must categorically reject any attempts to compare Vietnam with Czechoslovakia. We were invited to Vietnam by the lawful Government that was attacked both by homegrown guerrillas and foreign troops and we are there to expand freedom and not to stifle it. While searching for a honorable peace at Paris and using all our diplomatic means to achieve such a solution we must never forget that we are there for a noble purpose: to prevent Czechoslovakia-type Communist aggression against other peoples of Southeast Asia as well. May I now ask for unanimous consent to submit extraneous material and for the extension and revision of my remarks and those of my colleagues participating in the debate for the next 5 days?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, the recent invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union is wrong and no excuse can be made for it. The deliberate suppression of freedom by Soviet and Warsaw Pact troops is a tragedy not only for the people of Czechoslovakia but for the people of the entire world.

It demonstrates that communism is not a monolith but instead has deep divi-

sions regarding the necessity for personal freedom and intellectual integrity. It also, unfortunately, reveals that the old hardline military solution Communists still have the strength in the Soviet Government to overcome the Moscow "doves" and use solely military force to maintain their national security. The threat that an unfriendly Czechoslovakia might geographically split the Warsaw Pact states into two parts and create a possible invasion route from the west to the borders of Russia were arguments we are informed were used by the Russian military leaders to justify this invasion. What a colossal tragedy that their military demands should prevail and the beginnings of Czech freedom should be snuffed out.

America must not panic nor be foolish in the face of this display of military arrogance. Instead we must fashion our future policies in light of what has occurred. Many American "hardliners" are taking the same position as that taken in Moscow—more troops, more military involvement—more rhetoric of the post-Hungary variety. This is panic. Others try to justify the Soviet action and say it will "be all right now"—this is foolish. Instead we should say to the uncommitted world: "See what hardline communism is and learn from Hungary and Czechoslovakia." We should say to our allies, "You had better help us; we are your partner, not your benefactor." Finally we should leave open our options with regard to dissident satellites in the Communist orbit.

America must stand strong but it must not fall into the trap of believing the solutions to all problems are military. We know now that the Communist world is not a monolith. We know that the Communist world is suffering from stresses and strains. Let us be strong but also wise and compassionate so that we resist the aggressors, convince the neutral and give hope and a bridge out of Soviet domination for the Czechs, the Hungarians, the Yugoslavs and others.

America can do this if we reject rigid old-fashioned solutions and move toward a new America with new priorities for its resources and new solutions for world problems. This means reexamining and improving ourselves. Our time today is short, so at this point I have asked that an article I recently prepared for publication be placed in the RECORD so you may read some of my beliefs as to what we must do:

[From the office of Congressman BROCK ADAMS, 7th District, State of Washington, August 26, 1968]

## TOWARD A NEW AMERICA

The crisis in Europe caused by the invasion of Czechoslovakia offends the sense of decency in every free man and starkly demonstrates the need for America to establish new, vital, intelligent priorities.

In America today, this continuing series of crises in our foreign policy, the incipient revolt of our youth, and the growing black and white racism in our cities, are not isolated problems. They are maladies which have spread throughout our society since World War II but have been submerged under the tide of our startling economic growth, technological advancement and population explosion.

There is a gulf developing between the

American political parties and the people. When our political parties carry on "business as usual" in the face of crisis, growing numbers in our society resort to nonpolitical action, and all too often to violence.

This gulf also applies to the use of old-fashioned terms such as "liberal" and "conservative" in our private and public debates. These terms are applied to particular policies and individuals in the sense they were used in the 1930's when, in fact, today they have no meaningful application. The "liberal" of the 1930's, for example, would shudder at my being referred to as a "liberal" Democrat. His welfare system (not to mention agricultural subsidies, traditional public-work programs and other relics) is now dated and harmful both to its recipient and the economy. The ultimate irony, however, is that I must continue to fight and vote for his old welfare system because the alternatives presented to us in Congress are the cobwebs or nothing at all. When nothing at all would breed chaos, there is no real choice. Like the example of the thirsty man who has the choice of salt water or no water at all, the end result can be the same but the salt water at least postpones the inevitable. This salt-water psychology permeates much of our political system and it has brought bewilderment, confusion, and finally frustration, not only to our younger generation but to several generations spanning decades.

## A NEW SET OF PRIORITIES

Meeting this growing discontent really means putting America's problems in perspective. As a beginning, America must decide how it will use its immense but nevertheless limited resources. For twenty years a majority of our people have lived in growing prosperity and America has enjoyed overwhelming strength in relationship to the rest of the world. This has lulled and finally trapped us into an illusion that we can do everything at the same time. We must now face the knowledge that our resources are not inexhaustible. We must assign priorities for their use. How do we assign priorities? Very simply. First, we must meet our crises, then necessities, next our ordinary needs, and finally, if anything is left, indulge in some luxuries.

Let us examine these categories and face reality in establishing priorities for a new America.

## FOREIGN POLICY

The first crisis is in our foreign policy, and that means bring the war in Viet Nam into perspective with our worldwide foreign policy commitments and objectives. Since 1965 I have repeatedly cautioned against treating this small Asian country as an Armageddon. To contend that the only way to save ourselves from communism is through the use of conventional military force on the borders of communist nations—a contention which played no small part in getting us embroiled in Viet Nam—is to indulge in the luxury of a legend to which we can no longer afford to pay tribute.

Reality dictates that the South Vietnamese must in the end settle their own difficulties. Based on that knowledge and the fact that we have more than made good on any commitments we have had to South Viet Nam, we must begin to move out of Viet Nam so the Saigon government knows that it must meet its responsibilities. As we disengage our troops and de-escalate our military efforts in Viet Nam, we can work to assist the South Vietnamese to produce a government which will have enough support to avoid an immediate collapse and we can aid those who believe they cannot live in the country when we have departed. We must face the fact that our almost total preoccupation with Viet Nam has diverted us from our proper role in world affairs and to a large degree prevented us from dealing with America's legitimate concerns in the Middle East

(during the continuing Israeli-Arab crisis) and in Europe (the Czech crisis, for example).

#### DOMESTIC POLICY

The second crisis is in our central cities where black and white racism, exacerbated by poverty, is taking hold. We must have enforcement of the law and the creation of order with justice in all sections of our cities. The alternative is anarchy. We must also more intelligently divert a large portion of our national tax dollars into meeting the problems of poverty in our cities. The alternative is urban chaos.

Repeatedly I have warned in speeches, to both civil rights groups and law enforcement groups, that our law enforcement system has been buried in the back row of our priorities for too long. Today we most urgently need new police administrations equipped with money and social insight to deal with our ever-worsening crime problems. Instead we have too many old-timers preaching the philosophy of the club and gun. Conversely, too often our civil rights groups will excuse violent criminal acts as being solely a result of past social ills. We most urgently need expanded criminal courts and correctional institutions. Our police departments are undermanned and underpaid. Archaic prisons, rather than correcting a man, solidify his commitment to crime. Radical improvements in our law enforcement system can be brought about at a relatively modest cost. Increased salaries and educational incentives for the police officer, expanded court facilities to make justice accurate and swift, variation in custodial institutions to make rehabilitation possible and increased emphasis on probation and parole services to make them function properly are minimal requirements which can be brought about at a relatively modest cost. These must have high priority.

Black and white racism is the greatest threat to American cities today. The black population in our cities has been and continues to be shut out of the political, economic and social structure of this nation. As a result, the pent-up energy of new and better educated leaders in the black community has been increasingly funneled into anti-political and antisocial action. The moderate leadership of the Negro community which historically has sought gradual accommodation with whites through traditional programs has been in retreat before black militancy for several years. This retreat has been hastened by the shocking loss of Dr. Martin Luther King.

The violence that has now erupted could have been avoided by meaningful antipov-erty and social action programs a few short years ago. But these preventive antipov-erty, education and job programs initiated during the early 1960's began suffering cut-backs almost at birth. Agriculture, the military, public works, and other traditional programs all retained their "untouchable" status so that when Viet Nam began to pressure the budget, the new programs for the poor became number one target for the budgetary axe. The long-range objective is, as it always has been among men of good will, to provide Negro citizens with equal opportunities and the sense of dignity and respect that all freeborn men have a right to expect. But legal equality has little meaning if the Negro has no political and economic stake in American society. Our interim objective must be to stake him. This will take new programs and new money, supported by the country and implemented by bright, tough-minded men, both black and white. As a beginning, the interim programs must include: (1) local cooperative ownership of business; (2) local control of a wide range of jobs in the central city by those living there; (3) creation of new housing, probably including suburbs, by new financial interests; and (4) radically revamped school

systems to bring acceptable public education back to the central city.

It is essential that we understand that at this point in time, more old-time give-away programs will lead only to further disappointment among whites and greater rejection among blacks. We have learned that equal opportunity and brotherhood among the races depends not on how much whites give blacks, but rather on how much whites are willing to share with them.

This is at the heart of the concept of Negro ownership, for until the Negro community actually owns something, it has nothing to share. Giving and sharing are very different concepts. The elimination of racial tensions in our society depends to a large extent on our willingness to acknowledge this difference. How senseless and tragic it would be should we decide to do otherwise.

#### ECONOMIC POLICY

The third crisis we must immediately face is really an offspring of the first two. It involves the stresses on our economic system brought on by excessive deficit spending to cover the rising cost of Viet Nam while meeting domestic emergencies. This has caused a challenge to the dollar, a reduction of our gold reserves, and spawned a plethora of palliative tax programs which patch but do not meet the crisis. Again we have a crisis caused by our inability—or unwillingness—to change past policies in the face of new problems.

Despite the fact that in 1968 we are engaged in a fantastically costly land war in Asia, we continue to maintain troops and their dependents in Europe, Korea, Japan, and elsewhere at a cost of over \$3 billion without a firm policy as to what they are there to accomplish. We continue bilateral aid, including military assistance of questionable necessity, to scores of small countries. This continues while we engage in the luxuries of farm subsidies, unusual space program hardware, and traditional public works, to name a few. I do not mean that each of these programs is without value. What I do mean is that in any sense of national priorities, such programs must be subordinated in time of crisis.

Clearly there are a number of steps we must take to abate the challenge to the dollar. They are steps to be sure which will find little support among the powerful lobbies, or for that matter the present institutional committee structure of Congress. They are steps which run directly contrary to the inertia of the past. But with the support of the people at the grass roots, I think we can: (1) reduce the annual \$30 billion cost of Viet Nam if we disengage and de-escalate our military involvement; (2) sharply reduce the \$3.4 billion we are spending to maintain troops and their dependents in developed areas of the world by re-examining their function and our commitment; and (3) re-examine and substantially reduce our bilateral aid commitments, especially military aid to developing countries in Latin America, Africa and Asia.

Putting our priorities in perspective for the new America we want to create really means relieving. If not solving, three inter-related crises—the Viet Nam war, urban and racial unrest and financial instability. These are our crises, but this is not meant to suggest that no other problems are troubling our society.

There are, for example, unfair draft laws and inequitable income tax laws. There is a desperate need for better air and water pollution control, modern comprehensive transportation systems, stiffer air safety standards, and a host of other problems to be met with worthwhile programs. But each must seek its own level of importance after we have met our crises.

Our mistake heretofore has been our stubborn retention and expansion of nonessen-

tials even when crises face us—our inability to put first things first. When disagreement between the two political parties with their so-called "liberal" and "conservative" wings becomes nothing more than a dialogue over how to roll back or maintain the present order, we no longer have a healthy confrontation of old versus new. Today our political parties seem to be souping up their horses and buggies to race in a Grand Prix. Souped-up and renamed programs will not solve the crises of the new America.

John F. Kennedy liked to say that there is nothing so powerful as an idea whose time has come. Everywhere in America—in the ghettos, in the suburbs, on the farms—we can, if we will listen, hear new people using new words to express ideas whose time has come.

No doubt "old pros" chortle at the suggestion that the American people desire a clear choice between traditional policies on the one hand and a creative, problem-solving meeting of our priorities on the other. I believe they are mistaken and 1968 will mark one of those turning points in American history when the people demand that this nation hoist the old anchors and set out on a new and enlightened course. Let us begin.

(Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an article.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

I commend the gentleman for taking this time to express the indignation of this House and this country at the dastardly, brutal aggression which has been perpetrated upon the brave people of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union. We remember, Mr. Speaker, it was in 1923 that the Japanese made a dastardly attack upon China and laid the predicate for World War II. We also very vividly recall that Hitler also attacked, without provocation, in furtherance of nothing except his own evil, devilish ambition for conquest, the nation and the people of Austria and of Czechoslovakia, and he assured the inevitable coming of World War II.

The regrettable thing, Mr. Speaker, is that in 1923, when Japan made that dastardly assault, the League of Nations and the leading powers of the world stood by and did not do anything to prevent it or to punish the perpetrator of the aggression. Also, one of the grievous mistakes of our time was the fact that again the leading nations of the world stood by and allowed Hitler to perpetrate his aggression upon Austria and Czechoslovakia. Even the Prime Minister of a great country with a great past, and a great record of humanitarian accomplishment and contribution, said that it was no concern to the people of his country if Hitler invaded a nation the name of which a lot of his people could not pronounce, and which was far away from their homes. That was a part of the contribution to the bombs that later fell upon the country of that Prime Minister.

We saw a little while ago another aggressor, a totalitarian from the left, if Hitler was a totalitarian from the right, perpetrate the same kind of assault and conquest and tyranny upon the people

September 26, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 9219

of Hungry. Again the United Nations and the leading nations relatively stood aside and, like Pilate, relatively washed their hands of that episode.

Now another brutal aggression has come, and a half million soldiers of the Soviet Union, certain members of the Communist Warsaw Pact and bloc went into that brave little country and took over the physical possession and domination of it to show the world that they were utterly impervious to world opinion, had no sentiment except contempt for what the world thought of what they did, determined to hold that brave people so tightly in their orbit that they could not politically breathe except by permission of their Soviet master.

Again what concerns me is that the United Nations and the leading nations of the world stand by. I have heard relatively little of expressions of indignation, let alone proposals to give assistance to these brave people. I want to join in what was said by the able gentleman from Washington [Mr. ANAMS], that we should let those people know that while the time may not be propitious for us to do all that we would like to do, that we do not intend to stand aside, indifferent to their being conquered by a sinister master and brought within subjection of that ambitious, imperial power, that we can do something, and we do propose in good time to do something. To help them regain their freedom.

I would also say to many of my fellow citizens living in the Miami area and in other parts of America, be assured, we have not given up hope of getting rid of Castro in Cuba. We may not find the time as I have said, propitious to do all that we would like to do right now, but we want them to know that we are not accepting Castro's domination of the beautiful Caribbean with his communistic oligarchy and his imperialism there.

So I think it is well that others, like the able gentleman from New Jersey, who has set us a good precedent here this afternoon, should speak up and let those Czechoslovakia people who are today having to make the critical decision of whether they will put up with a military subjection, overwhelmingly conquered and overwhelmingly ruled by soldiery, or whether they will give up their aspirations to be a relatively free people. It will influence them in order to get rid of the armed forces now upon their necks, it will give them moral strength and courage to hold out if they know that in this great country where we love freedom we are aware of the freedom that they have lost. We want to give them encouragement to believe that in God's good time freedom will come again to this brave country of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. PATTEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida, and I welcome your remarks and I agree with you.

I intended to explore this in depth, but I see such distinguished company here wanting to pay tribute to our colleague, that great Virginian, Governor Tuck, that I will not continue.

(Mr. PATTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, and others, are discussing the impact of recent Soviet aggression in Czechoslovakia.

I commend them, and I join them in denouncing the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia. This is a country which tried to proceed cautiously in the direction of a more humane interpretation of socialism within the Warsaw Pact framework. As a result, Czechoslovakia has been dealt a blow similar to that of Hungary, where the popular uprising of 1956 sought to restore full democracy and to sever Hungary's ties with the Soviet Union.

Soviet suppression of freedom movements in Czechoslovakia and Hungary shows that the Soviet Union is unwilling to tolerate any evolution toward individual liberty in the countries of East and Central Europe, lest the yearning of man for freedom might infect various parts of the Soviet Union herself. It also shows that the Soviet Union is still not a law-abiding member of the international community.

No less than six basic provisions of international law and the United Nations Charter have been violated by the occupation of Czechoslovakia. These include the two bases of international law and order: the sovereign equality of nations in relation to one another and the fulfillment of treaties in good faith. Moreover, all the U.N. injunctions against a military solution of international disputes were disregarded by the Soviet Union.

There appears to be little hope for Czechoslovakia despite the exemplary passive resistance of the people and their governmental leaders against the occupiers at this time. Six of the nine major liberal leaders have already been purged, and the rest, including Dubcek, may be forced to resign in a matter of months.

The ramifications of the events in Czechoslovakia extend over a wider field. Not only were the dissident Communist countries of Rumania and Yugoslavia threatened militarily, but the Soviet diplomatic offensive is now directed against the Federal Republic of Germany. Some West German Government leaders complain that the Soviet Union is acting as if West Germany should be in the Soviet sphere of influence, according to Washington Evening Star writer Crosby O. Noyes. The Soviet claim to a legal right of intervention in West Germany presages, if not an invasion of Germany, then perhaps another explosive Berlin crisis.

In order to avert such developments we must take energetic diplomatic and military measures in time.

Strong steps should be taken in the United Nations to place the American resolution that was vetoed by Russia in the Security Council on the agenda of the General Assembly. Also, similar efforts must be made with regard to the Canadian resolution calling for a U.N. fact-finding mission to Prague.

In this connection, the U.N. Secretary General should be called upon to report back to the assembly on the initiatives he has taken on the Hungarian question

under resolution of the U.N. Assembly of December 20, 1962.

Finally, we must take steps to strengthen NATO militarily and politically. The task is not ours alone. The European allies must contribute their fair share. But the United States must assume the moral and political leadership.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleagues in condemning the Russian invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia. Russian threats of military force subsequently have been extended against the Federal Republic of Germany and even to two Communist satellites, Rumania and Yugoslavia.

The free world has expressed its revulsion and disgust over these manifestations of Soviet aggression, but this has helped little so far as the Czechoslovak people and their leadership is concerned.

More than 24 divisions are stationed in Czechoslovakia; six of the reformist leaders already have been purged and Party Secretary Dubcek still is high on the Russian purge lists; most of the reforms which had taken place since January were rescinded under the muzzle of Russian guns. There is little doubt that the remaining liberal leaders will ultimately have to resign under Soviet pressure. A curtain of silence will fall over this pro-Western nation.

The similarities to the situation in Hungary in 1956 are striking. On both occasions man's yearning for freedom has created powerful pressures within and without the party to create a democratic order to pursue policies in the national interest. While the pent-up pressures in Hungary were not permitted by Communist leaders to find expression without a revolt, this revolt was so unanimous that a new government of Communists and non-Communists could be created under the reformist Imre Nagy. Yet both Dubcek and Nagy were denounced by Russia, Nagy even suffering the fate of martyrdom in 1958 by the Soviet and Hungarian authorities who had been put in power by Moscow.

The invasion was fought by the Hungarians, still hoping for Western help. Twelve years later the Czechs and Slovaks have no such illusion. The same salami tactics are used in Czechoslovakia which were used in Hungary. Unless Western diplomatic pressure is stronger than in 1956, Czechoslovakia also will share the same sad fate as Hungary.

The General Assembly of the United Nations has just opened. In remarks on this floor earlier today I urged the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to quickly adopt my concurrent resolution which would start the machinery moving to involve the United Nations in behalf of all the captive nations. It is mandatory that the United States move with more elan and consistency to achieve the condemnation of Soviet actions in Prague. It is essential that a U.N. fact-finding mission be sent to Czechoslovakia.

But beyond the actions in the U.N. we must take strong measures in bilateral Russian-American relations and abandon the illusion of a detente. We cannot "do business as usual" and remain credible to the world in our de-

nunciation of Soviet aggression. Let us not extend the credibility gap to Czechoslovakia as well. Much damage has been done by the pursuit of a summit meeting between the President and Soviet leaders in Moscow even after August 21, but seemingly the project has finally been put off.

In NATO we must take constructive steps to insure greater participation of our Allies and must ourselves pursue a NATO summit meeting as proposed by West German Chancellor Kiri-Georg Kiesinger. It should be held immediately after the Foreign Ministers' meeting of NATO on October 7.

I believe that former Vice President Richard Nixon has made a valuable contribution, has, indeed shown the way, by calling his staff together to devise new policies for countering the Russian threat in Europe and by sending former Governor William Scranton on a fact-finding tour of Europe. Certainly the Congress should follow suit with hearings and studies by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for allowing me to participate in this discussion.

The ruthless invasion of Czechoslovakia, last month, by Soviet forces should pain all those who love freedom for the move was made to stifle the spirit of a people who dared to express individualism.

Czechoslovakia, through the 1920's and 1930's, had been the showcase of democracy in Central Europe. It was a prosperous and productive nation of different national groups who had learned to live together. The agreement at Munich betrayed Czechoslovakia and doomed her to conquest by Hitler and to eventual subjugation by the Russians.

While I recognize that our Government was in no position to commit troops at the time of the Russian invasion, I feel strongly that we should take economic action that will make those who crushed Czechoslovakia reconsider their action.

If the cold war refrigerates to its 1950 temperature, the onus is on the Russians but the Czechs unfortunately are the first victims.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, free people everywhere are dismayed at the new Soviet aggression. There was the recent march on Czechoslovakia, the threats against our NATO ally, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the continued presence of Russian troops in Hungary.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia has again demonstrated the unwillingness of Russia to abide by the rules of international law which it professes to accept. At least six principles of international law were violated. Further, the United Nations Charter obligations have been breached.

Russia also violated the U.N. Charter when it notified the Federal Republic of Germany of its claim to the right of intervention under obsolete and misinterpreted Charter clauses. The menacing moves against Rumania at the end of August were further violations of the U.N. Charter.

As long as Russian troops remain in Czechoslovakia, there is little hope of any degree of national independence or effective domestic control by the surviving government. The purge of the present leadership has already begun and likely will continue despite the unanimous support displayed by the Czech people for the Dubcek-Czernik government.

The situation also is bleak in Hungary, which has been occupied by Soviet troops since 1956 when they crushed the short-lived attempt of the Hungarian people and Government under Imre Nagy to throw off the yoke of Moscow.

The narrow limits allowed the Hungarian Government are made clear by the presence of Russian troops and the nation's complete economic dependence upon the U.S.S.R. The presence of Russian troops in Hungary facilitated Russian military moves against Czechoslovakia and would do the same in case of a Soviet attack against Rumania or Yugoslavia.

This is a disturbing and intolerable situation for the freedom-loving Hungarian people. These people had to dispute with the Dubcek-Czernik regime, which was the first government since 1945 that listened to the legitimate complaints of the 700,000 Hungarians in Slovakia.

We must increase our efforts in the United Nations to achieve a condemnation of the Russian occupation of both countries. There has been no discussion in the past 6 years of the Soviet presence in Hungary which the Secretary General has treated as a problem solved by inaction.

We must also reinforce the determination of our NATO allies to contribute militarily and politically to halting the erosion of the alliance. Perhaps the United States should take the initiative in calling a NATO summit meeting to take a whole new look at the alliance.

Here in Congress, I am joining my colleagues in recommending that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs hold hearings and make a study of the situation in Central and Eastern Europe with the assistance of academic and political experts.

The dangers inherent in unchecked Russian aggression in Europe require that we do our utmost to devise adequate countermeasures.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am joining my colleagues, ably led by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, in condemning recent Soviet aggression in Czechoslovakia and calling for further moves in the United Nations to insure the withdrawal of all Russian occupation troops from that country and also from Hungary where they are still stationed in violation of numerous U.N. General Assembly resolutions.

Twenty years ago the universal declaration of human rights was voted by the United Nations General Assembly but the callous disregard for human rights displayed by Soviet occupation troops in Prague, Bratislava and other cities of Czechoslovakia shows that progress has been slow or nonexistent in Communist countries.

While more flagrant in Czechoslovakia, where even a reformist faction of the Communist Party believing in a limited freedom of expression of the people is forced by military power to rescind its liberalizing measures, violations of human rights continue in the entire Communist bloc.

The massive influx of Russian divisions, 24 extra since August 21, into Central Europe also creates a dangerous strategic situation for NATO and urgent measures are needed to restore the balance and the confidence of the Western European nations which are both shocked and intimidated by the aggressive moves of the Soviet Union.

Finally, I am joining my colleagues in asking for a study by the House Foreign Affairs Committee of the current situation in Eastern and Central Europe and its ramifications for our commitments and interests in Europe. Hearings should be held and outside academic and political experts asked to undertake a scholarly, policy-oriented study of the situation. We also hope that the State Department is undertaking an in-depth study on this vital subject.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am joining my colleagues today in discussing recent developments in East Central Europe as a result of the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia and the use of threat of force against several other European nations like West Germany, Rumania, and Yugoslavia.

It is with sad heart that we are contemplating the strangulation of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union's military command and political leadership. Despite the brave attempts of the present leadership which possesses the support of the overwhelming majority of the population to hang on and preserve at least some of the liberalization measures, the outcome can not be in doubt. Already now Russian pressures for the removal of Party Secretary Dubcek have been renewed, several of the others have already resigned under pressure and gleichschaltung will take its place slowly but inescapably in Czechoslovakia.

There is one avenue which we must continue without respite and reluctance. This is to bring upon the Soviet Union the moral indignation of the world, expressed through United Nations actions. The Canadian proposal for the dispatching of a fact-finding commission to Prague should be renewed in the Assembly and every informational agency or instrumentality of the U.S. Government and public must be used to denounce the rape of Czechoslovakia and demand the withdrawal of all Russian troops from that country and also from Hungary where they are stationed in violation of numerous United Nations resolutions. While full success will probably be denied to these moves, they might well have a restraining influence upon Moscow in its dealing with Czechoslovakia and alleviate the suffering of its people.

We must also urge a reassessment of NATO commitments in the view of the deployment of 24 Russian divisions in Czechoslovakia. A NATO summit might well be a useful step as would be an ac-

celation of returning the withdrawn troops to Central Europe on our part.

While not abandoning all hopes for later negotiations with the Soviet Union, we must realize that until the balance is restored and the Soviets are aware of our determination not to permit aggression in Europe, any talks would only condone the August invasion and the subsequent Russian diplomatic and psychological offensive against the Federal Republic of Germany. As the Earl of Avon wrote on September 14 in his New York Times editorial:

The history of the thirties has taught us mercilessly that to attempt new agreements, while ignoring flagrant breaches of the old, earns contempt, not progress.

Finally, it is necessary for the House Foreign Affairs Committee to investigate and analyze the changes occurring in European security and American security in view of the Czechoslovak and related events. Hearings and a study by outside academic experts should be undertaken at the earliest feasible date. In this connection, I must commend the Republican presidential candidate for arranging for a study of American commitments by his staff and for sending former Gov. William Scranton to Europe for a fact-finding tour. We, in Congress are also obligated to undertake a comprehensive study of the ramifications of the Russian occupation of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join my colleagues, ably led by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN], in analyzing the situation created by renewed Russian aggression in Czechoslovakia for the entire region.

Just as 12 years ago when the brave people and youth of Hungary rose against their Soviet masters and established a government which promised democratization under Premier Imre Nagy, the people of Czechoslovakia have, in the last weeks, experienced the crushing weight of the Russian juggernaut. While circumstances were different, and while at least the tremendous blood-letting that had accompanied the valiant, but futile, resistance of the Hungarian youth and army units was avoided in Czechoslovakia, the fate of both countries has been, and will be, essentially the same. Both are deprived and will continue to be deprived of national independence, domestic sovereignty. Their people will miss the basic human rights of expression and assembly and will have to adopt the "Soviet type" of socialism.

The repetition of the 1956 events in Prague shows both that man's yearning for freedom is a fundamental, non-ideological fact that breaks through the bondage of tyranny even if has sometimes to use the same ideological arguments which the invaders have forced upon them.

The basic evil in central and eastern Europe today has been now exposed: It is the presence of Soviet occupation troops in the various countries, most particularly Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland. One must concentrate on these issues and force as much as possible, with diplomatic means, the withdrawal

of the Red army from the central European heartland. Given such circumstances, the people's yearning for freedom and independence would help the present regime evolve in a more democratic and truly national direction.

The United States has the moral duty and political interest to promote such a policy. Now the whole world is condemning the Russian occupation of Prague, including many western Communist parties as well. We must do everything in our power diplomatically to have the U.N. General Assembly condemn the aggression, authorize the dispatching of a factfinding commission to Prague, and to reopen the Hungarian question. For 6 years the latter has been relegated to oblivion by the resolution leaving it up to the Secretary General to report back to the Assembly after he has taken initiative which he deemed necessary. Our administration should ask Mr. U Thant to report back and place the question on the agenda of the General Assembly again.

The Russian moves created legitimate and deep doubts about the effectiveness of NATO defenses which have been pursued with leisure in the last few years as a result of the Vietnam war and bridge-building policies. The holding of a NATO summit might be a good step to start strengthening our NATO ties and defenses. More importantly, the Congress should take part in the deliberations over policy revisions by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. It would be advisable for the committee to hold public hearings and authorize a study by academic and political experts of the situation.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it is with concern that I am joining the responsible remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey on the serious situation the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia, its continued presence in Hungary, and its threat of the use of force against Rumania, Yugoslavia, and the Federal Republic of Germany, has created for the peace and security of the region and its freedom-loving population.

We have witnessed the invasion and slow political and economic strangulation of Czechoslovakia so aptly described by the New York Times on September 20, 1968:

The heavy reality overwhelms the contrary appearance of a permissive or confused occupation, an appearance given off by repeated outcroppings of Czech dignity and valor. The Russians are strangling Czechoslovakia.

Yet, the move of over one-half million troops into the small country is now used by the Kremlin leaders for the achievement of wider objectives. The Russian policy has had repercussions already in two directions: toward the Balkans and the Middle East and toward the Federal Republic of Germany. The threat of invasion of Rumania has already caused our President to warn against "unleashing the dogs of war" and the "caving in" of the Rumanian President on the conclusion of a friendship and alliance treaty extension with the U.S.S.R. and restricting intergovernmental visits between Rumania and her

second largest economic partner, West Germany. Yugoslavia also feels militarily threatened and it looks like Russia is trying to clear the decks before a new Middle East crisis is in order, to be in a better position to intervene.

Equally serious is the constant Russian propaganda barrage accusing the Federal Republic of aggressive policies and new-Nazism, claiming the right of intervention under the hostile state clause—article 107—of the United Nations Charter. If ever tried in earnest, this would mean world war III and the nuclear holocaust. But even the bluff is supposed to work on the West German attitude toward America and NATO and to lead up to a new Berlin offensive by Ulbricht and the Kremlin.

Under such grave circumstances, the need for a wide and far-reaching re-assessment of our NATO and East Central European policy becomes mandatory. Today I am calling for such a review within the executive branch, but it is also necessary to undertake an in-depth study and hearings on the situation by our House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Particular attention should be given to the consequences of continued Soviet military presence in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. A victim of Russian aggression about 12 years ago, Hungary has had to maintain over 50,000 troops on her soil since 1956, despite numerous U.N. General Assembly resolutions and strong protests of the majority of all nations in the world. These troops were used against Czechoslovakia and now Russians are manning the missile and anti-missile installations in Hungary directed against the West. The strategic repercussions of the presence of one-half million Russian crack troops in Czechoslovakia is too obvious to need detailed explanation. Under these conditions, the strengthening of NATO and a full-fledged psychological counteroffensive pointing out Russian aggression and calling for its ceasing becomes the demand of the hour and it is my hope that both the administration and Congress will find ways and means to implement such policies in the near future.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleagues in condemning Russian aggression in Czechoslovakia and subsequent moves to create fear and confusion among our NATO allies, particularly the Federal Republic of Germany.

In this connection it must be remembered that our administration has also committed many errors of omission, particularly because of its failure to warn the Soviet Union against invading Czechoslovakia and the deployment of 24 new divisions in Central Europe. The hypocritical attitude was best displayed when the President until very recently let the public know that he is still considering a trip to Moscow for a summit meeting with the invaders of Prague while at the same time our Ambassador to the United Nations has denounced the hideous disregard of international law by the Soviet Union.

Has not the renewed Russian aggression been sufficient to convince the dreamers and bridgebuilders? Is it not enough that because of the failure of a

strong American response we are generally considered in Europe as partners of a secret sphere of influence agreement with the Soviet Union that allows the Soviet Union to act like the rogue elephant in its own sphere? Is it not enough that since September 2 the Soviet Union initiated a new diplomatic offensive under the latent use of force threat against our major NATO ally on the continent, the Federal Republic of Germany? That even a liberal, but truly American, scholar-diplomat like George Kennan considers the prospect of a summit sheer madness? And that he is no longer sure that because of our defensive attitudes after the Prague occupation and recent changes within the Kremlin that Soviet Union might not attack Western Europe?

The time has come to take energetic and remedial actions. The restoration of NATO as an effective political alliance with sufficient military strength, a task which was neglected on both sides of the Atlantic since 1964, must become first priority beginning with a summit meeting of the NATO countries' Presidents or Prime Ministers.

We must also assume the psychological offensive and try through the use of world opinion in the General Assembly at least partially restrain unbridled restoration of Stalinism in Czechoslovakia and the other occupied country of East Central Europe: Hungary. It would be certainly to our advantage and to the advantage of the Hungarian people as well to raise the issue of Soviet presence in Hungary together with the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia. For the past 6 years as a result of our bridgebuilding policies the United Nations tabled the issue by leaving it to the Secretary General to take any measures or initiatives he deems necessary on this issue. Of course, Mr. U Thant has taken none. It would be time to remind him of his delegated power to report back to the Assembly.

Finally, it would be helpful if the House Foreign Affairs Committee were to undertake a comprehensive study of the situation in East Central Europe and its repercussions on American and NATO interests in Europe and hold hearings on the subject and preferably also secure the cooperation of well-known academic and political experts in the field to such a study. In this connection I have to commend former Vice President Nixon, our presidential candidate for having commissioned such a study by his staff and for having sent former Gov. William Scranton on a factfinding tour to Europe. The Congress should not do any less.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am joining my colleagues led by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey in condemning recent Russian aggression against Czechoslovakia and discussing the ensuing dangerous situation in Central Europe by the infusion of massive Soviet military forces and the threat of the use of force by the Soviet Union against other states in the region.

All Americans, indeed most people over the world, even including some Communists in the Western countries, Yugoslavia and Rumania were shocked by the monstrous act of invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union. That country's Communist leadership did not even want to detach itself from Russian tutelage, but only restore some freedom of expression to the people and to streamline the atrophied economy by expanding trade with the West and abolishing some of the central planning procedures.

On the top of the invasion of Czechoslovakia and forcing its reformist leaders either to resign or carry out the emasculation of their reforms the Soviet Union, aware of the condemnation of the world is attempting to start a diversionary propaganda and diplomatic campaign. The target is the Federal Republic of Germany. There is much indication that the East German puppets of Moscow are being encouraged to start a new Berlin crisis to test Western determination.

We should reinforce our efforts at the new session of the United Nations General Assembly to push through a resolution condemning the Soviet acts in Czechoslovakia and to send a factfinding mission to Prague. We must also raise the parallel issue of Soviet presence in Hungary as the presence of Soviet troops appears to be the hub of the danger to the peace and security of the region and its free national development. This can be done by requesting the Secretary General to report back to the Assembly under the December 1962 resolution which authorized him "to take any initiatives he may deem necessary," and by placing the question on the agenda again.

We must also take positive steps in the military and political field to avert a new Berlin crisis, or a German crisis. The convocation of a NATO summit meeting after the Foreign Ministers' meeting of October 7 might be a good opening measure, as asked by the West German Chancellor.

Finally, I hope that the House Foreign Affairs Committee will also take part in clarifying the issues and the needed policies by holding hearings at the situation in Central and Eastern Europe in the near future including preferably also a study of the problem by academic experts. In these dangerous circumstances we cannot afford to do less.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join my distinguished colleagues led by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] in expressing our serious apprehension about the Russian invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia and the subsequent deterioration of peace and security in Europe. Recent Soviet threats to Rumania, Yugoslavia, and the German Federal Republic show that the Kremlin leadership had wider designs than just the bringing into line of reformist Czechoslovakia.

While we are admiring the spirit of the Czechoslovak people in passively resisting the invaders and backing the besieged leadership against them, there is little question on the outcome of the unequal struggle. The purge has begun with the resignation of Interior Minister Pavel, the last of its present victims being Foreign Minister Jiri Hajek, and the salam tactics dictated by the Soviet High Command will ultimately eliminate Party

Secretary Dubcek and President Swoboda as well. Censorship has been restored, Soviet brutalities continue and while hoping against the hope the population realizes that the Moscow agreement of August 26 under the muzzle of Soviet tanks has robbed them of the last semblance of independence and sovereignty.

The present deployment of over 500,000 Russian troops in Czechoslovakia and the continued deployment of more than 40,000 Russian troops in Hungary are both dangers to peace and security in Europe and should be attacked with all diplomatic means at our disposal.

Such measures must include a spirited diplomatic offensive in the United Nations General Assembly both for the condemnation of Soviet presence in Czechoslovakia and new denunciation of callous Soviet disregard for U.N. resolutions in regard to withdrawal from Hungary. The truth about Russian aggression and American determination not to let a curtain of silence and diversionary propaganda attacks by the Soviet Union confuse the world opinion about its validity, must be the leading arguments of our diplomats, journalists, and policymakers.

We must also take urgent steps to strengthen NATO both as a military alliance and a political organization. The calling for a NATO summit as proposed by the West German Chancellor Dr. Kurt Georg Kiesinger should be taken up as a means to discuss the military and diplomatic coordination necessitated by the Russian moves.

It would be also advisable if the House Foreign Affairs Committee as my colleagues have suggested would hold hearing and undertake an outside academic and political experts study of the situation in Europe and come up with some recommendation of a revised policy especially as we may soon face a Berlin crisis and further Russian political moves in the Balkans.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I am joining my colleagues today in expressing our serious concern about the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, the threats of the use of force against West Germany, Rumania, and Yugoslavia and the continued occupation of Hungary by the Soviet Union. We call for a reassessment of our policies toward Eastern Europe and NATO in the light of the change in the balance of power and the intentions of the Soviet leadership.

The lights were again extinguished in Prague after an exhilarating spring and summer when press freedom was restored and hope was prevalent that human rights and civil freedoms would be at least limitedly returned to the people after 20 years of dictatorship and terror. The promise of the freedom of the individual, no matter how limited, sounded an alarm to the masters in Moscow and after unsuccessful attempts of political and economic intimidations, the Red Army moved in and only the unanimous passive resistance prevented a bloodbath. However, no Czech diplomacy or internal resistance can do away with the fact of the invasion and the laws passed in implementation of the Moscow Accords which were the surrender terms of reformist Communist Czechoslovakia to



September 26, 1968

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

the orthodox Moscow leaders. Soon the purge which began with the removal of Pavel, Hajek, and Kriegel will extend to Dubcek, Swoboda, and Czernik as well, and all the accomplishments of the January-to-August period will have been undone.

Not only did Russian aggression occur, but Moscow leadership forced four of the satellite countries, including reluctant Hungary, to participate in the attack. Especially in the case of Hungary, this would not have occurred except for the presence of Russian divisions in Hungary. For even the Communist Party leadership sympathized on some issues with the Czechoslovak leadership and the people of Hungary had certainly no aggressive designs against the Dubcek government. For after 23 years of oppression, the new Prague government has been the first one which at least listened to the legitimate grievances of the 700,000 Hungarians in Slovakia.

The impact of the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia transcends that of East Central Europe. It changes the balance of power in Europe and the Soviet Union has already begun the next phase of attack: the diplomatic and propaganda offensive against West Germany, claiming the legal right of intervention under certain circumstances under the United Nations Charter. The aim of the offensive is twofold: to intimidate the German people and to set the stage for further moves at West Berlin. Our administration has countered it with the automatic guarantee recently announced, but more than words are needed if Russian aggression should not be given further opportunities. Measures for strengthening NATO militarily and politically are needed and the military commitments of all NATO powers reassessed in the light of new developments. A NATO summit as urged by German Chancellor Kiesinger would be a helpful step in this direction.

Finally, I am agreeing with my colleagues today on calling for a broad study of the situation of Eastern and Central Europe and its impact upon American interests in Europe and Western European security. I hope that the House Foreign Affairs Committee will call for hearings at the earliest feasible moment and have outside academic and political experts and officials to undertake a comprehensive study of the events as well. I also trust that similar steps have been taken by our State Department.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join my distinguished colleague from New Jersey in expressing deep concern over the Russian occupation of Czechoslovakia, and additional Soviet moves which threaten the peace and stability of Eastern Europe.

The details of the Russian occupation of Czechoslovakia closely parallel the strategy and tactics used in crushing Hungary in 1956. Despite almost complete national unity, Czechoslovakia is being strangled by the Soviet Union.

The agreement announced August 26 in Moscow completely negates any independent Czechoslovak policy abroad or domestic sovereignty. The most lethal point in the so-called agreement calls for Czech political development along

the lines of Soviet socialism. Since there was no freedom in the last 2 years of the Novotny regime in Prague, it is logical to assume that this point of the agreement will turn the Czech clock backward to 1963, rather than January of 1968, as we would be led to believe.

Moderate ministers have been removed, press censorship restored, Soviet internal security personnel are everywhere, and the United Nations has virtually been told to observe a hands-off policy. The Soviet regime has also declared that the Czech border with West Germany is not defensible at present and must be secured by Warsaw Pact troops.

At present there is little hope for a reasonable solution to the crisis, despite the continued support by the Czech people for the Swoboda-Dubcek regime. As pressures upon him mount, Dubcek's fall is merely a matter of time, and we may reasonably expect the Iron Curtain to fall, just as it did over Hungary 12 years ago.

The New York Times on September 19 summed up the situation succinctly:

If the Russians do not know how to govern Czechoslovakia, they do not know how to humiliate it. Thus their press smears the Czechs without allowing them to answer back. They deny Prague the openings for trade with the West which they have long since taken for themselves. They are stuffing down Prague's throat the very economic reforms they have adopted for themselves, the very reforms initiated in Czechoslovakia four years ago by the neo-Stalinist Novotny . . . The heavy realities overwhelm the contrary appearance of a permissive or confused occupation, an appearance given off by repeated outcroppings of Czech dignity and valor. The Russians are strangling Czechoslovakia.

Anti-Semitism is also used by the Soviet Union in its campaign against Czechoslovakia. One of the chief objects of their purge was Dr. Frantisek Kriegel, president of the National Front, arrested at the beginning of the invasion and released only after personal intervention of President Swoboda during the Moscow talks. Another was Foreign Minister, Prof. Jiri Hajek who was accused by Pravda falsely as having betrayed his Jewish brethren in the concentration camp during World War II. The third Jewish victim was Deputy Prime Minister Ota Sik, the father of the Czechoslovak economic reform who also has been removed from his government position. Polish press particularly stresses that Jews were in forefront of the Czech "counter-revolution."

However, the events in Czechoslovakia have wider implications. The balance of forces in Europe has changed by the introduction of 24 new Russian divisions into the area. Russian and Warsaw Pact forces now outweigh NATO forces in Central Europe by 2 to 1, and the crescendo of the war of nerves against the Bonn government by the Soviet Union bodes nothing good for Berlin or NATO security.

In an interview printed in the New York Times on September 21, ex-Ambassador George Kennan, a leading authority on the Soviet Union, stated:

I have never understood this talk about detente. I have not seen any evidence of de-

tente and I wouldn't trust any so-called detente if it is not supported by free contacts between governments and peoples . . . Their (Russian) conspiratorial method of diplomatic action cannot create such an atmosphere. There has been some progress in the field of the central weaponry, Mr. Kennan said: But, he added: "This is not detente. This is simply the dictate of an obvious and bitter situation, presenting danger for both."

Ambassador Kennan attacked allusions that President Johnson might meet with Soviet Premier Kosygin before the end of the year. He commented:

The suggestion . . . smacks of one of the worst phenomena of American diplomacy in earlier years, namely: the abuse of external relations of our people as a whole for the domestic political advantage of a single faction or party. The idea of President's going to Russia at this time strikes me as pure madness.

We must counter the Russian moves—which also included threats of the use of military force against Rumania—by a combination of diplomatic and military measures. Among the measures indicated are the strengthening of NATO forces and a psychological propaganda offensive against the Soviet Union, which now stands exposed as an aggressor in the minds of most Western European Communists.

When the issue is raised before the United Nations General Assembly, the entire question of Russian occupation of both Central European countries, Czechoslovakia and Hungary must be considered. Numerous resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly have denounced Russian occupation of Hungary and demanded withdrawal of the Soviet troops, but in the last 6 years the question has been dormant. In a study based on international law rules and practices, the American Hungarian Federation in late 1966 analyzed the validity of the Hungarian-Soviet Troop Stationing Treaty of May 27, 1957 which, in the Soviet view, enables them to maintain troops in Hungary. The Federation found that it was a treaty signed under duress by a government that has not yet regained its sovereignty either at home or in international relations. As evidence for this conclusion the study cited the following facts:

As late as in March 1957, the Soviet Military Command was in direct control of peace and tranquility in Hungary. Thus, military and police power in May 1957 still rested directly or indirectly with the armed forces of the Government of the U.S.S.R. in Hungary. The Hungarian army was still in a state of disarmament and reorganization, and could not exercise an independent function at that time. This, combined with the fall of the Nagy government in November 1956, shows that the new Government could not have had full sovereignty.

The problems are complex and the need for alternative policies is both urgent and vital. In my opinion, the House Foreign Affairs Committee would perform a great service by holding hearings on the situation in Central and Eastern Europe, and its impact upon American and NATO interests in Europe. An independent study by academic and political experts would also be a welcome

step in clarifying issues and deciding upon new policies. A good example was set by the Republican presidential candidate, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, in sending ex-Governor William Scranton to Europe for a factfinding tour and commissioning a study by his staff of American commitments.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] and other distinguished colleagues in expressing concern about recent events in Europe, particularly the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia and the threats of force against West Germany, Rumania, and Yugoslavia.

The suppression of incipient efforts to permit some individual freedom and national independence for the Czechoslovakian people has been a clear example of naked Russian aggression in every sense of the word, and it cannot be ignored. Sad to relate, the tactics used by the Soviet Union in Hungary in and after November of 1956 have been and are being repeated in Prague, except that some of the old leaders have been temporarily left in power. The process of forcing those leaders to get rid of "objectionable" colleagues, until their successors achieve a sufficient majority to push the old leadership out of office, means that inevitably the purge will include President Swoboda, Party Secretary Dubcek, and Premier Czernik as well.

Simultaneously, the meaning and place of the January-to-August "liberalization" events in Czechoslovakia are constantly redefined in Communist ideology. While Dubcek and Czernik consider their liberalization efforts as a progressive element in communism—because they did not, after all, reject Marx, Lenin, or party primacy—Soviet newspapers agitate for the physical punishment of the "counterrevolutionaries." Attacks are now concentrated on the media; soon the writers and regional party officials will be denounced; finally, the leadership will be isolated and removed. Thereupon, the new leadership may be expected to proclaim the "liberalization" period as an era of "counterrevolution," and personnel cadres will be rewritten accordingly. And the silence of coercion will once again shroud the Czech and Slovak lands.

We must use the present disgust felt all over the world to inflame a psychological and political offensive against aggressive Soviet moves lest further such aggressions put us into a position where we may have to use more drastic methods to deter them. The present Russian diplomatic and propaganda offensive against West Germany, Rumania and Yugoslavia confirm that the Soviet designs are more encompassing than Czechoslovakia alone. Neither can we separate the import of these developments from the newly acquired Russian dominance in the Middle East.

In the light of the August invasion of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet threats which have followed, meaningful negotiations with the Kremlin on almost any subject become extremely difficult, if not impossible. Former British Minister Anthony Eden, now the Lord of Avon,

aptly wrote in the New York Times recently:

The history of the thirties has taught us mercilessly that to attempt new agreements, while ignoring flagrant breaches of the old, earns contempt, not progress.

We should heed those words.

Conditions throughout the world demand a reappraisal of the U.S. role in the peacekeeping efforts. I am sure, too, that the forthcoming session of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will be one of the most crucial in its history.

As part of our sombre re-evaluation of the world situation, therefore, I join my colleagues in calling for an in-depth study of conditions and prospects in East Central Europe by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. This study should include public hearings at the earliest feasible moment, with testimony from academic experts and appropriate officials versed in the subject.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] in denouncing the newest evidence of Soviet aggression in Central Europe—the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia.

The conscience of the entire world has been shocked by the August 21 events. As in 1938, Czechoslovakia again lost whatever national sovereignty she has had and now exists as a Soviet protectorate. This is true despite the valiant attempts of the Czechoslovak Government's leaders to find compromises to preserve at least a small part of the reforms of the spring and summer of 1968.

In invading Czechoslovakia—its own ally and loyal friend—the Soviet Union committed grave breaches of international law. As a member of the United Nations the U.S.S.R. violated the provision of the U.N. Charter forbidding the use of military force in solving disputes with other United Nations members.

The similarity of the situation in the Prague and Budapest events of 1956 is striking. In both cases the people and a reformist Communist government worked together to remove some of the unbearable barriers to individual freedom and national sovereignty erected during the Stalinist era. They sought a freer society, a more efficient economy and better understanding between the nations of the East and West. In Hungary there were even the multiparty system as practiced in Western democracies, press, assembly, and religious freedom and a revamping of economic life.

While the Hungarian people acted more violently and demanded full freedom, the Czechoslovak people and government took the more prudent road of compromises, endeavoring to stay within the Warsaw Pact. However, both the Communist reformers and the population, led by the intellectuals and the young people, have become or are becoming victims in Czechoslovakia just as they were victims in Hungary. Avoiding military resistance to the Soviet Army averted a bloodbath in Czechoslovakia, unlike in Hungary where 35,000 of the freedom fighters died and many thousands perished later in jails and Soviet labor camps.

However, the tragedy of Czechoslo-

vakia has broader implications. The presence of more than 20 Russian divisions in that country has upset the military balance of power in Europe. Language akin to the iciest period of the cold war is now used against both the West and "people's democracies" such as Rumania and Yugoslavia.

Under such circumstances we must do everything to be prepared both militarily by strengthening NATO and politically by reinforcing cooperation between the Western powers. We should also denounce the deployment of Russian troops in Central Europe as an act of aggression.

We must urge the United Nations General Assembly to adopt a resolution condemning the Soviet action and to demand immediate withdrawal of Russian troops. Simultaneously, we should support a resolution akin to the Canadian resolution in the Security Council providing for the sending of a U.N. fact-finding mission to Prague and other Czechoslovak cities. Furthermore, we should ask Secretary General U Thant to report back to the Assembly on the question of the Soviet military presence in Hungary, as under resolution No. 1857/XVII of December 1962 he was empowered "to take any initiatives he may deem necessary." On this question he has not reported back for 6 years. No one can doubt that the presence of Russian military forces in Central and Eastern Europe creates a grave danger to peace and security in the area.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in calling for early hearings on the general situation in Central and Eastern Europe and possibly also for a study by academic experts commissioned by the Foreign Affairs Committee. In these dangerous times clarifying the issues and devising revised policies to deal with the challenges is a demand of the hour.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleagues led by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey in discussing the situation created by Soviet aggression against Czechoslovakia and Soviet threats against the Federal Republic of Germany and other European countries.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have followed the developments of the past few months in Eastern Europe with great interest and profound dismay. Our committee has given close attention to that part of the world. We have held meetings with officials of the executive branch, including Secretary of State Dean Rusk and other experts; as a matter of fact, we have another one of those meetings scheduled within a few days.

It had seemed to me that in one fell swoop the Soviet Union managed to reverse the modest progress of the past decade leading toward some semblance of liberalization in Eastern Europe, toward the resumption of East-West contacts, toward the reductions of tensions and dangers of war, and toward the creation of a stable base for peace and justice not only in Europe but throughout the world.

Certainly the shocking display of the brutal Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia left no room for doubt about the true

September 26, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 9225

character and intentions of the Soviet leadership.

Total reliance on naked, brutal power; paranoid fear of an attack from the outside; mistrust of all non-Soviet peoples are as much trademarks of Soviet leadership today as they were during the height of the cold war.

Mr. Speaker, since the dark clouds of Soviet displeasure and possible Soviet aggression began to hang over Czechoslovakia, I have taken the floor of the House on a couple of occasions to call to the attention of my colleagues the fast-breaking sequence of developments in that country. In this regard, I would particularly like to call the interested Members' attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 30, 1968, page H7883, and of September 5, 1968, page H8330.

Moreover, I would like to point out that on September 5, 1968, together with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Dr. MORGAN, and 26 other Members, I cosponsored a resolution in the House condemning the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia and expressing our admiration for the courage of the Czechoslovak people.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that the House should approve that resolution before adjournment. I also feel that we ought to serve notice that the unwarranted entirely excessive use of force by the Soviet Union is endangering world peace and plunging mankind down the road towards the type of tensions that prevailed during the height of the cold war.

The tragic fate of the Czechoslovak nation which was just emerging from the darkness of totalitarianism that had ruled it for 20 years, is shocking indeed. Any excuse, power political or ideological, was avoided by the Czech leaders which could offend the Soviet Union, or could be construed as nonfulfillment of previous treaty obligations. Only a modicum of personal freedom was to be secured for the population, no transition to Western democracy has been planned. Yet even these fledgling steps toward freedom were considered to be too dangerous to the security of the Soviet Empire and were crushed by the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia by more than 500,000 troops.

Unfortunately, despite the valiant efforts of the people and the remaining reformist leaders, the fate of Czechoslovakia seemed to have been sealed by the Russian occupation.

At this time, we must give the people of Czechoslovakia support by pressing diplomatically for the condemnation of the Russian actions in the U.N. and use our leverage in bilateral relations with the Soviet Union. This might not be sufficient to effect a withdrawal of all the troops, but will still exercise a restraining influence on the Soviet Union in handling the Czech and Slovak nations. We should also press for a revival of the Hungarian question in the United Nations. The occupation of Czechoslovakia and Hungary are kindred affairs and they constitute the major danger to peace and free national development in the area. In resolution No. 1857/XVII of December 20, 1962, the General Assembly has empowered the Secretary General to

"take any initiatives he may deem necessary" on the matter. For 6 years, the Secretary General has not reported back to the General Assembly and we would be on solid grounds to ask for a report and ask the Assembly to contemplate action because of noncompliance. We should not forget that Hungary was used as a staging area for Russian aggression against Czechoslovakia and that except for the constraining influence of Russian military presence, not even the present Hungarian Government would have sent troops into Czechoslovakia.

The comprehensive significance of the August 20 events extend to NATO security as well. The presence of more than 24 Russian divisions in Czechoslovakia has redressed the military balance in Europe in favor of the Soviet Union. We must take energetic actions together with our NATO allies to balance the military strength of the two alliances in Central Europe and to coordinate NATO political strategy as well. In my statement of September 5, I dealt with this question. Here may I only add that a meeting of the heads of states of the alliance might be a good way to expedite the necessary measures that must be taken if we want to avert another Berlin crisis or a walk to the brink.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, first, let me express my appreciation to our colleague from New Jersey [Mr. PATEN], for stimulating this discussion of the situation in Eastern Europe.

We are all shocked and bitter at the armed invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union and some of its satellites. It was a cruel and naked attempt to suppress small, first efforts to restore democratic freedom in the European nation which has so rich a heritage of democratic liberty. The crime of the Czechs was that they wanted free speech for their own people. The threat to the Soviets was that freedom is contagious and, if Czechoslovakia moved in that direction, other satellites might follow.

It is inspiring to see that, though democratic forms may be suppressed by a dictatorship, the dream of freedom cannot be suppressed. Moreover, it was an astonishing sight to see Czechoslovaks, confronted with Soviet tanks and troops in their streets, rally behind their leaders to frustrate the Soviet program of replacing the Dubcek regime with puppets. This message and this example should be brought home to all of those behind the Iron Curtain because it must encourage the enslaved.

I am pleased that the United States is providing refuge for those who left Czechoslovakia because of their outspoken support for freedom. These people have a message for the world and the United States should make certain that it is disseminated. This can be done through the privately-financed Radio Free Europe and through our own Government outlet, the Voice of America. Public journals, the world over, must describe what happened. I am very pleased that our country took the lead in bringing the Soviet-led aggression against Czechoslovakia before the United Nations. Obviously, the glare of an aroused world community made the So-

vets very uncomfortable. Hopefully, they will think twice before repeating such an act.

There are many in the United States who believe that the Soviet-led invasion should induce us to reduce our contacts with Eastern Europe. To me, this is a short-sighted approach. We must distinguish between the government regimes and the people of these countries. We must make sure that those who are anxious to improve the atmosphere for freedom in their own countries know that they have the support of free nations elsewhere and free peoples both behind and outside the Iron Curtain.

U.S. tourists, journalists, and performers, visiting in Iron Curtain countries, demonstrate that free peoples are creative people. Artists, tourists, and journalists from Eastern Europe, traveling in the United States, cannot avoid seeing that a democracy can protect freedom without suppressing dissent. Our ability to provide an atmosphere where nationality groups can preserve their cultural heritage demonstrates that our people are not enemies of peoples behind the Iron Curtain even if we are wholeheartedly opposed to the totalitarian regimes which run their governments.

One final word: I have no patience with those who argue that the United States because of its actions in Vietnam, is somehow responsible for the Soviet actions in Czechoslovakia. This is nonsense. Although I have been often critical of our Vietnam policies, I believe the Soviet Union alone is responsible for the evil it has brought in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere.

Moreover, I greatly regret the recent statements by U Thant in which he implied that U.S. actions in Vietnam are more to be condemned than the Soviet move against Czechoslovakia, because they involve military action. Two points should be made: What the United States is doing in Vietnam has been at the request of a series of Governments of South Vietnam; whereas the Soviets, even after the fact, can find no Czech leaders to sponsor their cause. Moreover, the Soviets in Czechoslovakia were obviously prepared to use their guns if there had been resistance. Military aggression is no less evil because it is not resisted.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am joining my colleagues in expressing our sincere concern on the ramifications of the Russian occupation of Czechoslovakia both for that unfortunate country and for the other states threatened by Russian pressure like the Federal Republic of Germany, Rumania, and Yugoslavia.

The deterioration of law and order in our country coincides with the breakdown of international law and morality on the international scene. Now the other world power, too, has demonstrated again that it is not bound even by the tenets of international law officially subscribed to by it; but will use naked aggression if it fits its own national policy. Russian aggression, a sign of strength and weakness simultaneously, succeeded in stamping out much of the reforms in Czechoslovakia and force the Government and the people of Czechoslovakia to follow without any afterthought the Russian Communist line. The hopes for

September 26, 1968

a more humane life in Czechoslovakia are gone after the censorship law and the new economic agreements with the Soviet Union.

The presence of over 500,000 Russian troops has serious consequences for NATO, too. NATO forces are now outnumbered two to one in the central section and while it is unlikely that the Soviet Union would be brazen enough to attack West Germany despite its claim to legal intervention under the U.N. Charter against an "enemy state," the implications as far as West Berlin is concerned are unmistakable. We must take measures to strengthen our position in Europe and Berlin, both diplomatically and militarily, if we are not to help the Soviet Union to conjure up the most explosive Berlin crisis since 1948.

We must use all diplomatic means available to secure the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia and also from Hungary where they are stationed for 12 years despite numerous resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly.

The changing situation calls for a careful study of the changes and their impact upon our and NATO interests in Central and Eastern Europe. Such a study should be undertaken by the House Foreign Affairs Committee by means of hearings and an independent academic study on the subject at an early date. Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon has already showed the necessity for this step by having his staff undertake a study of American commitments and sending ex-Governor William Scranton to Europe for a fact-finding tour. It is my hope that the Foreign Affairs Committee will also do its part to clarify the issues and arrive at policy recommendations after a careful study of the situation.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, in expressing the shock and indignation of all Americans over the recent invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet troops.

I feel very strongly about the basic right of sovereignty of all countries, and their right to determine the course of their internal affairs without outside influence. By forcefully entering the borders of Czechoslovakia, the Soviets have violated not only the moral code of all civilized countries, but international law, and the United Nations Charter as well.

The freedom of a people to choose their own way of life is the principle on which our great country was founded. The Soviet Union, in trying to force these people to accept their philosophies, only serves to demonstrate how tenuous is their hold on the hearts and minds of the mass of people. Further, it has served to harden the resistance to those philosophies by those in the small nation of Czechoslovakia who feel the need to be a part of the entire world, rather than only a part of the Soviet bloc.

Even though we may not be able to assist the Czechoslovaks in a concrete manner, I am hopeful that our words here today will at least express to them the depth of our sympathies, and those of the vast majority of American people, as well as the depth of our moral indignation over this step backward in the

progress toward peace and good will among the nations of this earth.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet and Communist-bloc troops in August left quite a few red and long faces among our so-called foreign policy experts in and out of government. These are the people, of course, who have been pushing the bridge-building policy as the best avenue to world peace. Those of us who have opposed this policy have emphasized that this was a one-way bridge and that the Communists still sought to enslave the entire world. After the Soviet's role in the rape of Budapest, no one should have been surprised at the recent developments in Czechoslovakia. It is now high time that the Munichmen—those who hope for peace while ignoring totalitarian regimes—should have their fallacies discredited.

Among those who have been realistic concerning Soviet goals and designs have been American citizens of Hungarian descent who will never forget the Soviet record concerning Budapest. On August 28 the American Hungarian Federation sent a letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant, with a copy to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, outlining specific proposals concerning the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. As past victims of Soviet aggression, members of the federation are certainly qualified to comment knowledgeably on this present crisis. I include the above-mentioned letter signed by Rt. Rev. Dr. Zoltan Beky, chairman of the board of the federation, in the Record at this point:

AUGUST 28, 1968.

HON. U THANT,  
Secretary General of the United Nations,  
United Nations,  
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SECRETARY GENERAL: The American Hungarian Federation, representing the majority of American citizens of Hungarian descent and referring to the telegram of its Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Dr. Emery G. Szekely of August 21, 1968, respectfully appeals to Your Excellency to use all your personal and official weight to ensure the withdrawal of Soviet Russian, Polish, East German, Hungarian and Bulgarian military units from the Czechoslovak Peoples Republic.

The illegal occupation of Czechoslovakia by Soviet and other East Central European forces as attested by the Czechoslovak Foreign Minister before the U.N. Security Council on August 24, 1968 violates both the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter and the tenets of human decency as well. It represents stark imperialism and callous disregard of principles usually espoused by the Soviet Government like national self-determination and non-interference with the domestic affairs of other states.

We Americans of Hungarian descent remember too vividly the bloody aggression of the U.S.S.R. against Hungary in 1956 which Your Excellency has also condemned in harsh terms as a delegate of the Republic of Burma. May we remind Your Excellency that despite numerous General Assembly Resolutions Soviet troops are still stationed in Hungary?

We support fully the resolution of the United States Government calling for a withdrawal of Soviet and East Central European troops from Czechoslovakia and also the proposal by the Canadian Government to establish forthwith a Committee of Observers to be dispatched to Prague with the duty of reporting back to the Council and Your Ex-

cellency on the political and legal situation in Czechoslovakia and the observance of human rights by the occupation forces. May we also ask for the support of Your Excellency toward these proposals?

May we also assure Your Excellency that American Hungarians in particular, but the Hungarian people in general as well, harbor no ill-feelings toward the courageous attempts of the Czech and Slovak peoples to reassert their national independence, restore their individual rights and work toward a representative democratic socialism. May we call Your Excellency attention to the fact that even the pro-Soviet Hungarian Government originally expressed warm sympathies toward the reforms of the Dubcek regime and even toward the end only mildly criticized the Czechoslovak Government. Hungarian participation in the aggression is a command performance of a satellite country that has no choice but to follow his master.

We also believe that Soviet action in Czechoslovakia extends beyond the regional importance of the invasion and displays a spirit of aggression and disregard for national and human rights, elements which will aggravate the search for a lasting peace. May we respectfully ask Your Excellency to emphasize in your discussions with Soviet leaders that they are not only depriving a small nation of its national self-determination and independence, but are ultimately endangering the peace of the world?

We remain

Very sincerely yours,

Rt. Rev. Dr. ZOLTAN BEKY

Chairman of the Board.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] in condemning the fresh demonstration of Soviet aggression in central Europe by the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia and continuing threats to Rumania, Yugoslavia and West Germany.

The tragic fate of the Czech and Slovak nations, now deprived of the hope of a more humanistic interpretation of life and of their national independence, shocked the civilized world, including even some of the Communist parties, into realization that Russian imperialism and Communist totalitarianism are very much with us. It is further realized that we have to be prepared to defend our freedom against potential aggressors, unless we slip into the fatal mistake of appeasement.

Unfortunately, there is little hope for an acceptable solution of the crisis for the Czechoslovak people. Press freedom, nonparty social and political activity, personal safety are things of the past in Czechoslovakia. Six of the nine major reformist leaders have been removed from office and the Russians are zeroing-in on Party Leader Dubcek as well. Soon, the January-to-August period will be declared "counterrevolution" and the silence of the graveyard will envelop the unfortunate country.

The similarities with Hungary in 1956 are obvious, though the old leaders were temporarily kept by the invaders in view of unanimous popular resistance. However, they only have the tragic task of dismantling the edifice they have created.

The immediate task facing us is to provide the diplomatic help and moral assistance to those Czech leaders who are trying the impossible. The first requirement is an energetic push in the United Nations General Assembly for a resolution condemning Russian occupation of

Czechoslovakia and calling for the immediate withdrawal of the Warsaw Pact forces, and another one calling for the sending of a U.N. fact-finding commission to Prague. Furthermore, it would be just and advantageous to raise the question of Soviet military presence in Hungary as well. After all, the Secretary General despite his authorization "to take any initiative he may deem necessary" in December 1962 failed to take any steps or report back to the General Assembly and the crux of all tensions in Central Europe lies in the continued presence of the Red Army.

We must also undertake constructive steps to strengthen NATO, politically and militarily. The days of neglect must end and NATO must assume high priority in planning and implementing American policies. The convocation of a meeting of the NATO leaders, a summit meeting, might be necessary upon completing the session of the foreign ministers in New York on October 7, 1968.

Finally, the House Foreign Affairs Committee must also contribute its share toward a reassessment of our policies by calling hearings and commissioning a study of the issues by academic and political experts. The gravity of the situation demands full attention by the administration and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleagues led by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey in denouncing renewed Russian aggression in Europe.

We were all shocked by the events since August 21, when the Soviet Union, forcing four of her satellites, Poland, East Germany, Bulgaria and Hungary, to follow her lead, invaded and occupied Czechoslovakia.

The Czechoslovak Government was by no means pro-Western or democratic in our sense of the word. But it attempted to restore some human rights to its people including limited press freedom and tried to modernize its industry by managerial reforms and increasing trade with the West. The stirrings of human freedom in Czechoslovakia between January and August 1968 were considered to be as dangerous to the Soviet Union as were the Hungarian revolutionaries and Premier Imre Nagy in Hungary. That Czechoslovakia did not incur the same blood losses is only a result of nonresistance of its armed forces. Otherwise, the events of Prague and Budapest are strikingly familiar even to the mass passive resistance of the people against the invaders. The same divide et impera play is used by the Soviets in Czechoslovakia as it has been in Hungary and after the resignation of six of the reformers under Soviet pressure it is only a matter of time until Dubcek, Cernik, and even President Swoboda are replaced by more malleable personalities.

The influx of 24 Russian divisions into Czechoslovakia also upset the military balance in Europe and threats of the Soviet Union to Rumania, Yugoslavia, and West Germany demonstrate that the Soviets would like to exploit their momentary military superiority in the region.

We must, therefore, take energetic countermeasures ranging from diplomacy and propaganda in the U.N. to diplomatic steps in our bilateral relations with the U.S.S.R. and to a thorough revitalization and strengthening of NATO.

In the General Assembly we must press incessantly for a resolution condemning the Soviet action in Czechoslovakia, calling for a withdrawal of Soviet troops from all countries of the Warsaw Pact until a peace treaty from Germany is in effect, and by reintroducing the Hungarian question as, even after 12 years and numerous U.N. resolutions, Soviet troops are still stationed in Hungary. They participated in the aggression against Czechoslovakia as did the units based in Poland and forced both the Polish and Hungarian Governments to send token units to accompany the aggressive Soviet forces to Czechoslovakia. Resolution No. 1857/XVII of the 1962 Assembly offers the procedure for such a step. It did empower the Secretary General to "take any initiative he may deem necessary" to hasten the departure of Soviet troops from Hungary. He should be called upon to report back to the Assembly; after all, 6 years have passed since he has been given his mandate.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee must also do its best to clarify the issue and devise alternate policy suggestions by holding hearings on the subject of Central and Eastern Europe and preferably also by commissioning a study by academic and political experts. The dangers of the present situation in Europe, which probably will explode in a new Berlin crisis, urge us to do so at an early date.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of this special order, the crisis in Eastern European affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### TRIBUTE TO HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the retirement of our colleague, Hon. WILLIAM M. TUCK.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, among those of our colleagues who will be missing at the rolcall when the 91st Congress convenes is our genial and good friend, BILL TUCK, the able and outstanding representative of Virginia's

Fifth Congressional District. BILL is voluntarily retiring after 16 years of faithful and dedicated service as our colleague in the House of Representatives. His retirement will mark the end of more than 40 years as an elected public servant, and during much of this time I have known him well and have been privileged to have him as a friend.

To most of us BILL is affectionately known as "Governor," and he came to Congress in 1953 following distinguished service as Virginia's chief executive. And this had been preceded by 4 years as Lieutenant Governor of Virginia, which in turn had been preceded by 10 years in the Virginia Senate and 8 years in the Virginia House of Delegates. Most of his life has truly been in the service of the people.

Just glancing at the background of the "Governor's" political activity before he came to the House of Representatives, we can appreciate the foundation in representative government which he had already acquired. He was well versed in the government of Virginia, and had a deep and abiding appreciation of our Constitution and the Bill of Rights. He had strong convictions about the prerogatives which were reserved to the States by the Constitution and all through his public service he has devoted much effort to protecting the rights of the several individual States from encroachments of the Federal Government.

The people of the Commonwealth of Virginia have long recognized BILL TUCK's tremendous qualities of leadership, his strength of character, his sincerity, and his integrity; and all through his public service he has demonstrated these qualities.

While he was Governor of Virginia he provoked considerable controversy when on numerous occasions, without hesitation, he arrived at his own independent judgment concerning pressing issues and acted on that judgment without regard to criticism or disfavor. Among the most controversial of his espousals was the Virginia right-to-work law which he sponsored and which was adopted by the Virginia general assembly during his administration. That statute still provokes controversy, but I am sure his conviction with respect to its correctness is as strong today as it was when this bill was passed.

There were many internal problems confronting Virginia when BILL TUCK became Governor, and through his initiative great strides were made in such things as improving teachers' salaries and educational opportunities generally. He also contributed much to Virginia's long-neglected mental institutions, and he will always be remembered for his determination to "get the farmers out of the mud." He initiated a program of farm-to-market roads which was soon to lead to a secondary road system which I dare say is hardly surpassed in any State in the Union.

BILL TUCK has a farm background. He is a farmowner and as a matter of fact still owns and operates the farm on which he was born, as well as other surrounding farmland. He has main-

tained all through his public life a close association with his early surroundings and loves to spend as much time as he can back in his hometown, or on his farm, visiting with his neighbors, and enjoying their fellowship. I can appreciate how BILL's neighbors must have enjoyed his trips back home; for his genuine good nature, his love of people, his fondness for the simple things of life, for mountain music, for cornbread and brunswick stew, and his delight in storytelling, all are characteristics which endear BILL TUCK to us as they do to Virginians all over the Commonwealth.

BILL TUCK is genial, colorful, controversial, unimpressed by stuffed shirts and scornful of shirkers. There is no deceit in his unpretentiousness and he still speaks of himself as a "country lawyer."

I know that BILL will be missed here in the House. Since he and I are both dropouts this year, I shall not miss him here, but instead I may even get a chance to see him occasionally in his own territory. In fact, I plan to make it a point to do this. BILL, I hope you will get down to see me occasionally in retirement, and whether you call it a threat or a promise, I am looking forward to an occasional visit to Halifax. I hope you will let me enjoy with you some reminiscing about our colleagues in the House and our experiences here, and I hope you will also share with me some of that humor and the incomparable stories you can tell. Perhaps we might even do this with a background of the strains of some mountain music coming from your fine new stereo.

And so I wish you good health, and the ultimate of enjoyment and satisfaction in a well-deserved retirement.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff].

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, thank you for your courtesy in yielding to me to perform what will be an act of pleasure. I assure you

I first became aware of the existence of big BILL TUCK when I was a student at the University of Virginia Law School. At that time he had established himself in his profession and in statecraft. But his act of heroism in 1958 was the thing which commanded by attention, my respect, and my continuing admiration. I respected, admired, and applauded the many fearless deeds he performed as the Governor of our Commonwealth.

I think it is fair to say that his service in that august position was unsurpassed by any of his predecessors and will remain forever unsurpassed by any who might succeed him there. He won the respect and affection not only of his own party in our State but of members of the other party as well.

Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to be a guest under his roof and at his table, and I can assure you that the menu you recited a moment ago, PORTER, while almost complete, is not entirely complete. It omitted the good Virginia country ham and chitterlings. If our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABERT], had been here we could have reminisced about a little experience

we had out near the battlefield which lies nearby the great Capital City several years ago.

What I have said I think reflects—at least, I intend that it should—my personal affection which runs so deep for this great and good man. I admire him not alone because he has acquitted himself so honorably in such high positions but also because I recognize a character which a person cannot acquire superficially and which must shine through to the surface even through the most genial spirit. It is a steadfastness of character which commands the respect of all.

Often BILL TUCK and I have sat together in his office or mine discussing what we regard as some of the profound verities of the day. In the course of one of these shortly after he came to the House he recited a little poem which he has often used since and which at the time I committed to my own memory and must now confess that I, too, have used on occasion. In order to illustrate the type of character and the depth and constancy of character which is his, I will undertake to recite it now from memory:

#### THE MAN IN THE GLASS

When you get what you want in your struggle for self,

And the world makes you King for a day,  
Just go to the mirror and look at yourself  
And see what that man has to say.

It isn't your father or mother or wife  
Whose judgment upon you must pass,  
The one whose verdict counts most in your life

Is the one staring back in the glass.  
He's the one you must satisfy beyond all the rest,

For he's with you right up to the end;  
And you have passed your most difficult test  
If the Man in the Glass is your friend!

You may be one who got a good break—  
Then think you're a wonderful guy;  
But the man in the glass says you're only a fake

If you can't look him straight in the eye.  
You may fool the whole world down your pathway of years,

And get pats on the back as you pass;  
But your final reward will be heartaches and tears

If you've cheated the Man in the Glass!

For the man who looks back from that glass as he shaves every morning is his friend, because he sees nothing that is not altogether admirable.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that he will live many long years and as long as he lives every year will be a fruitful and productive year or one that will somehow bless mankind and inspire young people to pursue the paths that our forefathers have always thought worthy.

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman, and now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply thank the able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] for allowing me to share with him and our colleagues some words of tribute to our esteemed friend that we know as BILL TUCK.

I have developed a great admiration for this Governor of Virginia, this very charming and distinctive gentleman, [Mr. TUCK], but he first endeared himself

to me and my wife when my wife went down to Richmond on one occasion when he was Governor to speak and he was so gracious and hospitable to her. I felt when I came to know him here that we were already old friends.

Mr. Speaker, I would not want to embarrass my good friend, the able gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCK] by having either him or any of his friends to believe that by my speaking in tribute to him here this afternoon that he shares my political philosophy. We do not exactly share the same political philosophy. However, that is what makes this House and this Congress and this country what they are. We do not ask whether a fellow sits on that side or on this side of the aisle; or whether he votes with or against us; or whether he agrees with us or opposes our views. What we ask is, Is he a gentleman, is he an honorable man, is he a good American, and is he sincere in what he believes and advocates, and is he a delightful and likable fellow whose friendship you cherish? If a Member meets these criteria and he leaves this House one does deeply regret his departure.

Mr. Speaker, BILL TUCK has been a very able legislator. With his long and wide experience in government, he knows the matters that pertain to the Government's interests. He is genuinely dedicated to the service of his people. He has rendered eminent service to his district, to his State, and to his country, but above all he has been one of the most delightful and charming gentlemen who have ever sat in this body.

I shall never forget some of the stories that he has told here. My only complaint is that he has not told enough of them. I wish he would still leave us a little legacy to remember him by before he departs for home. I hope that when he goes home he will write some when he has the time for reflection on it.

He has made a contribution to this Congress and to his country. When he retires to be the enviable squire of Halifax, I hope that we shall not do to him what so many friends did to Thomas Jefferson, that is, so many visited him that they almost ate him out of house and home, but I will certainly accept his invitation tendered to me to come down and visit with him and I am sure that he will be a very busy host entertaining all of us who would like to come and share with him the friendship which we have enjoyed so much in this House. We want him to know that he carries with him our affection and esteem and best wishes for many, many years of good health and great happiness.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] for yielding to me in order to pay my respects to a dear friend, BILL TUCK.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of meeting BILL TUCK for the first time in November 1948 at the country club in Selma, Ala. He was just out of the Governor's office at that time and had flown down with the late great Senator Harry Byrd, Sr. I fell in love with BILL the first