

FOIA b 7

All Americans, I believe, are impressed with our own ability in this country to accumulate one-half of the production of the world by private enterprise, democratic, reasonably bloodless, hard work. There are none of us who would not want our system to work for the world as it does here.

American policy since post-World War II is to spread the benefits of our system worldwide through Marshall plan aid, Agency for International Development, Alliance for Progress, food for peace, and kindred international organizations. We supplement our program through the most extensive military oversight system ever designed on this globe, Peace Corps, tourism, and sundry other State, private, and Federal technical assistance programs. We have spent more money and given more people assistance under this program than other nation or group of nations in history.

By and large we have been extremely successful with sophisticated people. The threat of communism which I understand to be as a forsaking of liberty and justice and individual freedom in favor of a precisely managed socialist dictatorship has been met and has been successfully challenged.

The trend for the left in Britain, Italy, France and Japan after World War II is now only a whisper because through our aid and their own creativeness these countries are economically successful. Were this not a fact, all of our guns and rockets could not have changed the tide.

In the underdeveloped countries, however, of Africa, Asia and South America where poverty is rampant and populations are exploding, our "do good" policy has been questionably successful. A success record for Japan, Taiwan and Western Europe should be closely evaluated in relation to other restless countries unable to fathom the precedents we give to them.

The problem is that we become mesmerized with the term "communism." We know of the doctrine of Stalin, Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung that they peacefully or forcefully plan to capture the imagination of peasants and rural people first in south Asia, then Africa, then South America, and we are set in panic. We remember Hitler said what he would do and in 10 years he almost did it. We see the Communists restless in their containment and we fear they will do the same.

Communism should be contained—there are many other ways where liberty is not irrevocably lost by which people might develop and progress. History will no doubt record our age, I hope, as the great era when mankind conquered space and poverty through the programs developed in the competition between democracy and communism. I hope that the programs which ebb to the top as successful are democratic.

We should not become paranoid, however, when the competition is discussed. I and many Americans would like to see the United States develop the leadership and the programs that will bring peace and prosperity to the underdeveloped world. When war breaks out, usually all hope of real progress is jeopardized.

The problem is that if the United States is going to assume the stature of policeman of the world we should develop a realistic policy of helping people declare effective wars on poverty and stagnation worldwide. We are the only nation that literally has a military ring around the world—the only nation that can provide that needed cloak of protection. When we use that cloak to stamp out dictatorships of the right or left, we are working for the good of mankind. When we use that cloak and the CIA to stultify programs of people and perpetuate military coups and dictatorships, we many times militate against the progress of peoples.

When people's movements are grounded in communism we are in a dilemma. The people's program to change poverty we should support—communism we fight, and rightfully. Not to recognize that Communist programs with their ham-and-egg offerings appeal to many people, however, is to misread human nature. To handle such a movement of change when war does not break out is relatively easy. We step up our military assistance program to maintain the status quo and simultaneously step up AID efforts to promote economic development. A military coup many times is superimposed and our purposes are confounded in local public opinion. The point is that we want to help people develop because that gives us security in the United States. However, we do not act with vigor until we are hit on the head with communism.

When local war breaks out we are totally confounded as in southeast Asia today. We want to help people but things are so confused we do not know who to help or who to hurt. We are engaged in a war which it is to our own and the world's interest not to formally declare. We want to fight communism wherever it might be, but we are obviously confused because we are forced to support six successive dictatorships, none of which were popularly elected, one of which only this morning very democratically announced the summary execution of a number of too enthusiastic merchants for the American dollar.

I am pleased to see the United States now announce the \$1 billion effort to solve the economic problems of South Vietnam, this sum apparently to constitute the balm to salve the pangs of any would-be Communist supporters for a better economy. We certainly were not prepared to offer this kind of "dough" while the French had control and it is only now that we are psychologically prepared to support this kind of one small country commitment. If we want to be the policeman of the world, which role I frankly support, I think we should have better reflexes than this.

We are now in this position where to prove our point we are dropping bombs at a greater daily rate than during World War II. Our commitment as reported in the newspapers is better than 50,000 tons of TNT per month, or 500,000 250-pound bombs per month. It is obvious that if we only wound one Vietcong with every 10 bombs we would cascade the enemy to the conference table

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the only record that will really be made in the House of Representatives this 1st day of March 1966, is that virtually unanimously, with few exceptions, the Congress of the United States votes \$4.8 billion additional authorization to defend freedom in South Vietnam.

I support the President and this appropriation—the loyalty to the United States of those who do not certainly is no issue here. There are perhaps some outside this hall who would question the patriotism of anyone who expresses trepidation with respect to our commitment in southeast Asia. I would say that anyone who is not concerned with discussing choices of procedure to accomplish peace and the freedom and progress of southeast Asians in the face of the obvious threats to the existence of mankind is a superpatriotic fool.

in 30 days. We now have in excess of 200,000 men committed, joining 500,000 South Vietnamese, plus 40,000 allied soldiers. Civilian casualties, I understand, are fantastic, though American military deaths are light to date. We have a program to liberate territory and are making modest gains. However, the Vietcong today is twice as strong as they were last year this time, control more territory, and their main units are yet to be engaged.

We are raising our level of support by a substantial percentage and I believe the fiscal year 1967 military budget, when it is properly supplemented next year, will again extend substantially our commitment.

We are expending ammunition at the greatest rate in history, perhaps expending on this undeclared war one-fourth of our national income—approximately \$24 billion. We are thus drawn in battle to defeat a so-called Vietcong and North Vietnam who have a less budget for a year than we have in a month, who need but a few truckloads of materials a day to sustain them, who have no air force, no navy and certainly not a modern army. They do have tunnel and jungle sanctuaries that are difficult to penetrate.

I think then my judgment under these circumstances would be to gage carefully not only what we do but how we do it. We are really not so much ourselves trying to beat the Vietcong but trying to supplement the force of the free South Vietnamese so that the people themselves will want to rid themselves of the Vietcong. Barbarous executions by South Vietnamese and massive land scarring by B-52's and our artillery will not get the support of the people if nearly a million injured refugees are forced into Saigon as was reported today.

It is possible that we can try too hard and lose the people. In a jury trial you can have a perfect plaintiff's case, but spend too much money on diagrams and witnesses and lose the jury.

So in an election you can have an electable candidate, spend too much money and he is defeated by the electorate because the money shows.

The point is that money alone will not win the war of ideas in South Vietnam.

I do not think we can say realistically for long that the peasant just wants to be left alone, he has no philosophy, yet by night many of them make the best soldiers in the world.

The people of South Vietnam are erupting in part by northern stimulation and in part by conditions. The stimulation we can control, but we must develop and sell long-term economic programs to change conditions, to control corruptions, to expand education, to democratize leadership, to abort class and caste systems and foreign economic domination.

We must outline workable programs. It is not enough that we carry on a foreign aid program at the \$3 billion-plus authorized level and \$1 billion-plus appropriated level and carry on a program largely with surplus grains and through the many times corrupt private sector

and channel that aid to scores of countries.

We appropriate at the \$2 billion level to change poverty in our domestic program in 3,000 counties—OEO. Are we successful? How can we do the job worldwide at this level where per capita income is not \$2,000 as in the United States but \$100 as in nearby Mexico or less.

The point is that we cannot ship surplus materials with hands clasped across the boxes even at the greatest rate in history worldwide and then under our assumed worldwide police power declare that nations in our favor can qualify for this aid to more or less do as we do but that if this program is obliterated by creeping poverty, local corruption, dynastic domination or population explosion, we will blow your head off if you try to revolt if you are Communist tinged.

Rightfully and in a good moral conscience if the United States would stimulate people rebellious against dictatorship oppression and poverty, where our aid programs are ineffective, maybe more rebellious people would be oriented toward the U.S. middle ground rather than the extreme right or extreme left.

In our efforts to maintain and perpetuate our own security we should not be satisfied with a good try to defeat poverty worldwide. We should make our programs work. Where poverty and domination swell behind dormant dictatorships, then should American foreign policy be to effect change by democratically oriented revolution if need be.

Declare to the world, then, that the impoverished and the dominated will receive our support, not just a halfhearted effort and not just when communism is the competitor. This policy declared and followed then will mean a successful U.S. foreign policy—people will rally around us worldwide—this is the best and only effective containment policy—this policy also will have a natural fallout of giving us security at home.

It will mean a worldwide effort for perhaps our lifetimes by the United States and other successful democracies at a dollar level commitment not at current foreign aid rates, but at current military South Vietnam rates.

By my words of trepidation to the President concurrent with 77 of my colleagues this is what I mean.

MAR 1 1966