

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

GAUS, MAN WHO SAVED POLITICAL SCIENCE, VISITS UNIVERSITY AFTER 16 YEARS
(By Elliott Marantiss)

Prof. John M. Gaus, the man who saved political science from dying of irrelevancy—the Dutch elm disease in the groves of academia—has returned to the University of Wisconsin campus.

Dr. Gaus will spend a week here visiting his old classes in public administration, regional planning, and political theory.

Among the political scientists in South Hall, this has aroused the same kind of excitement that would be found among historians if Frederick Jackson Turner suddenly showed up at old Bascom.

In the opinion of Prof. James McCamy, one of Dr. Gaus' hosts this week, the comparison is appropriate.

"Professor Gaus is to political science what Turner was to history," Dr. McCamy said Monday.

"He took it out of the law books and put it into life, among the people and in the communities in which they live. He said government is not just statutes and constitutions, but people dealing with other people."

For 20 memorable years between 1927 and 1947 the Wisconsin campus and the Badger State were the vineyards of Professor Gaus' fruitful labors.

A graduate of Amherst College with a master's degree and a doctorate from Harvard, he came here to become part of an Amherst triumvirate which made an imperishable contribution to Wisconsin's rise to greatness.

Dr. Alexander Meikeljohn had been president of Amherst, and Dr. Walter Agard had been an Amherst classmate. Dr. Gaus happily responded to their invitation to join them here in establishing the famed Experimental College. Dr. Agard taught the first-year course in Greek civilization and Dr. Gaus taught the second-year course in American civilization.

In those years the Wisconsin idea—putting the resources of the university in the service of the people of the State—provided a perfect basis for Dr. Gaus' ideas about political science.

Gov. Phil LaFollette named him executive secretary of the Wisconsin State Planning Board, an advisory board of legislators and citizens, charged with the task of "making a continuing inventory of the State government and its functions and suggesting ways as to how the State may operate more efficiently and economically."

Together with Robert Goodman, who later became chairman of the Conservation Commission, F. L. Sensenbrenner, then president of Kimberly Clark, Charles W. Nash, then president of the Nash Motor Co., Dr. Gaus and his board made many important recommendations, the most lasting of which was a far-sighted plan for the uses of the State's forest resources.

As a member of the Madison Area Planning Council, Dr. Gaus helped devise an orderly plan for the growth of the city.

In every one of those 20 years Dr. Gaus was the object of flattering and bountiful offers from rich and famous universities such as Harvard and Chicago, but he turned them all down, saying "Wisconsin is where my heart belongs."

Ironically, it was during one of those dark periods when the Wisconsin spirit faltered temporarily that Dr. Gaus finally left here.

In 1947 the board of regents refused to appoint Prof. Howard J. McMurray to the political science faculty. Dr. McMurray had served a term in Congress and had sought political office as a Democratic candidate two other times while a member of the faculty.

Dr. Gaus disagreed with the regents' decision and accepted an offer to go to Harvard as professor of government. At Harvard, Dr. Gaus' reputation continued to grow and was culminated with his election as president of the American Political Science Association.

In June of 1961, Dr. Gaus retired as professor emeritus of government at Harvard and returned with his wife to a farmstead in the lovely dairy and forest country in the Adirondacks in New York State, where he was born 68 years ago, the grandson of German immigrants.

There, Dr. Gaus said in an interview Monday, he has found a perfect laboratory for his lifelong interest in the interaction of city and country.

"I really don't know what kind of society we are coming into," Dr. Gaus said. "There are thousands of people who live in the open country, yet are city oriented in their work and their recreation."

Dr. Gaus said the metropolitan areas of the country are faced with "tremendous problems" presented by the profound changes in distribution of the American population, not only in terms of space but also in terms of employment and technological development.

He remains hopeful, however, that the problems will be solved.

"It's amazing how people will respond to a really objective, factual diagnosis of what is going on if you put it to them in human terms," Dr. Gaus said.

Putting things in human terms is what Dr. Gaus has been doing all his life.

SOVIET CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Washington Post has published two very fine editorials dealing with the problem of Soviet Cuba. While it is believed by Government officials that last fall we were successful in forcing removal of Soviet intermediate and medium range missiles and bombers, it is now recognized that the Soviets are continuing to maintain a powerful military base in this hemisphere.

The first editorial, published on March 4, strongly affirms:

Peace in this hemisphere will not be secure as long as Castro rules in Cuba. * * * The regime in Cuba is one with which its neighbors will not be permitted to live in peace.

The second editorial this morning is still more explicit. It suggests that the distinction between defensive and offensive weapons may have been erroneous or largely a semantic one. It then calls for an end to recriminations over the past and a recognition that Castro's Communist regime in Cuba is a very real threat to the safety of every democratic regime in its vicinity.

With that view I am in full agreement. Our concern must be with the danger Soviet Cuba poses at the present moment. This is a much more important issue than what the situation may have been in the past.

These editorials clarify the perils of the present situation and, in my judgment, emphasize the need for a firm and effective policy to meet the problem, a policy which, so far as I know, has not been made evident.

I ask unanimous consent to have both editorials printed following my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

NO PEACE WITH CUBA

Peace in this hemisphere will not be secure as long as Castro rules in Cuba. That is the meaning of the events of the past week—whether they relate to disclosures of Cuba's role in training subversive forces in neighboring countries or to the movement of Soviet personnel from Cuban ports. No one will ever be sure how much subversion is going on and, in spite of the efficacy of aerial surveillance, no one can be certain how large are the remaining Soviet forces.

The regime in Cuba is one with which its neighbors will not be permitted to live in peace. The threat to the security and peace will rise and fall as their own precautions are extended or contracted. There is every present indication that no country can afford to allow its guard to relax.

As long as Cuba remains a center from which Communist infiltration is carried on, it cannot expect the United States or any of its other neighbors to make any firm pledge against the invasion of Cuba. The day may arrive when these belligerent operations will reach a level of military significance to which there will be no appropriate response but military operations. To make sure that this pitch of activity is not achieved in total secrecy the scrutiny of operations on the island must be maintained at the highest level.

The Western Hemisphere must live in danger while this situation persists. The precautions necessary to contain this threat are so onerous, disagreeable, and unsettling that the United States will be under continuous pressure to take arms against this sea of trouble and end it. Were there any assurance that it could indeed be ended by extreme measures, it would be harder to resist such counsels. There is, however, no assurance that even this dangerous alternative would end the crisis. It might only start a greater crisis.

There is no easy escape from the Cuban nuisance. There is no present alternative to the maintenance of a high state of readiness for extreme action, a continuous scrutiny of Cuban measures for signs of increasing hostility, an unremitting readiness to defend any threatened country in the hemisphere. All that we can be sure of for the moment is that as long as this regime lasts, there can be no real peace.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1963]

PAST AND FUTURE IN CUBA

What is going to be done about Cuba tomorrow is a question of such pressing urgency for the survival of freedom in the Western Hemisphere that it is too bad to see it put into eclipse by a debate over what was done about Cuba yesterday.

The intellectual resources of the administration and of its opponents, unfortunately, seem to be going chiefly into the controversy about the past. No aspect of this debate is more unproductive than that which centers about the date when the administration decided that the Soviet arms buildup was offensive in character and so dangerous as to require the strong measures that were taken. The charges that the administration knew of the offensive character of the weaponry long before it disclosed its knowledge and acted on it is essentially political in character. If the charge ever is proven true or false it will leave the future quite unaffected.

Perhaps the administration erred in trying to make a distinction between defensive and offensive arms. Certainly it is a very difficult thing to do. The argument is largely a semantic one. The anticraft weapons, the defending fighters and the antimissile missiles are defensive in one sense of the word. They are, at the same time, components in any offensive weapon