

ment and their dependents under 5 U.S.C. 103a.

Section 11 requires the President to transmit reports to Congress on operations under the bill at least once in each fiscal year.

Section 12 provides that all persons employed or assigned to duties and all corpsmen enrolled under the bill shall be investigated to insure that the employment, assignment, or enrollment is consistent with the national interest in accordance with standards and procedures established by the President. It is anticipated that under this provision the same type of investigations would be provided for National Service Corps personnel and corpsmen as are presently provided for Federal employees.

Section 13 authorizes the President to adopt a seal or emblem for the National Service Corps.

Section 14 is the same as section 20 of the Peace Corps Act. It amends the student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to suspend principal and interest payments on such loans for student borrowers during the period of their National Service Corps service, as is now provided with respect to borrowers in military service. Because of possible constitutional objections to this amendment if applied mandatorily to loans outstanding on the date of enactment of the bill, a proviso has been added which would apply the amendments to loans outstanding on that date only with the consent of the lender.

Section 15 is the same as section 21 of the Peace Corps Act. It contains a technical amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act to assure that a corpsman who later became a participant in

the civil service retirement system would not receive both annuity payments under that system and social security benefits based upon his period of volunteer service.

Section 16 defines various terms used in the bill. In particular, subsection (d) defines the period of service of a corpsman so as to include the training period prior to enrollment, except for the purpose of accruing retirement or other credit in connection with subsequent Federal employment. These definitions are substantially the same as those in section 25 of the Peace Corps Act.

Section 17 is a standard separability provision.

Section 18 provides that the bill's effective date shall be the date of its enactment.

## SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 6, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. George Claude Baker, Jr., of Perkins School of Theology, Dallas, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Be pleased, O God, to accept the gratitude of our hearts for the renewed gifts of Thy mercy. Thou hast granted us the light of another day and strength for our tasks. Thou hast linked our lives with solemn responsibilities through which we may serve our fellow men and Thee. Grant us, O Lord, righteous motives for all we do. Guard us from selfish decisions, and guide us into wise choices.

Amid the debate of policies and the discussions of plans, so direct and bless the President, the Vice President, and all in authority, especially this body of Senators, that they may fashion a bold vision of Thy divine purposes for our Nation and for all lands, wherein earth shall be fair, men shall be free, justice shall obtain, and peace shall bless.

So may our destiny be shaped by Thee, Almighty God, that all men may know Thy law, walk in Thy ways, and make known Thy love, through the power of Thy Holy Spirit. In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 2, 1963, was dispensed with.

### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 11, 1963,

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, on May 3, 1963, reported favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 5366) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the

President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 168) thereon.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

### ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

### LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS IN MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### REPORT BY OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS OF EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ended March 31, 1963; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### RESTRICTION OF CERTAIN AREAS IN THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi Offshore Warning Area, for defense purposes, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### CHIEF M. SGT. SAMUEL W. SMITH

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Chief M. Sgt. Samuel W. Smith, U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 753(b), TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PROVIDE FOR ELECTRONIC SOUND RECORDING OF CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 753(b) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for the recording of proceedings in the U.S. district courts by means of electronic sound recording as well as by shorthand or mechanical means (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### CHANGES IN FUNCTIONS OF THE BEACH EROSION BOARD AND THE BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make certain changes in the functions of the Beach Erosion Board and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

#### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A certified engrossed copy of a legislative bill (No. 449) enacted by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

#### "ENGROSSED LEGISLATIVE BILL 449

"A bill for an act to ratify a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the poll tax or other tax as a qualification for voting

"Be it enacted by the people of the State of Nebraska,

"SECTION 1. That the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, set forth in the resolution appearing in section 2 of this act, is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska.

"SEC. 2. That the resolution mentioned in section 1 of this act was referred to this legislature for action thereon by the Governor of Nebraska, and reads as follows:

"POLL TAX AS A QUALIFICATION FOR VOTING

"Senate Joint Resolution 29

"Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

"SEC. 3. That copies of this act be duly certified by the Secretary of State and forwarded by the Governor to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the presiding Officer of each House of the Congress of the United States.

"DWIGHT W. BURNET,  
"President of the Legislature.

"HUGO F. IRB,  
"Clerk of the Legislature.

"Approved April 8, 1963.

"FRANK B. MORRISON,  
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 16

"Joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to qualifications of electors

"Whereas both Houses of the 87th Congress of the United States of America by a constitutional majority thereof made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation: Therefore, be it

"Resolved and enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa:

"SECTION 1. RATIFICATION. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America as set forth herein be and the same is hereby ratified and consented to by the State of Iowa and by the General Assembly thereof.

"SEC. 2. CERTIFICATION. That the certified copies of this enactment and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States.

"W. L. MOOTY,  
"President of the Senate.

"ROBERT W. NADEN,  
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"CARROLL A. LANE,  
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved April 29, 1963.

"HAROLD E. HUGHES,  
"Governor."

A telegram from the City Council of Gingoog City, the Philippines, signed by its secretary, remonstrating against an amendment of the war damage bill giving the money to the Philippine Government instead of the claimants; ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1451. A bill to amend section 41(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1452. A bill to donate to the Stockbridge-Munsee community some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 1453. A bill authorizing an appropriation to provide for the expenses of a joint select committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to study the problem of local self-government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1454. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to a taxpayer who is a student at a college for certain expenses incurred in obtaining a higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks by Mr. PROUTY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. PROUTY (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 1455. A bill for the relief of the Shelburne Harbor Ship & Marine Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. FELL):

S. 1456. A bill to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways from Hartford, Conn., to Providence, R.I.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1457. A bill to amend section 203(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative

Services Act of 1949 to facilitate the procurement of certain surplus personal property by State agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

ALIEN PROPERTY UNDER THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, in the last session of the 87th Congress both House and Senate passed bills dealing with some aspects of our alien property problem under the Trading With the Enemy Act. Since there were divergent views on some matters contained in these bills a final conference between House and Senate took place on the last day of the 87th Congress in 1962. As a result of the conference a garbled language on one item developed which had failed to take into account a dictum in a U.S. Supreme Court decision on June 25, 1962, in the so-called Glidden case, which related to the general jurisdiction of the Court of Claims.

The Senate version of the bill was in compliance with the court decision but the conference language was something of a mixture which overlooked it. One of the results of the Glidden decision was to place about 35 cases referred to the Court of Claims by action of only one branch of Congress, in a state of suspension, and some effort has already been made to draft general legislation so that all doubts concerning congressional intent in the 35 cases referred to would be resolved.

At the moment general legislation on this subject does not seem practicable and in addition, the case involved in the Senate bill is such that it merits separate treatment. One reason for this view is that in the case referred to it was the only one considered by both branches of the Congress and was, therefore, incorporated in a bill which was signed by the President. The garbled language does, in fact, defeat the real intent of both Houses of the Congress and that intent was to give the U.S. stockholders of the General Dyestuff Corp. a trial in the Court of Claims on the basic merit of the respective claims. The measure I am introducing, therefore, undertakes to restore the Senate language and should, therefore, be approved by both the Senate and the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1451) to amend section 41(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RETURN OF CERTAIN LANDS TO STOCKBRIDGE-MUNSEE INDIAN COMMUNITY, SHAWANO COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last year I introduced a bill which provided for the return to the Stockbridge-Munsee Indian community, in Shawano County, Wis., of lands adjacent to their

reservation which were taken over by the Federal Government in the 1930's. Unfortunately, that bill was not acted on last year.

I am introducing the bill again, this year; and my bill is being cosponsored by my distinguished junior colleague [Mr. NELSON].

The lands involved are considered submarginal. They were taken over by the Federal Government during the depression, under the national industrial recovery program and the Farm Security Administration.

For many years, the Department of Agriculture had jurisdiction over the lands. Recently, they were turned over to the Department of the Interior, to be administered for the benefit of the Stockbridge-Munsee community.

But many members of the tribe who live on the lands can get title only on a year-to-year basis. This uncertain tenure makes it very difficult to establish decent homes and farms, and to secure satisfactory mortgage financing.

The bill would promote this by donating the land to the tribe, and making it part of the reservation. Such action has been recommended by the Secretary of the Interior in both the Kennedy administration and the Eisenhower administration. This means that the bill has bipartisan support.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill, and request its appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1452) to donate to the Stockbridge-Munsee community some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; introduced by Mr. PROXYRE (for himself and Mr. NELSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR STUDY OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BY THE JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

This bill provides an authorization of \$50,000 for the operations of a joint select committee, composed of Members of both the Senate and the House, whose duty shall be to prepare a statement of conclusions, together with their reasons therefor, suggesting a proper form of local self-government for the District of Columbia.

The bill requires that the report of the committee must be submitted to the Congress not later than January 1 of 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1453) authorizing an appropriation to provide for the expenses of a joint select committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to study the problem of local self-government for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr.

PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### DEDUCTION TO TAXPAYERS WHO ARE COLLEGE STUDENTS WORKING ALL OR SUBSTANTIALLY PART OF THEIR WAY THROUGH COLLEGE

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to aid students who are working all or a substantial part of their way through college.

These students have demonstrated their great desire to obtain more education and their willingness to labor for it.

How difficult it is for these thousands of youngsters who are trying to prepare for tough courses and at the same time must hold down a job to pay their tuition expenses.

A National Science Foundation study points out that a lack of money caused up to one-half of the male college drop-outs, and one-third of the female drop-outs quit college because they simply did not have adequate financial resources.

Members of Congress seem to recognize that education is important and we permit philanthropists and others tax deductions if they make charitable donations to educational institutions.

Yet when a poor boy or girl works full time during the summer and part time during the school year to pay for his or her books or tuition, the Federal Government taxes their meager income without regard to the fact that it is being used for education.

How inconsistent this is to allow a deduction to the rich man when he does something for education and to deny similar benefits to hard-pressed young men and women who are willing to work night and day to learn—to get ahead—to become better citizens.

One of the great questions facing this Nation is whether higher education should be limited to those who can afford it.

Many of the keenest students in the Nation come from the poorest families and it is said that one-third of these talented and needy youngsters are financially unable to attend college.

We shall need a million and one-half engineers and over half a million scientists by 1970.

To meet this need we should graduate about 80,000 engineers a year during the 1960's. Sad to say, however, current enrollments indicate that we will be graduating fewer than 40,000 per year through at least 1964.

Sure, scholarships are some help but studies show that the average scholarship award—whether from a corporation or a State program—is approximately \$400 per year—less than one-quarter of the cost of attending college.

Loans are becoming more available, but the student who may have to help out at home after he graduates from college is not always eager to accept the prospect of total borrowing. He would much rather work as much as possible while he goes to college so that he will

not be faced with huge obligations when he finishes his training.

Many Americans in the past have worked all or at least a part of their way through college and they have a right to be proud of it.

But times have changed. The cost of going to college was less then and taxes did not get into the picture.

Today educational costs are much higher and a student who works for his education does get into the tax picture and incurs a penalty, an extra charge for education, from the U.S. Government.

This very unfair situation exists notwithstanding the fact that we are more aware than we ever have been of the benefits of education to our national well-being and even more survival.

Let us reorient our thinking and be grateful that we have thousands of young boys and girls who have caught the spirit of our free society. Let us not dampen that spirit by taxing in a cold routine manner the nickels and dimes they have earned to pay their tuition and book expenses.

My bill does not give a complete tax-exempt status to students who work while they attend college, but it does allow them to deduct for tax purposes certain expenses incurred in obtaining a higher education.

The deduction allowed is this: up to \$1,200 per taxable year for an undergraduate student and up to \$1,500 per taxable year for a graduate student. The work must be toward a baccalaureate or graduate degree. The deduction is only for tuition, fees, and supplies. It does not apply to sustaining expenses of board and room.

The student may be going to school either full or part time, but he or she must be in a degree program from an institution which is accredited either nationally or regionally. Hobby courses, beauty culture or any program in any institution would not be accepted as legitimate degree work and will not be aided.

By putting a ceiling on deductions, an undue burden upon the tax structure is eliminated. This ceiling has been set carefully in terms of average costs in a private school as figured by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A lower ceiling would discriminate against private institutions. A higher one would benefit unfairly the higher cost private schools and be a stimulus to them to raise fees.

A principal aim, of course, is to help the student taxpayer, and this it will. For example, if a student earned \$2,000 in 1 year, took full advantage of the \$1,200 deduction, plus his personal exemption and automatic 10 percent deduction, he would pay no tax at all.

Certain exemptions and special deductions are available under our tax laws because it is said that they serve national purposes which are more important than the mere raising of revenue.

What expenditure of money will bring greater returns for the public benefit than the expenditure of funds for education?

What greater purpose can a tax deduction serve than to stimulate an intelligent young boy or girl to prepare

for teaching or science or engineering where they can make a lifetime contribution to their Nation?

I pay tribute to the hundreds of thousands of young men and women who are working their way through college, and I express the sincere hope that we will be able to tell them before this year is out that Congress recognizes their efforts and that help is on the way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1454) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to a taxpayer who is a student at a college for certain expenses incurred in obtaining a higher education, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### INCLUSION OF ROUTE NO. 6 FROM HARTFORD TO PROVIDENCE INTO THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and Senators RIBICOFF, PASTORE, and PELL, a bill which would include an additional 75 miles between Hartford, Conn., and Providence, R.I., in the National System of Interstate and Defense highways.

A recent analysis undertaken by the Connecticut and Rhode Island Highway Departments indicates a serious need for a supplemental interstate highway in this area.

My colleagues and I are of the opinion that this addition to the Interstate System meets all the necessary criteria and would serve peacetime, wartime, and national defense interests.

The proposed route would be in a direct easterly direction from Hartford and would roughly follow the present U.S. Route No. 6.

The joint study done by the Connecticut and Rhode Island Highway Departments proves conclusively that the 12 standards of criteria for the selection of routes for interstate highways are completely met by the selection of this route.

Not only would the proposed route serve the maximum number of urban population centers in the area but it would also serve the needs of the rural population as well. Its location would take into consideration the requirements of manufacturing communities and also be of value to agriculture markets along its route.

The proposed route further meets the standards of serving Military and Naval Establishments as well as defense industries.

My colleagues and I feel there is much justification for including this additional 75 miles of highway in the Interstate System and we hope that early action will be possible to make this a reality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1456) to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways from Hartford, Conn., to Providence, R.I.,

introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

#### AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] be added as a cosponsor of S. 835, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930. We welcome Senator MCINTYRE's support for this bill and are pleased to have him as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT OF SECTION 301 OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on February 28 I, along with a number of other Senators introduced the bill (S. 941) which would amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] desires to cosponsor this proposal and I ask unanimous consent that his name be added at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### DESIGNATION OF OCTOBER 9 IN EACH YEAR AS LEIF ERIKSON DAY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 1, 1963, the name of Mr. JACKSON was added as an additional cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 76) to authorize the President to proclaim October 9 in each year as Leif Erikson Day, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators) on May 1, 1963.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. THURMOND:

Editorial entitled "Disarmament: The Grand Delusion," published in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on May 2, 1963; and his newsletter of May 6, 1963, entitled "Disarmament: Wishful Thinking."

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of May 5 appears an article, by the able and highly knowledgeable Capitol correspondent, Robert C. Albright, which deals with the brilliant majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. Albright, by the adept use of highlights and sidelights from the Senator's career, presents a very vivid profile of our distinguished colleague, who is noted for his honesty, his integrity, his know-how, his understanding, and his tolerance. As a Senator, HUBERT HUMPHREY

is an outstanding example of the value of full debate in the Senate in clarifying the issues which confront us and in the creation and evolution of remedies for meeting these issues. As a leader in this body and in the Democratic Party, he personifies the dedication to public responsibility and the courageous approach to innovation which for so many years have kept Democrats closely attuned to the needs of the American people.

Mr. Albright, in his unique and exceptional fashion, has given the public a revealing glimpse of one of the most able of Senators. I am delighted to call his article to the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### PERPETUAL MOTION HUMPHREY HAS SOARED IN 15 YEARS

(By Robert C. Albright)

The U.S. Senate has many wonders, but only one challenge to natural law: For going on 15 years now, one of its Members has been in perpetual motion.

The bundle of energy is Minnesota's HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, compulsive talker, walker, idea catalyst and wit. He can spout more words, put in more bills, whirl in and out of more meetings, race over more territory than any other politician in memory. He's all over the Senate's legislative spectrum.

Dazzled colleagues can't explain how he keeps up the pace. Contrary to legend, this sort of vitality doesn't come out of those vitamin bottles he always keeps handy around the office. HUMPHREY generates activity. When forced to lay off, he frets, wilts, and turns physically pale.

At 52, a comparative youth by Senate standards, he has mellowed slightly from the brash young Democrat of 39 who first came to the Chamber from Minnesota in January 1949. To the Senate, he has become a fact of political life. But the galleries rediscover him daily and reporters monitor him as they would a man in orbit.

He's been called everything from a windbag to a paragon of oratorical brilliance; from a meddler to a goal-scoring team player—depending on who's talking. The truth, as always, lies in between.

But however one rates him otherwise, he's a bright daub of color across the Senate's sepia landscape.

In two decades, he has clambered from defeated candidate for mayor of Minneapolis to No. 2 Democrat in the Senate. A fellow Senator he once tried to lick in the presidential primaries, John F. Kennedy, now sits in the White House but listens to his advice.

In a way, HUMPHREY has become a sort of idea factory for Kennedy administration bills. The Peace Corps, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the Senate-phased youth opportunities and wilderness bills had their inception in Humphrey proposals.

The Chamber that once gawked at his flaming liberalism, and smiled at his boundless enthusiasms, long ago took him into its inner club. The liberalism is still there, tempered by experience, but even the southerners have learned to live with him.

Critics say he tries to do too much, puts in too many bills, fails to set priorities and ration his time. He has all the traits of the man in a hurry. Sometimes he even catches up with his appointments, but seldom on time.

Newsmen, the most critical of audiences, have grown used to cooling their heels while waiting for his scheduled press conferences. When he shows up, it's worth it. But often

the time runs out and the conference is canceled.

HUMPHREY has been known to attend, even speak at, three or four luncheons in one day, but he generally returns to his office hungry and unfed. When he finds time, he drops by the Senate cafeteria for a sandwich and some soup.

He is likely to react to the challenge of the moment and respond to the stimulus of an immediate set of circumstances rather than plan ahead carefully. In many long-range fields, however, he has shown phenomenal perseverance.

He has been President Kennedy's strong right arm on disarmament policy. Under General Eisenhower as well as under Mr. Kennedy, in fact, he stoutly maintained that an effective nuclear test-ban treaty was in the national interest of the United States.

Among HUMPHREY's surprising number of legislative firsts was S. 3675, calling for establishment of a Peace Corps. He introduced it in the Senate June 15, 1960. Many others had supported the idea and called for a study, but HUMPHREY got there first with a bill. In 1961, HUMPHREY helped push Mr. Kennedy's own Peace Corps bill to enactment.

Two years before, during the Eisenhower administration, the Senate passed a Humphrey youth employment bill. It foundered in the House. This year, HUMPHREY urged the President to give the Kennedy youth bill No. 1 priority. During the pre-Easter rush, the Senate passed it, with Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, joining HUMPHREY in applying the spurs.

HUMPHREY was among the first to push the food for peace idea, and as long ago as 1960 he proposed an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Eight years ago he scored another first, offering the original bill to preserve millions of acres of America's wilderness. The Senate recently passed it, for the second straight year.

Sometimes HUMPHREY improvises with the ideas of others to frame legislation aimed at pressing needs. Just now there's a gleam in his eye reflecting his concern for the problems of megalopolis and our overpopulated seaboard areas. Any day now there'll probably be a Humphrey bill on how best to assure for future generations adequate open space and recreational facilities.

During the 1960 presidential year, four full-fledged Democratic presidential candidates blossomed in the Senate. But it was HUMPHREY who directly challenged Mr. Kennedy in decisive primaries all the way from Wisconsin to HUMPHREY's West Virginia "Waterloo."

Few would have bet money on HUMPHREY's political future when Mr. Kennedy became the Nation's 34th President. But Mr. Kennedy welcomed HUMPHREY into the leadership fold. Today, there are few legislators closer to the White House.

In the Senate, his stature has grown as second in command to Democratic Leader MANSFIELD and heir apparent to the office if the Senate follows its recent tradition of promoting the majority whip.

Time was when the Senate's southern Democrats would not have stood still for any leadership role for the man who came to the Senate in the wake of the bruising civil rights fight he led on the 1948 Democratic convention floor. Barely had he taken his oath before he tangled with a leading southerner, Virginia's HARRY FLOOD BYRD. The Senate, which stands by its seniors, administered a merciless hazing.

But today HUMPHREY gets along reasonably well with the Dixie contingent. The fact is that he likes most of the southern Members and they respect him. They fall out during every civil rights ruckus, then make friends again.

HUMPHREY's own basic liberalism is not subject to challenge, but occasionally he is needed by some of the progressives for not

playing a more militant role. In one instance, he was asked to join a picket line at the White House in support of a liberal cause. Said HUMPHREY:

"Why do that, when I can go in and have breakfast with the President?"

Today's Senate is not noted for its orators. The last golden-voiced speaker passed on with the retirement of the late Senator Walter F. George, Democrat, of Georgia. With a few notable exceptions, modern Senators speak their piece without rising to forensic heights, then call it a day.

HUMPHREY is one of the exceptions. On a moment's notice, he can delight the Senate with a sparkling flood of words and humor. Seldom if ever is there any prepared text. The day before his appearance as a featured Gridiron dinner speaker, aides were startled to learn that he had prepared nothing in advance. A text was rushed out on the eve of the dinner.

Whether on the stump or in the Senate, HUMPHREY has only one problem: How to turn off the torrent of talk. For the first 20 minutes, he's a charmer. Then the audience grows restless. For HUMPHREY doesn't know when to stop.

Recently he worked out a compromise. By sheer willpower he holds speeches short during the business start of the Senate's day. Then he compensates by delivering those long, long speeches after most of his colleagues have gone home.

One way or another, to an audience or without one, he has to talk.

## LAOS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the press, this morning, carries reports that Prince Souvanna Phouma may withdraw as Prime Minister of Laos. These reports, Mr. President, are most disturbing. From the outset, he has been the one man in a position of leadership in Laos who has been fully and courageously dedicated to the concept of a peaceful, neutral, and unified Laos. His withdrawal at this time would spell the end of effective efforts to create, in that nation, conditions which would benefit all concerned and, most of all, the people of Laos. It would spell the end, for all practical purposes, of the attempt to apply the Geneva accords.

Mr. President, the cost of United States aid to Laos has been sharply reduced during the brief period in which Souvanna Phouma has been Prime Minister. If Souvanna Phouma is now compelled to withdraw, if circumstances are such that he feels that further efforts are fruitless, as it would seem to me that this Nation should give immediate consideration to the complete termination of all United States aid to Laos, pending a complete reexamination of our entire problem there.

So long as Souvanna Phouma remains, there is hope that a solution can be achieved which will salvage something worthwhile for peace and freedom in return for the approximately \$500 million which, in a decade, we have poured into that remote land. If he goes, there is little prospect of anything but a prolonged blood bath, induced by rival war lords, supported by outside powers, which will devastate the remote and rustic villages and decimate the peaceful inhabitants of that unfortunate kingdom. It is doubtful, in my opinion, that it is in any way in the U.S. interest to subsidize any part of that revolting process.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me ask the distinguished majority leader whether I correctly interpret his statement on Laos to mean that if the efforts of Souvanna Phouma are not successful, and if he is forced to withdraw as Prime Minister, all our aid to Laos should stop immediately; or that our aid should continue until we reexamine our Laos policy after which our aid to that country might be stopped.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me repeat my statement: "If Souvanna Phouma is now compelled to withdraw, if circumstances are such that he feels that further efforts are fruitless, it would seem to me that this Nation should give immediate consideration to the complete termination of all U.S. aid to Laos, pending a complete reexamination of our entire position there."

That decision is not—of course, will not be—the decision of the Senator from Montana. It is the decision of the President of the United States which must prevail. He would have at his fingertips all the available information as to what the situation was there, and he would have to make the decision. But in view of the situation which has developed in that unhappy kingdom, I believe that the times may call for drastic action of the sort proposed. Souvanna Phouma, in my opinion, is the one man who can keep Laos together and bring about the creation of a buffer state, a neutral state, and a unified state.

We ought to keep that in mind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Montana. I have been in Laos. The only question I raised about the Senator's statement is that if we should shut off all aid immediately, there would certainly be great turmoil. On the other hand, I agree with the Senator that current events are fast bringing this matter to a conclusion unless the present government can be continued under the Geneva accord. If the Geneva agreement breaks down, our aid policy certainly should be reexamined, and we should come to some definite conclusion regarding our entire Laos policy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted at the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I am glad to note that he is in accord with the suggestion—and it is only a suggestion—which I have made. I would point out that, once before, Souvanna Phouma was forced from the premiership, and on that occasion, following his withdrawal, the situation in Laos became worse and our aid was expanded enormously.

I should like to point out also that Souvanna Phouma is the one man in the present situation upon whom it seems possible to depend to bring about the type of agreement which was envisaged in the Geneva accord. This agreement was at best tenuous, a calculated risk. But I also point out that what happens in Laos, in view of its location, is very important in relation to the rest of southeast Asia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is very true. If Laos goes, the whole situation over there will be very much changed. We must make sure that Laos does not

go if we can possible prevent it, but certainly our aid should not be continued there indefinitely. We are really supporting the entire Government of Laos today, or at least 75 percent of it. If our aid were suddenly withdrawn, there would be no chance for a stable government in Laos in my opinion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If Souvanna Phouma were to withdraw, the situation of Laos would become very much more difficult and would cause us to reexamine our whole policy because of the dangers which would come about because of such an action. If he were to withdraw, the dangerous situation in southeast Asia would become doubly dangerous as a result.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is no question about that.

#### NATIONS OF THE PACIFIC—ARTICLES BY ROY A. ROBERTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President during the month of April, the Kansas City Star published a series of articles by the distinguished chairman of the board of this outstanding newspaper, Mr. Roy A. Roberts. Mr. Roberts toured the rim of the Western Pacific and the countries and islands of the South Pacific. He wrote vividly of his impressions, garnered, with a reporter's eye and ear, from New Zealand to Tokyo.

As I have noted on previous occasions, this is a region of the world of which our knowledge and understanding are only too sparse and limited. That is particularly the case with respect to the two great nations "down under" with whom we are allied—New Zealand and Australia. Mr. Roberts has performed a public service in reporting on his visits to those countries and to the other regions of the Far East. Let me say, too, that in his penetrating article on the new State of Hawaii he has illuminated not only the great addition which its admission to the Union has made, but also its high importance to the future of the United States in the Pacific.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the series of excellent articles by Mr. Roy Roberts be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 12, 1963]

PEACE DAGGER BY RED CHINA—MAO'S FORCES HOLD MORE PERIL THAN RUSSIA, ROY ROBERTS REPORTS—LEADERSHIP AT STAKE—EDGE OVER SOVIETS SEEN IN DEEP-ROOTED ASIA-FOR-ASIANS BOND

(NOTE.—Since early this year, Roy A. Roberts has been traveling in the Far East. This is the first of several articles written upon his return.)

Back home after a fascinating, nearly 3-month tour of the South Pacific and Orient, I find several impressions—just that, no more—stand out in my mind.

Communist Red China presents a far more dangerous threat to world peace and our own future security than Russia. Of that I am completely convinced.

Seeing, firsthand, the population explosion in the Orient—you saw it, felt it and it bore in on you in country after country—I brought home the feeling that this pressure

of people is almost as dangerous as the nuclear threat itself. History tells us nothing has created more wars than this pressure of populations for survival.

The split between Mao, the Red Chinese boss, and Khrushchev, the Russian dictator, is far more serious and deep-rooted, and could have more far-reaching consequences, than we have recognized so far over here.

#### A TIME OF STRESS

But don't be too sanguine about it. Conceivably, in the long pull, it could work out to the advantage of the free world. On the other hand, as the two rival camps of communism pull and tug in a power struggle, it could make more difficult our immediate job of finding a way to live in the same world with Russia and Red China. And for the present, this latter result is more probable.

Of all the trouble and danger spots—and they're everywhere—in that vast, unfathomable Far East that we so little understand, Indonesia seemed to me, on a hunch, to be nearest the exploding point. This could create a situation even more dangerous than the tough, indecisive battle we now are waging to hold Vietnam, in southeast Asia, out from under Red domination.

I could go on and list many more impressions here, such as the fabulous story of Japan's comeback, but these are the vital ones concerning world peace which I picked up on an altogether-too-hasty survey.

#### A VACATION TRIP

I don't pretend to be any expert on the Far East; a vacation trip on a luxury ship is not a very good premise for any survey, and we left the ship frequently to fly, in order to cover more ground. Such a trip, in itself, would be no better background than that of someone who spends a few days in New York and Washington and then poses as an expert on America.

What I did do during the trip, however, was to meet newspapermen at every major port and pick their minds on how they saw conditions in the Far East. Most of them had been out there for years—this is certainly no field for the novice reporter. What follows, then, outside of certain personal reactions—such as the feeling of the sheer pressure of people, people, people—represents my sizeup of many views, some agreeing and some sharply in conflict, of those who are living through these thrilling days of an emerging Orient on the march.

#### OPINION OF THOSE THERE

I purposely did not seek out people in government, because I wanted to get more objective viewpoints, but I did occasionally run into some very well-informed people in both government and business. This report is based more on what the men on the job out there feel about the Far East.

Red China, of course, is the real enigma of that part of the world and, I might add, increasingly is becoming more of a factor in the future than is Russia. That despite the very serious, even critical, times they are having behind their Bamboo Curtain. You sense the danger specifically in every port and capital from Singapore to Tokyo.

Make no mistake about it, the Chinese brand of communism is a far greater threat to world peace than the Russian version, and there's certainly no reason to be lulled into security by the latter, either. They just operate differently. Always, and particularly in the Far East, you have to view everything in the perspective of history, because time is endless in the Orient. It might be added, so is their patience. They're not in a hurry as we are.

You sense, too, that in Russia, as history has always shown to be the case, the fires of revolution are beginning to burn out. They have begun to acquire some of the things that make life better. They have built up

a giant industrial complex, have projected themselves into a world power and now they have learned enough to realize that nuclear war would mean total destruction. Hence, basically, they now seek to communize the world, as always, but short of total war.

In Red China, on the other hand, they don't have much to lose. A war of nuclear devastation, with their hundreds of millions of people, might possibly leave them in a relatively improved position with fewer mouths to feed. Thus their tough, uncompromising position in world affairs.

Let it be said, no one is fooled by Mr. K—he is no angel but he has shown that he doesn't want total war. The pressures of the struggle with China for leadership of the Communist world, however, in some respects make it more difficult for him to work out any kind of accommodation with the West.

#### A BUFFER STATE

Again, let's lug in what history has told us for hundreds of years, that Russia has always been more or less a buffer state between the East and West. Moscow, of course, vociferously denies and scorns any suggestion that a complete breach might occur between them and Peiping, with Russia turning toward the West. Nevertheless, unless somebody touches that fatal nuclear button in the next few years, it's a fairly good guess that, as the Russian internal economy improves, they will again find themselves back in their historic role as the East-West buffer state. That's just a thought—not a prophecy.

At Hong Kong, especially, naturally asked everyone—newspapermen, educators and whomever—how really serious was this break between Moscow and Peiping? I was surprised at the unanimity with which they all took it seriously. I had expected to hear of some public, kiss-and-make-up type of meeting for the sake of giving the world a picture of Communist unity.

#### THE RIFT DEEPENS

Instead I found that most observers felt the split had only emphasized basic cleavages between Russia and China, and that as the years progress these will deepen and widen rather than heal.

One night in Hong Kong, sitting in a restaurant with a small group of Chinese and a delightful American couple who have dedicated much of their lives to China, I got this very succinct description of the situation from a very intelligent Chinese:

There are three angles, he explained.

First, the struggle between Khrushchev and Mao for personal leadership of world communism. Much of that is a matter of personalities, but it goes deeper, to the basic question of which way the leadership will go.

Secondly, there is a strong nationalistic clash between the two countries, along their borders and over the issue of which will dominate their satellite and neighboring countries. These differences will endure no matter what the next few years develop.

And thirdly, there is the ideological issue as to how Marxism and communism should be interpreted and applied. This is the one over which they quarrel publicly, but the first two factors are more important, and in the order listed.

That was about as clear a picture of the situation as I encountered, and as I tried it out on others there was general assent. Yet everywhere I was cautioned, "Don't expect too much." There is just as much chance that the split will make the free world situation more difficult instead of less so.

Another man who has lived for many years in Hong Kong told me:

"At first I thought it was a phony quarrel, just a bit of minor maneuvering, and I wasn't sure but what it was being done for deceptive purposes. Yet just when I expected it would be patched up with some sort of love feast, out of nowhere came the most bitter exchanges yet between Khrush-

shchev and Mao, almost beyond the point of return.

#### A REAL DIVISION

"The longer I live out here, the less certain I am of anything they'll do. Despite any public making-up that may occur, the basic clash between two schools of communism as to which will continue to exist certainly has been dramatized. And we should never forget it."

At Singapore and all other stops, I heard varying opinions as to whether the other Communist or near-Communist nations of Asia would side with Peiping or Moscow in case of a showdown; countries, that is, such as Burma, Indonesia, and Mongolia. Except for North Korea and North Vietnam, most of them still give some public lipservice to Russia, because Russia can give them things they need.

I found, however, that most of those who have lived longest in the Orient believe that if those nations had to make a choice—and they don't want to—they probably would side with Peiping, for two reasons:

First, they're Asiatic, and Mao's revolution is more than just Communist. Underlying it is a philosophy of Asia for the Asians. It was even more a peasant uprising than was that in Russia.

#### USING RUSSIA'S PLOY

In the second place, there is a strange paradox. For years, in her efforts at international subversion and infiltration, Russia has used the technique of representing the have-nots against the haves in the Western bloc nations. In the Orient, now, China is using the same technique in her power struggle with Moscow, only Russia represents the haves and China the have-not countries. And it's just as effective as what the West has had to contend with.

All this points up the fact that when we believe we can make a deal with Russia on the Far East, it may be just a part of her devious strategy of deception. Russia may not be able to deliver any more, as she used to, now that China is prepared to ignore any Moscow decisions as not binding on her at all.

The very least China would accept, apparently, is equal partnership in communism with complete domination of Asia. But with the huge populations of the Orient which would fall into the Chinese orbit under such an arrangement, Khrushchev probably is no more anxious to see this happen than he would be to see China become a nuclear power.

Up to now, his ace in the hole in asserting world Communist leadership is that Russia is a nuclear power but little else.

#### A SHIFTING LEADERSHIP

Where is it all going to end? I can't pretend to have brought home any specific answer, but I would point out one highly significant factor for the future: Not only in the Far East but in Europe as well there is a period of waiting and drifting now for one vital reason—the world leaders there are growing old. Mao is aging; Chiang Kai-shek, on Formosa, is nearing the end of his string. Khrushchev himself is no youngster and is showing the strain. In West Germany, Adenauer will step down next fall, and in France, De Gaulle has reached the age where more and more people are asking, "What next? And who next?" Elections are in the offing in Britain with some new faces likely to come on the scene.

Of course, no one can predict, but I would suggest that barring the usual passing crises—and they'll always be with us in both the East and West—not until the old leaders pass on will it become clear how world trends and currents are going to run in the years ahead. I came home from the Far East with the feeling that this is how it will be out there, too.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 14, 1963]

**CAN HOLD OFF CHINA DECISION—BUT EVENTUALLY THE UNITED STATES MUST DEAL WITH RED GIANT—NO RECOGNITION NOW—MOST OBSERVERS BELIEVE THERE WOULD BE NOTHING TO GAIN AT PRESENT**

(By Roy A. Roberts)

When you're there, you find yourself caught up in the spirit of the Orient where time means little or nothing and history means much.

You come away from an entirely too brief look-see at the problems of the Bamboo Curtain and the massive Communist revolution behind it—but you come away without a feeling of red-hot urgency.

What's happening there is something that will be going on for a long time to come. So the threat to world peace and to our own security is not for now, but in the long years ahead. How many years is anybody's guess.

#### STILL FAR BEHIND

Today, the mighty giant of China with its 700 or 800 million people—even they don't know how many—is not industrialized. The Chinese are about where the Russians were three or four decades ago. The Chinese have a long way to go.

But all you have to do is take a look at Japan to see what the Oriental mind can do when given the opportunity. In the span of a few years Japan has become one of the industrial powers, not only of the Orient, but of the entire world.

True, the Japanese had several decades of industrial development, but look how fast they moved, given the time, money, and know-how. There is no reason in the world why the awakening giant of China, with its enormous population, can't do as well. The Chinese already have shown their ability to be the traders and bankers of the East.

#### ONLY A GUESS

It took Russia 40 years to do the job. How long will it take China? It's anybody's guess. But you can see the probable challenge to the Western world. The great move to industry away from a crude agricultural economy is under way.

Coming away from a brief and entirely too sketchy look at what's going on behind that Bamboo curtain, I find three questions are asked by nearly everyone. I wish I could give definite answers. I didn't find them. But I can suggest some of the possible answers from the thinking I picked up. The questions:

1. When will China become a nuclear power?
2. What are present conditions in China—as best known by constant observers?
3. Should we or should we not recognize the most populous nation in the world and should we continue to oppose its membership in the United Nations?

#### A GUARDED SECRET

As to that first question, no one knows, and nearly everyone is trying to find out, how far along Chinese scientists are in crashing into the nuclear club. This is a most carefully guarded secret and some say that even the Russians don't know. One thing is dead certain: Khrushchev is no more anxious to see Mao with the bomb than we are.

I asked over and over again the best judgment of those who might read the riddle of the bomb timetable. Some thought Red China might set off its first explosion within the year. But almost without exception they would add, "Don't panic when this happens."

It would be a far cry, they explain, from that explosion to actually putting working missiles on an operational basis. Of course the Chinese can do it and we can't discount the fact. But the industrial capacity

simply isn't there for any quick transformation from an experimental explosion to an atomic arsenal.

#### A JUNIOR MEMBER

France, for instance, had its first explosion in February 1960. The French still are a long way even from junior membership in the nuclear club. And France is highly industrialized. You might as well make your own guess on Red China, but don't panic. It's coming, even though nobody on the outside knows when.

All this brings up a nagging question. To date, all our negotiations over control have been with Russia although the British more or less have been on the sidelines. But if we are going to have any real global restrictions on nuclear arms, some day Red China will have to be taken into consideration, whether we like it or not. That is one of the paradoxes in the world picture. Nearly everyone agrees that when China gets the bomb, the weapon will be in the hands of one of the most irresponsible powers, a great threat to peace.

If the world is to have enforceable curbs on atomic weapons, some day those curbs will have to apply to China—or they will be worthless.

#### NEWS LEAKS OUT

Now to the second question on present conditions in China. You get most of the information from across the border. The Communist radio beats waves of information into Hong Kong, Tokyo, and other spots. What they say officially is no secret. It's carefully monitored by many agents. Also, the press of Red China gets out in a steady flow. There is no effort to hold the newspapers in. This information is carefully studied.

Frankly, it seems that the situation is almost the same as in those days along the Russian border after World War I when the Baltic States were the listening posts.

You get a pretty fair and varied picture although the details aren't always adequate or necessarily accurate.

#### BETTER THAN IN PAST

No one disputes that conditions in Red China, with its huge population, are somewhat better than they were a year ago. That isn't saying too much. An almost un-falling barometer of conditions is the influx of refugees into Hong Kong and the Portuguese crown colonies. When starvation is the only alternative, even the police and the army can't keep down the rush to get out. When the food supply is better, the tide of refugees slows down. But it never stops entirely.

Statistically, I found from government people that, on the average, food production was up 20 percent this year. But that's a rise from an almost impossible starvation level. I doubt whether folks here at home realize how close Red China was to being on the ropes for a year or so. We knew that conditions were bad, but just how bad came out only later.

Some of the trouble was due to droughts, floods, and generally bad weather. But you learn now that much of the difficulty came from the collapse of the Central Government program of completely communizing farm production, and sacrificing everything for industry.

#### A TURNAROUND

So serious did the food crisis become that the great industrial push had to be stopped. Factories under construction were cut off short. Plants ready to go into production had to stand idle. The Government simply had to get back to food production and the major industrial effort is still suspended. Without wheat purchases from Canada and Australia, the central government might have had a hard time weathering the storm. But it did.

Perhaps it is significant that in various provinces farmers now are allowed to keep small plots and sell the produce. This information came from Chinese who had recently filtered out from behind the curtain. The free enterprise farming, plus better weather, has spurred production.

But many of us probably have missed the really significant event of those dark days of crop failures and starvation. That was the power struggle that set in between Russia and China. Khrushchev withdrew his vitally important technicians and he choked off the flow of aid. No doubt that added great bitterness to the ideological quarrel between the two leaders of the Communist world.

You heard in Hong Kong that Khrushchev was perfectly willing to see the Chinese regime go to pot rather than to face its challenge of leadership in the world and particularly Asia.

#### MADE THEM PAY

The Russians also made the Chinese pay through the nose for the aid they got. This information comes secondhand, but it is much discussed on the perimeter of Red China.

Summing up this point, you get the picture that conditions could get better, but that already the regime is getting somewhat cocky again. It still isn't strong enough to resume the massive drive toward industrialization.

But in the meantime the Chinese aren't averse to military adventures anywhere that would help politically or fan the spirit of the people. Excursions in India and Vietnam are examples. But they aren't ready yet for anything big.

Most observers say that while the Chinese people may not be happy, the regime is firmly entrenched and won't be upset. As for Chiang's invasion talk, it has propaganda value.

But that's about all it amounts to. Another food collapse could present a different picture. Food production is an internal problem that probably has kept Red China from far greater aggression. We can be absolutely sure that the ruthless program of the Government is to get what it wants, no matter what the cost. It's a different picture from Moscow and the wily Mr. K.

#### HARD TO ANSWER

Now for the big question. Should we or shouldn't we recognize China—and what about acceptance by the U.N.?

I'll be frank here. I had much more positive views on the subject and thought I knew more about it than before I visited the Orient. I wish I were as positive in my thinking now as I was then. It's one thing to sit at long range. It's another thing altogether to sit on the edge of that teeming, mysterious continent and try to give answers.

Offhand, I found that most of those I talked to gave the opinion that nothing was to be gained at this time by recognition—and that possibly, there was something to lose.

The same people also thought that U.N. membership and diplomatic recognition by the United States are inevitable—sometime. The veteran observers thought that these things would have to come after a gesture by Red China. Advances on our part would involve too much loss of face. After all, we have been their favorite whipping boys—the arch imperialists.

One mistake probably has been the American conception of what is constituted by diplomatic recognition. Certainly it doesn't mean approval. But that is what it seems to the American people. You simply don't condone sin—at least publicly. Yet this is not a realistic approach.

#### U.N. IS THE POE

The situation is complicated. For instance, it's not ourselves but the U.N. that is at war with China. Although the truce in

Korea has been in effect for years, the problem for the U.N. is to take in a country that fictionally is still at war with the U.N.

China is insisting that we abandon Taiwan (Formosa) and Chiang. Of course that's out of the question. Impossible and dictatorial as Chiang may be at times, we can't forget that several million Chinese followed him into exile. If we abandoned him the greatest blood bath the world has ever seen probably would follow. It would utterly destroy our position in the Far East.

Also, many overlook the sea and air defense line we've drawn to contain communism in the Pacific. It starts in Japan and runs through Okinawa, Formosa, the Philippines and ranges down to the two sturdy commonwealth nations, Australia and New Zealand. If we ever abandoned Formosa, the line would be disastrously pierced. Folks at home probably don't realize the extent of the enormous bases we've built up in the Pacific over the years. This is the line of containment far from our own shores.

#### WAIT AND SEE

So there you have just a few of the problems involved in recognition. When you find veteran and knowledgeable observers wary of such a move, certainly there seems to be no reason to hurry. Nor is any immediate change of policy called for. Maybe we'd better adopt the Chinese policy of letting things rock along for awhile.

On one phase related directly to my own business, I reversed my thinking. I admit to getting up before newspaper meetings in the past and urging that U.S. newsmen be permitted to go to China.

But when you get to the firing line of Hong Kong, Singapore, and Tokyo, you find that most of the news comes from sources outside the curtain. There are the radio monitoring, the publications and the people who have just left China.

This is better than getting news spooned to you on the inside. Sure, we should go when there is freedom to move about, ask questions and get information. But the correspondents in China now seem to be completely haltered. They get scooped every day by those on the outside. For the most part, in the Far East, you write what the government wants or you get arrested or kicked out.

#### ACTION SOMEDAY

But someday, sometime—already we're getting this oriental sense of patience and time—we will have to take China into the family of nations even if it is still Red. We will have to work with them somehow.

It won't be too long until this nation of 800 million is a nation of a billion people. You can't ignore them as if they don't exist, whether you like it or not.

As of today, I doubt whether we could get them to agree on anything—disarmament, trade or whatever. But someday they may recognize that their revolution—partly Communist, even more Asiatic—will have to be adapted to the existence of the rest of the world.

Someday—but when?

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of Apr. 15, 1963]

**EAR TO THREAT IN HONG KONG—CROWN COLONY IN ORIENT SERVES AS MAJOR LISTENING POST ON RED CHINA—A CITY OF CONTRASTS—CLEAN AND WELL-GOVERNED, IT IS ALMOST CHOKED WITH REFUGEES FROM COMMUNISM**

(By Roy A. Roberts)

Of all the places we visited in the South Pacific and the Orient, if I had to pick one to see again, it unquestionably would be Hong Kong.

Some other spots were more beautiful, Bangkok for example. Compared with Bangkok, with its huge temples, ageless shrines that are roots to the past, Hong Kong in

terms of the Orient is a new and upstart city with little or no tradition.

I wasn't prepared for all we found in Hong Kong—its charming setting, its beautiful harbor, the flood of lights running up the mountainside by night, the myriad of shops and fine business blocks, the really good hotels with their excellent meals, the friendly people—and the pitiable poverty of its refugees.

#### EAR TO RED CHINA

But above all else Hong Kong today is the No. 1 listening post of the Orient, and that made it doubly fascinating to me. It's the major link between Red China, the most populous nation on earth, and the rest of the world.

The situation of this city is almost incredible. Much has been said of West Berlin as an indefensible island in a sea of communism.

Yet here is this tiny British crown colony, on the very edge of the land mass of Communist China, growing and expanding with the apparent acquiescence of the fiercely nationalistic Reds. From the city, you can drive out to the sealed-off border in less than an hour.

The commies could take over Hong Kong in a matter of hours, and everyone knows it. Yet millions of dollars are being poured into this exposed city and the tide of investment is rising, not dropping.

Obviously, the Reds don't move in because Hong Kong is more useful to them in its present status than it is even to the British and the West. It's their gateway to the Far Pacific and the Western world.

They need it as a trade, banking and shipping outlet. The Communists, loudly belligerent over Formosa and such fly specks as Quemoy and Matsu, nevertheless are content to let the status quo continue, seemingly for an indefinite time, on Hong Kong.

Even Khrushchev, in his recent bitter exchange with Mao over Cuba, twitted them about the contradiction of their position, pointing out they have never made a move on Hong Kong.

#### SEES A CONTINUANCE

Certainly this situation will continue until Red China opens some other major ports and establishes contact elsewhere with the outside.

In the meantime, hard-headed American businessmen, as well as British, are investing millions of dollars in Hong Kong. Typical is the Hilton chain, which will open a huge new hotel next month in a city where there are many fine hostelrys already. Business and banking expansion continues at a feverish pace.

Before the Communist revolution in China, Hong Kong was merely an outpost of British trade, distinguished by its fine harbor and little else. The British have a knack for picking excellent seaports in this part of the world, Singapore on the Malayan peninsula, for example, and Suva in the Fiji islands, a crossroads of the Pacific.

The deep-water harbor of Hong Kong, surrounded by mountains, is a breathtakingly dramatic spectacle for the arriving traveler. It is jammed with literally thousands of vessels, giant Pacific tourist liners, countless freighters from all over the world, a continuous stream of ferry boats crossing from the island to the mainland and Chinese junks and sampans in uncounted thousands. For sheer interest, one could spend several days visiting this waterfront area alone.

In the city itself, public buildings and the banks are located on the island, with most of the main hotels and shops over on the Kowloon peninsula.

Hong Kong doesn't have big department stores, such as those in Tokyo which rival our own, but so many thousands of small shops that one wonders how they all survive. Tailor shops by the hundreds are found all the way from the brand new sea terminal

to small, winding alleys. Jewelry shops offer jade and pearls, others have fine silks and art work.

With the great influx of tourists, tailors, and dressmakers work almost around the clock. You can get a suit made, not in a week or 10 days, but within 48 hours.

It is a shoppers' paradise, built on cheap labor and small margins. Hong Kong merchants even undersold the Japanese on their historic specialty, pearls, to the point where the Japanese had to take off the tax to hold the trade.

A shop with a small store front may have living quarters in the rear, where the family which operates it lives on slim rations, indeed.

A word of advice to American husbands: Don't take your wife to Hong Kong unless you're prepared to loosen your bank roll.

#### PROBLEM OF REFUGEES

In this colony the British have done their usual competent job. It's clean and well-governed, yet the British cannot cope with the seemingly endless flood of refugees from the interior of China.

The streets of Hong Kong are packed with their teeming masses—an American woman who lives there remarked that she felt safer in the streets than she would in Washington or Chicago.

For me, the people were the most interesting aspect. I like people, period. And I liked the Chinese especially. All through the Orient I found them friendly, intelligent, and appealing.

Of course, I didn't get behind the Bamboo Curtain, where 700 to 800 million of them have been subjected to a continuous brainwashing of hatred for the United States, to see what effect this is having. It certainly has had no effect outside of Red China.

Hong Kong, obviously, has its problems. The one that would disturb me is the constant threat of Red China taking it over, but over there they act as if the present arrangement would go on forever.

The gravest problem is that of absorbing, feeding and finding work for the many tens of thousands of refugees. Crown authorities try to hold them back, but it is like stopping the ocean tides. They slip in through every opening to join their relatives already in Hong Kong.

In this city you see the same story found everywhere in the Orient: The sumptuous quarters above the harbor of the wealthy merchants, bankers, and traders have as neighbors hundreds of squatters' huts built from tin oil cans and other scraps.

The heart aches to see any human being living in such abject poverty; existing, nothing more. It's a situation far beyond the capability of even this efficiently run crown colony.

#### MAJOR NEWS POST

For me, as a newspaperman, Hong Kong was especially interesting because of the news coverage there. Along with Tokyo and Singapore, it is a major world listening post for news.

The press services—Associated Press and United Press International—the news magazines and broadcasting networks all are making tremendous outlays to keep the world and especially the United States informed of this awakening Orient and its problems.

Out there you find real news veterans who have lived in the Far East for years.

Years ago the British news service, Reuter's, dominated this area, but today the American news services are doing the No. 1 job.

I was very proud of my profession, seeing how they are meeting the challenge of covering this increasingly important world crisis spot. The costs are tremendous and the difficulties many.

In Hong Kong, Tokyo, and Singapore the press enjoys the greatest freedom, but at the outposts, particularly in the new countries,

coverage is almost indescribably difficult. A reporter who writes anything which displeases the government may be jailed or kicked out. The press services are busy constantly trying to get some staff member or some story released.

Most of the services have their headquarters in Tokyo, but now even some individual newspapers maintain correspondents in Hong Kong, from where they can fly to trouble spots—and there is always trouble somewhere.

Having been in this business more than half a century, I would be remiss if I did not comment that the newsgatherers in the Orient by and large are doing a splendidly competent job, probably a better one than we at home are doing in publishing their efforts. News from the Orient, except in times of crisis, seldom rates high in reader esteem.

#### DRIVE FOR EDUCATION

One other aspect of Hong Kong—and one with a Kansas City angle—rates mention: The great surge for education, more intensive than here at home, as seen in the many colleges and universities.

The Protestant missionaries, driven from Red China and forced to give up their schools there, are continuing their work here.

Among these educators are Dr. Andrew T. Roy and his wife, who is a sister-in-law of Homer C. Wadsworth of the Kansas City Board of Education. The Chung Chi College where Dr. Roy is a department chairman is a fascinating, people-to-people type of operation, training leaders from all over the Orient.

After graduation, when they return to their various countries, they are about as good ambassadors for American friendship as could be developed, and probably more effective than foreign aid.

The story of Hong Kong's problems and significance is almost endless. But its key role is that of a listening post pointing toward Red China from the free world. And it is a most interesting and comfortable spot in which to listen.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 16, 1963]

**BIG IMPACT BY SURGING JAPAN—THE VIGOROUS ISLAND NATION MATCHES WEST GERMANY IN ITS COMEBACK—MUST HAVE U.S. TIES—ABSOLUTELY DEPENDENT ON TRADE, NATION LOOKS TO US FOR PROSPERITY**

(By Roy A. Roberts)

The miracle story of the Orient is Japan. It's all that and more—make no mistake about it.

I'd never visited this fabulous, jampacked little island of 90 million people that soon will pass 100 million. So I had no background for comparison with the past.

But I had seen the comeback of West Germany—the great rebuilding of the Ruhr after the desolation of war. Now West Germany has one of the world's most potent industrial complexes. That story has been duplicated in Japan on the other side of the globe, perhaps over even greater obstacles. But there is so much similarity in the two comebacks that it strikes you in the face.

#### VARIETY OF FACTORS

Many factors contributed to the industrial recovery in Germany and Japan. But at the bottom, the basic causes were identical. These were the determination of the people to come back through sheer, hard work without thoughts of hours or wages.

West Germany saw much of its industry smashed in the war and the Russians dismantled a lot of what was left. But the Germans do have tremendous resources in coal, iron, and other raw material. Japan not only suffered comparable destruction, it never has had the natural resources. The Japanese have to ship in the materials, fab-

ricate them and sell them back to the world as finished products.

You don't need statistics to see this tremendous comeback. You see it and feel it from the minute you hit Japan at Kobe. You are aware of it every minute. It's almost unbelievable.

#### GRIMY TOWNS THERE

Except for the signs, and a bit of difference in the construction of homes, it not hard to imagine yourself in Pittsburgh, Pa., Gary, Ind., or Youngstown, Ohio, instead of the mysterious East. As you cross Japan on the magnificent electric railway system, most drab, gray and grimy steel towns look like the steel cities of America. You ride through cities of more than a million people.

You've never heard of those cities, but there they are, pouring out smoke and steel and an amazing variety of manufactured products. From one end of the little island to the other you ride past miles of factories and shipyards. Even some of the ancient cities, like Kyoto, are thoroughly industrialized. The holy shrines are almost lost in the gray shadows of the factories.

What we must never forget is that this is an oriental nation making this great leap back to industrial leadership. And while we know that Red China is several decades behind Japan, especially in education, and still basically agricultural, we've got to look into the future. China's population is eight or nine times greater and it has immense natural resources.

You've got to ask yourself: "How soon will China build into a great industrial power as did the Russian Communists?" That's why, for the long pull in the future, the next generation will be worrying about China and the Far East. Europe is still pivotal today. But it seems inescapable that in the future Asia will be the danger.

#### BETTER PRODUCTS NOW

Don't think that Japan's industry turns out only shoddy, imitative goods. It's true, they do a lot of copying and they aren't always creative in manufacturing. But they turn out a lot of quality goods, too. Against the background of the recent past, the development is fantastic. More than 60 percent of Japanese industry was destroyed in the war and the residential ruin was even greater.

Yet, today, their steel plants are more modern than ours. And along with the dime-store toys, they're turning out items like 100,000-ton tankers.

So far they've been able to compete in most of the world markets. It's the United States that is having the major difficulties. As Japan and Western Europe have come back, our excessive production costs have begun to hurt. This emphasizes that the American people haven't awakened to an overriding fact: We're living in a global economy, not a national one as we used to.

#### PLACE OF BEAUTY

Somehow, the average newcomer to Japan generally thinks in terms of cherry blossoms, geisha girls, and mystic shrines. They've got those, of course.

The flowers were just beginning to bloom when we took our first look-see at Japan. And Mount Fuji remains one of the most spectacularly beautiful sights in the world. We had real luck on that score. Usually that majestic mountain is shrouded in clouds. We hit it at a time of bright sunshine. It's a rare, moving sight, and I looked at it by the hour from my hotel window at the foot of the mountain.

There are some wonderful hotels in Japan. The Tokyo hotels rival those of New York and so do the big stores. The contrast is great between Hong Kong, a city of small shops, and Tokyo. The big tourist palaces are run efficiently. But for me, the Japanese food couldn't come close to the Chinese with its variety of flavors and ingredients.

For the tourist, there is much beauty from the past to see in Japan. Fujiyama, of course, heads the list, and there are the ancient shrines. But right next to the temples, surprisingly, you find the rubble and debris of industry. And this brings us back to that dominating theme: You just can't ignore the drive, hustle, and bustle of the Japanese people or their will to build a vast industrial nation. You can feel it in the air and you sense a nation in motion.

#### A STABLE NATION

As a people, the Japanese have never had it so good. There's no question about that. Everybody I talked to said that the Government is stable and wouldn't swing left despite recurrent efforts of the Communists to stir up trouble. As long as the big industrial machine stays in high gear that stability should remain.

Japan is absolutely dependent on world trade and especially trade with the United States of America. It's strictly a matter of survival. Here in the United States, we could survive even a full-fledged depression. But Japan wouldn't survive. For Japan, an American economic debacle would be ruinous.

So you find the leaders of Japan keeping a very close eye on the state of the American economy, the tribulations of the dollar and deficit spending. If we think of these as purely American problems, the Japanese don't. They probably watch our stock market closer than we do.

There are some signs that the boom is beginning to slow up. The Japanese pointed with pride to their annual growth rate which they say still exceeds that of the Germans. Maybe so. You can see an enormous volume of construction going on everywhere. A new subway system in Tokyo is in the works and it's got the heart of the city torn up. Traffic is a mess.

#### ON CREDIT BASIS

You can sense, too, that a lot of this building is being done on credit. There is a close tie between government and industry with government helping a lot in the advances. It's a sort of state capitalism.

These days the Japanese have to import 20 percent of their foodstuffs just to maintain a subsistence level. The figure used to be 5 percent. They've become the world's greatest fishermen, way ahead of all other nations. They're fishing in the banks all over the world. It's an example of the almost frantic, continuous efforts to keep things in balance.

Recently they cut shipping rates to keep the maritime fleet busy. They must scramble to preserve the balance of trade. And you wonder how long the pace can be maintained and where it will end. Right now everything surges ahead. But you can't help but feel that a real bust might be in the offing.

The Japanese don't agree.

Politically, Japan seemed more stable than any place we visited. The paradox is that this great industrial giant of the Orient is not a military power. We wouldn't let them rear and now the people don't want to. I asked again and again if there was sentiment for rearmament and I nearly always got the same answer. There might be a few stray politicians who would like an army to play with but the people wouldn't stand for it. They would overthrow any government that tried to get into an arms race.

#### FOR SINGLE GOAL

For years the Japanese people almost starved under a tremendous tax burden. They sacrificed and dedicated their lives for the military might of the war lords. Their gamble failed for overlordship of the Pacific. They gambled with their attack on us and lost the game.

Now the people like this idea of money being poured into the civilian economy in-

stead of the military. That may be an oversimplification, but as a people, the Japanese have had it so much better since the war. It could be political suicide for leaders to drive for a change and rearm. This isn't my judgment but opinion I picked up in a good many talks around Tokyo. It may be a more Western attitude replacing, in part, the fatalistic, oriental approach to life.

As a matter of fact, you continually sensed the turn to the occidental world in Japan. You saw it in the clothes, the sports, the night clubs and the industrial technique.

Even the kimonos now are mostly reserved for ceremony. For example, I happened to stop at commencement exercises for a junior college. All the girls wore beautiful kimonos. But it turned out that most of these had been rented for the occasion. Nearly all the parents were in Western clothes.

#### SOME EXCEPTIONS

They have copied the West in so many things. I did, however, run into a taxi driver who refused a tip. That was an attitude he never picked up from either America or Europe. But it is indication of the restoration of Japanese pride and faith in their destiny after the sheer despair of crushing military defeat.

The bustle of people is perpetual. Everyday Japan looks like Broadway when the theaters let out or a big stadium after the game. You wonder how this small island can support them all.

There are colleges and schools everywhere. You couldn't turn around without bumping into a swarm of students. Japan is emphasizing education and that might be part of the answer to industrial success. We happened to be there during a school vacation and the uniformed youngsters were out by the tens of thousands—many of them on tours like us and most of them taking pictures.

If you think the Americans are camera fiends, you should see the Japanese. It seemed like everyone in Japan was snapping shutters. When I got off the boat, toting a long cigar in a holder, four or five amateur photographers materialized and started snapping pictures. Not many people smoke in Japan and fewer still smoke big cigars. This was a photographic opportunity they couldn't resist. When I got rid of the cigar they melted away.

#### BIGGEST IN WORLD

Naturally I was interested in my own profession and in Tokyo I visited Asahi Shunbun, their top newspaper with the biggest circulation of any in the world—some 6 million. I found that they had a huge plant—in some respects more advanced than any in America.

What a contrast it was to the paper I visited in Bangkok. There, they had a flatbed press and dozens of women sitting around folding papers—the most primitive mailroom I've ever seen. That wasn't the case in Japan. The big Tokyo paper was the most modern operation you can imagine. It typified what you found in almost every line of manufacturing.

In Tokyo they told you that the United States should give more concern to buying Japanese products and no thought at all about keeping their products out. They need the trade. This was their big worry. They said again and again that Japan was one of our biggest customers and that they couldn't buy from us unless we buy from them.

Naturally they're keeping an eye on Red China. But I didn't find the concern on that subject that we exhibit. And this is true even though the giant of Red China is only miles away across the East China Sea and Japan is unarmed.

#### NO TRADE DEALS

Not long ago we got excited in the States because Japan sent a trade mission to China. They signed a lot of big contracts. What came of it? Absolutely nothing. China wanted credit and Japan is working that same side of the street. The deal fell through.

An eventual reconciliation between Korea and Japan could help, because Korea has a surplus of food. But the Koreans despise the Japanese. The feeling is not unlike the old Irish hostility toward England.

Don't get the idea that Japan is sitting there defenseless and helpless. She isn't. We have forbidden her to have an army and navy, so we've had to establish great defense bases of our own. We shield Japan and we pay the bill.

As I said before, the great bulk of the people don't mind. They are quite happy to have the government invest their taxes in the domestic economy. And of course there are the terrible memories of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Any mention of the atomic bomb is almost as shocking to the Japanese as irreverence toward the Emperor. He still is the symbol of authority, by the way.

I came to Japan with the feeling that I wouldn't care much for the people. I'd never quite gotten over Pearl Harbor. But their polite little bows, courtesy and charming manners won me over. Of course, I guess I like all people everywhere.

I believe the Japanese have feelings of real good will toward the United States. It's my guess that beneath those occidental shirts their Oriental hearts are beating with genuine friendship for us.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 17, 1963]

**STRONG TIES IN FAR-OFF LANDS—KINSHIP OF AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND IS REASSURING TO AMERICANS—SHOW A ZEST FOR LIFE—PEOPLE, PROUD OF THEIR ACHIEVEMENTS, FIND SATISFACTION IN SPORTS**

(By Roy A. Roberts)

Somehow it was like meeting up with kinfolk when, after several weeks of cruising among the balmy, carefree Pacific islands we finally arrived in New Zealand and Australia—way down under.

These are not ancient countries but young ones, younger even than we are. Sturdy, self-reliant and confident of the destiny which lies ahead rather than behind them, they stand as isolated but dependable bastions of Anglo-Saxon civilization. You understand them, and feel a tug of warm kinship in your heart.

#### HAVE COMMON ORIGINS

This only points up our worst problem in dealing with the teeming millions of the Orient. The roots of Australia and New Zealand go back to Britain; our own origins go back not only to Britain but to all of Europe. But we have no such link to the Orient.

It is idle to believe that we can ever fully understand the Oriental mind, with its complex thinking, religions and philosophies, or that they can completely understand us and get a true image of America. As the Orient, with its huge populations, grows into a more controlling power position in the world, this problem of understanding will be our worst hurdle.

As a people, we were woefully ignorant of Europe as recently as just before World War I. But ties of bloodlines, religion and ethnic sameness made for early understanding. Our ties with the Orient must be built from the ground up.

#### DRAWING US CLOSER

Distance is another limitation. You cannot realize what a tremendous expanse the Pacific Ocean is, in distance and time, until you cross it on a ship. Yet the Orient need not be remote forever. Jet air travel has

knit the world much closer, and when rocket travel eventually comes—as it will—spans between nations will become even narrower.

Even then, however, the bulk of the commerce between the Orient and the Western World will continue to move by sea. Admiral Mahon, the old prophet of seapower, is not obsolete in the vast area of the Pacific.

When I went on this trip I had no thought of inquiry or reporting; I went for a vacation and to get away. But, like the old firehorse, after getting through the tourism part of the trip and starting to bump into the fascinating problems of the Orient, it was just natural to start sticking my nose into finding out what was going on.

You couldn't find a better spot than the South Pacific to just sit and watch life go by. Most of those islands are out of this world and its troubles. If you want the simple life and little to worry about—taxes, deficit spending, Khrushchev, Mao, even Kennedy, nothing more serious than whether a coconut will drop on your head—this is the place.

#### SPOTS OF BEAUTY

Some of the islands are lovely, with the simple existence and the native dances. Tahiti was a disappointment, unless you want to join the beachcombers. Yet only 12 miles away, Moorea is exquisite and charming, one of the most breathtaking views of natural beauty anywhere.

Another lovely spot was Milford Sound, in southern New Zealand, a Norwegian-type fjord complete with glaciers and waterfalls. A little place in the Cook Islands, Rarotonga, was delightful because it was so primitive and the people so friendly. That and Bali, with its temples and quaint people, stand out in memory.

But when you pull into Auckland, New Zealand's busy port, you're back in the world streams with a bang. New Zealand is amazing, with just about everything in the way of scenery jammed into those two small islands.

#### PASTURES PREDOMINATE

Just average-sized cities, the largest about 400,000, but what a countryside. You can drive through miles and miles of rolling, pastoral landscapes, like a great park. Sheep by the millions—just thinking about them, let alone counting, would put you to sleep. And thousands of cattle, mostly Jerseys, New Zealand's economy is primarily agricultural, 90 to 95 percent of it, and what a job they do of it.

The view reminds you of the British Midlands, or the Pennsylvania Dutch farms, everything tidy. Something is missing, however—barns. The climate is such that livestock can be left outdoors the year round.

The farmers there have introduced the best blood lines into their livestock, and treated the soils with chemicals so the land can support twice or three times as many sheep. That farmland is not cheap, some of it has been in the same family for generations.

Seeing how dependent New Zealand is on agriculture, you realize just one of Prime Minister Macmillan's problems in trying to get Britain into the Common Market. He could ruin New Zealand and the Commonwealth with one misstep.

#### SOMETHING FOR ALL

The variety of the scenery is almost incredible: Strange regions of geysers and thermal springs, mountains, caves, glaciers, sandy beaches, great forests—largely built up with pine trees brought from California—and incomparable fishing lakes. Many on our tour took a day off to whip a line at those fabulous trout.

The people of New Zealand are delightful—independent and individualistic—and their newspapers reflect it. This is virtually the last bulwark of independent papers; each city has its own distinctive, locally owned paper, no chain publications, something almost unheard of in the world today.

Just a few hours away by jet but more than 2 days on a ship lies Australia, New Zealand's big brother—only they don't so regard each other, but rather with mutual, friendly independence.

Australia is another story entirely. It has its giant sheep ranches, or stations, but they also are doing a pretty good job of industrializing. Sydney, the largest city, has a magnificent harbor and scenery, and has been called the San Francisco of Australia.

#### ACROSS BY AIR

You must think of this country as being as large as the United States—minus Alaska, of course. When we left the tour, we had to fly 14 hours across it to reboard the ship at another port. You get the feel of a young nation, with most of its life story still ahead.

Sheep, wheat, and dairying are basic to the economy, but the volume of industry surprises the visitor. General Motors, for example, builds many of the cars for the Orient there and has become so large that even in Australia, where they welcome outside capital, they are beginning to wonder about the sheer size of General Motors. Chrysler, and Ford are there too. Mining and production of electricity—and Australia needs more power—are other key industries. Production costs are high.

As every schoolboy knows, most of Australia's development and population lie in a narrow fringe along the seacoast, with most of the interior a vast desert. By conserving their water resources, they are making good headway pushing the productive belt inland, but it is a slow and expensive process.

#### GO IN FOR SPORTS

You soon understand why this little country, with only about 10 million people, wins so many world tennis prizes, swimming championships and international cricket matches. Australians are tall and strong from their outdoor life—like Californians—and they love sports.

At the beaches you see the colorful volunteer lifesaving clubs, and for the children, learning to swim is as compulsory as taking arithmetic in school. Melbourne has a stadium that seats 120,000, larger than any of ours, and it is filled frequently. The race tracks are magnificent, and racing news and odds on the horses are features in the papers.

The Australians, and the New Zealanders, are pretty well satisfied with the life they lead and wouldn't swap it for that of any other country—including the United States.

Despite their nation's relatively brief existence, they are very patriotic, and you see many memorials to World War I and II, the biggest events in their history. Canberra, the new capital started some years ago and still building between the rival cities of Sydney and Melbourne, has the finest war memorial to be seen anywhere.

#### CITY OF BEAUTY

Melbourne is one of the most livable cities to be found, with its wide streets, beautiful buildings and landscape plantings, all capped by two great universities.

Australia is much more a welfare state than we are, and they like it. Yet the private-investment, profit motive is still in the picture. Tremendous amounts of American money—and much British—are pouring into their business life. The cities are modern and the transportation good, especially the air service which is essential in such a country.

Over the years, a system of industrial courts, which practically amounts to compulsory arbitration, has been built up. Both labor and management gripe a lot about it but neither would do away with it. The system hasn't worked perfectly, by any means, but major strikes are almost unheard of.

Australian labor, once violently leftist has become conservative because of the pressure of world communism—they certainly don't want to get into that category. For the most part, the country enjoys industrial peace, in sharp contrast to our recent needless strikes in the States, in which both sides as well as the public lost.

I frankly don't know if the Australian system would work in our country; I doubt it. We will just have to find our own remedy.

#### ALL FOR IT

I was interested also in their medical aid program, on which the doctors and everyone over there go along. It was not thrust on them but developed gradually. Patients are free to choose their own doctor and hospital in this state medicare plan.

Curiously, in Australia we were asked not so much about business, Wall Street or foreign policy as we were asked why all the fuss over medicare. You could explain that the American people are prepared to provide care for the aged but there is a wide divergence on how, yet they just couldn't see why there would be any debate. Australians accept the welfare state and just wonder why everyone else doesn't have it.

There is, of course, a catch to this apparent paradise—as always. You pay for everything you get, and their taxes would be considered staggering over here. Still the workers have become accustomed to paying out big amounts for various phases of security.

#### HAVE TIGHT CONTROLS

The handling of the immigration and racial problem in Australia and New Zealand is intriguing. Both set out to be Anglo-Saxon outposts with immigration strictly limited, yet over the years that policy has been relaxed because they needed people. They don't lay down sharp regulations which could become offensive and cause trouble. Both nations are essentially homogeneous.

Immigration bodies decide who can be admitted as a permanent citizen, and this may extend even to oriental students studying in their universities. But one sees few orientals or Negroes in either nation.

As much as Australia wants to expand, they limit immigration to what can be absorbed without undue burden on their job market, schools, and the like, hence the slow growth rate. They will take anyone who can contribute to their economy or culture, and they advertise widely those trades in which people are needed.

I doubt such a system would work in our melting pot Nation, but it does there, and with a minimum of friction. And they can't understand all the racial troubles in South Africa.

#### CLOSER TO IT

The overwhelming problem for Australia and New Zealand is the rising tide of nationalism in the oriental countries north of them. If all this ferment threatens world peace in the future, think what it means for these two isolated centers of Anglo-Saxon civilization down under.

The recent settlement by which the Dutch simply had to hand over Western New Guinea to Indonesia brings the Indonesians right up to the Australian mandate over the rest of the island, and a clash may be expected. It is a thinly populated and hard to defend territory.

The Australians are keeping up their armaments, especially their splendid air force. They were buying some French jets while we were there. And they are maintaining their ties with the motherland, as shown by the recent visit of Queen Elizabeth. Their bonds with the Commonwealth are strong, yet they remain fiercely independent—neither Britain nor the United States could tell them what to do and get very far.

They appreciate that the British navy and American nuclear might up to now have

contained the march of communism. And we won't let them down; it wouldn't be to our interest to do so. In Australia and New Zealand, you seldom hear them speak of this rising tide of racism to the north. You get the feeling that here is a people confident of their strength and future, looking ahead to their destiny unafraid.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 18, 1963]

**HOLDING ACTION IN THE ORIENT—UNITED STATES CAN EXPECT FEW REAL SUCCESSES AGAINST COMMUNISM IN FAR EAST—A MYRIAD OF PROBLEMS—OVERSHADOWING ALL OTHERS IS THE ECONOMIC DISTRESS FOUND EVERYWHERE**

(By Roy A. Roberts)

Still unwritten and unresolved is the answer to an all-important question: Are we winning or losing the battle with communism for the Far East?

Obviously, we definitely are on the defensive. Possibly too much so.

Yet by the very nature of the situation, defense is the only realistic posture for the free world. The basic elements of the problem dictate a policy of containment. It's a holding action.

#### AT LOW POINT

In Asia, the tide ebbs and flows. Sometimes we appear to be making headway. Then success runs out. When I made my first odyssey to the Far East our fortunes definitely were at low tide.

Time was too limited on my trip to gather up many pieces of the picture puzzle. You can't make solid judgments on the basis of a visit that was all too sketchy.

But my impression was that our position in Asia adds up to a series of plus and minus factors—and right now the minus sign predominates. By no means is the situation hopeless. It isn't a debacle. But as the Communists peck away, first at this spot, then at another, we're losing ground, not gaining.

Yet I came back home thankful that it wasn't worse.

In military terms you call it logistics—the problems of supply complicated by time and distance. The Orient is mighty far away, thousands upon thousands of miles from home base. You can consider this problem of distance from the viewpoint of the other side. Mr. Khrushchev, for instance, quickly retreated from the confrontation in Cuba. He knew that the logistical factors were overwhelmingly against him for a showdown in the Caribbean.

#### RED CHINA SPHERE

Yet we are trying to contain communism in the distant Far East. And although that strategic area may be thousands of miles from Moscow, it's right in the back yard of Red China, a more ruthless, uncompromising and even tougher foe than the Kremlin.

Another fact that we mustn't forget is this, and it's an overriding fact: Everywhere—in Indonesia, Thailand, China, all through the Pacific—we are dealing, not with millions, but hundreds of millions of people. The sheer mass of humanity is almost overwhelming.

Moreover, the bulk of these people are just existing on the razor-edge of subsistence. Their great concern is not freedom or even ideologies. They just want enough food to stay alive. It's a naked matter of physical survival. The following observations are minor points, but they serve to illustrate: We saw practically no elderly people in the Orient.

You didn't pay much attention to this at first. But gradually it dawned on you: In Asia they don't have much of a problem of medical care for the aged simply because so few survive beyond the middle years. They just don't live very long. The life span is amazingly short.

Another thing. You see very few fat people in the Far East. There are exceptions, of course, but they are rare. There isn't enough food to go around. What there is generally consists of rice sweetened with a bit of fruit and fish. The national pastime of Americans is to go on diets, exercise and lose weight. In Asia they spend their waking moments trying to find enough to eat.

#### ON TINY PLOTS

You watch the patient peasants toiling in their tiny rice paddies and wonder what kind of approach you can make to those masses. The little rice plots that represent food for generations of a single family wouldn't be good enough for a flower garden over here. How can we find a common ground for communication, let alone understanding? Those peasants don't envy the American workingman with his home and car. They can't even imagine such an existence. And there are million upon million of them.

What a fertile field they are for the Communists to till. And what a difficult problem they are for us to reach. Then you can add the centuries of racial pride—"Asia for the Asiatics"—with thoughts of imperialism mixed up in simple minds. The difficulties are multiplied over and over.

Yet there can be absolutely no doubt that these hundreds of millions in the Orient are stirring.

Still another major and very basic element is the fact that many of these are new nations. There is no political entity, large or small, quite so truculent, belligerent or difficult as a new nation. As we'd say out on a Kansas farm, "They're feeling their oats." That's what is happening in the Orient.

#### JUST CAN'T PRODUCE

Independence, and throwing off the hated, so-called colonialism, sound wonderful in theory. But independence doesn't produce food. It doesn't necessarily make for wise government. It doesn't even mean that the masses are better off than they were before. The new Asian nations all want to take the quick short route to utopia without facing up to the fact that it's not a pathway strewn with roses, breadfruit or even coconuts.

Generally, it's sad but true: The newer the country and the more it desperately needs to build a stable economy, the greater the emphasis on arms and military trappings. You see gold braid and military toys everywhere.

One thing is certain. They may have thrown off their old masters, but they are quick to get a new bureaucracy and a new set of overlords. True, the new rulers may be their own. But they can be just as oppressive as the old, and sometimes they aren't as intelligent.

You can't deny that the masses of the East have been gouged and oppressed through the centuries by the foreign devils and by their own. But neither can anyone expect the bonds of the past to be snapped overnight and the new world to appear as if by magic.

#### SOME WERE GOOD

For that matter, I came home feeling that we have made too much a fetish of the word "colonialism." There have been brands of colonialism that actually benefited the masses at one time or another. And there has been the other kind that exploited and degraded them. Now we are paying for the bad kind in terms of latent distrust by millions in Asia.

The above observations on colonialism may be heresy and I certainly don't mean to imply that the aspirations of nationalism are bad or that all the new leaders are without ideals. Everywhere you heard of the great stress on education. That's fine, and there is a tremendous emphasis on it.

But with the exception of Japan, education hasn't trickled down to the teeming masses. I'm afraid it will be a long time before the schools can produce the educated

classes that a broad industrial society demands. In the meantime, education at home and abroad is producing an elite that will be the leaders of tomorrow. These are the ones we should try to befriend and influence now.

It's easy to sit here at home and develop various themes on what ought to be done to save Asia. It's another thing entirely to come face to face with the stark reality of the other side of the world and realize how little you know about it.

For instance, it has been said, and I have agreed, that the U.N. ought to put new nations on probation for a few years before granting membership. Sort of let them get out of the tribal stage before they get a vote.

I advanced this theory at a dinner in Bangkok to a government official who had spent much time in the Orient. He shrugged his shoulders and said: "How long a period of probation do you have in mind? Thirty years? Forty years? Or maybe 50, 60, or 70 years?"

His point was plain. Obviously it would be better to take the new countries into the family of nations and try to work with them than to let them stay outside and go their own ways. In short, there is no quick trip to effective self-government. I imagine what is true in Asia is magnified in Africa. This is the background you must understand to talk of dealing with communism in the Orient.

#### VITAL TO POLICY

Take Indonesia as a classic example. Vietnam is vital to our prestige and containment policy in the Far East. In fact, observers told me that if we lose there we might as well pack up and go home. Yet for the long future, Indonesia is certainly as important and possibly much more explosive.

Indonesia ought to be the garden spot of southeast Asia. It has everything to make it a great nation. It is a rich country of more than 100 million right now. It has oil, minerals and the usual products of the tropics. Its soil is fertile and it should be a great reservoir of surplus food. In natural resources you might have to rate it third behind the United States and Russia in the entire world. Yet with all its blessings, this new nation isn't writing a very happy record.

From Singapore to Tokyo, a great many informed observers believe that Indonesia is headed for an awful blow-up. Already there have been more attempts on Sukarno's life than on De Gaulle's.

From friendly sources I heard Sukarno described as the Wendell Willkie of the Orient—whatever that may mean. From others I heard that he was a sensuous playboy and exploiter of his people—and at the same time, one of the most dangerous and wily politicians in Asia.

Frankly, I don't know enough about him to reach a judgment. I did see one of his magnificent palaces in Ball. On the basis of that luxurious building, I would say that while he may sympathize with the masses, he certainly does live well.

#### PLACE OF BEAUTY

Ball, by the way, is a picture book island that lives up fully to tourist expectations. It is beautiful. But even there the poverty of the masses is a jarring note. And it is one of Sukarno's showplaces.

We've poured hundreds of millions into Indonesia to keep it from going Communist. Yet Sukarno continues to throw his weight around against the West—the United States, the Dutch, and now, against the proposed Malaysia Federation that could be a member of the British Commonwealth.

The Russians, too, have hauled rubles and aid, including weapons, to Sukarno. Their contributions amount to only slightly less than ours. It's no secret that Indonesia is a spot where the United States is coldly reviewing its aid policy. The Russians, in turn, aren't too happy with what they've gotten

for their investment. Currently, the native Communists are demanding more representation in the government.

Again and again the situation in Indonesia has stopped just short of the exploding point. But the volcano hasn't gone up yet. Some think a push from the right by the army might succeed. Others think a Communist shove from the left might swing the country in that direction.

As adroit as Sukarno has been playing one off against the other, you suspect that he can't go on indefinitely. Some observers believe the country might wind up with a sort of Tito-brand communism—not under Moscow or Peiping, and certainly not under us. Yet the situation goes on.

#### HAS STRICT CURBS

As I said Indonesia ought to be the rice bowl of the East, but food is a problem. When we were there, for instance, we ran into the strict regulation of exchange. Everybody was warned not to take dollars or travelers checks ashore. You found the people ready to pay anything for goods—a shirt, even a lipstick. The official rate of exchange was 178 Indonesian units for a dollar. We found that the crew members, who ignored the warnings, were getting from 500 to 600. And at Singapore, we were told that the actual rate was about 1,500 to the dollar. That's a measure of the runaway inflation in Indonesia. Generally, it's a sure sign of blowup.

If Indonesia should swing violently to the extreme left—and it might—that would be a definite, positive loss, because it would sever our line to Australia and New Zealand, if nothing else.

So this potentially rich, powerful nation is a dangerous question mark. I'm afraid that its leaning toward Communist China is too obvious to be denied.

Burma, too, is full of unrest. In fact, you could hardly find a place in southeast Asia that wasn't in trouble now or facing tremendous difficulties.

#### CLAIMS ARE VARIED

I didn't get to South Vietnam, so I wouldn't attempt to discuss it in detail. But apparently it's a touch-and-go battle. From the outside I heard that our claims of progress are too optimistic and that our reports of failure are exaggerated. The final answer isn't written yet.

On the constructive side you can look at the very important effort to bring the Malay peninsula, Sarawak and North Borneo into existence as Malaysia and a Commonwealth nation under British tutelage. Sukarno is rattling the sword and making threats at the prospect.

But if the development does go through it would represent a very positive gain. Certainly Singapore and the peninsula are key crossroads of the Orient. Singapore is 85 percent Chinese and all of Malaysia about 50 percent. But unlike Indonesia, where the departed Dutch left a vacuum in know-how and technology, Malay is working closely with the British. It still is a bustling, prosperous spot, better off than most places in the Orient.

#### NOT VERY SMOOTH

In all these countries it was obvious that a gradual transition from the old colonial status to independence would have been beneficial. But that simply didn't happen in the great onrush of nationalism. In Singapore harbor you can see 60 or 70 abandoned freighters, just hulks and mostly Dutch. These ships used to carry most of the coastal cargo for Indonesia.

Thailand is a contrast. With its beautiful city of Bangkok it seemed to have a particular flavor of the Orient all its own. Certainly it seemed more tranquil and stable than other nations we visited. Unquestionably it is prosperous. We've done a good job there.

Without doubt, Thailand would like to cling to the West. But the constant pressure and pecking away by the Communists could bring battle to that peaceful land. Again, I'd say that Thailand—and Bangkok with its temples—is a tourist must. It's hot but colorful, romantic and with good food and hotels.

You'd have to catalog and assess each country separately—and there are a lot of new countries now in the wake of rising nationalism. Curiously, to me, India doesn't seem to be much of a factor. And this, despite her rank as the second most populous nation in the world and one of the great landmasses of the continent.

As a people and a nation, the Orientals seem to regard India as entirely apart from the rest. Because of that, I doubt that India ever could lead Asia. India is land and culture to itself.

#### CHINA THEIR FRIEND

The United States has placed its bets on India to demonstrate that freedom and a democratic system can bring better living standards than the Communist dictatorship of China. But until you're there, you don't realize that the kinship of southeast Asia is directed toward China, not India. To my intense surprise, I found strong anti-Communists who were somewhat delighted when Mao gave Nehru his comeuppance in the border invasion.

Everywhere you heard that we'd done a real job in making Formosa a showplace economically and in education. But we haven't gotten very far in spreading concepts of liberty in Formosa. Old Chiang is a dictator and probably will be as long as he lives.

We were told that South Vietnam and North Vietnam together would make a strong nation but that political division makes this impossible. By the same token, North and South Korea could make it if they were joined. In the meantime, South Korea will have to be supported. Right now, we're the ones who have to do the supporting. The job will go on for years.

#### HARD TO COMPREHEND

And so it went, Asia is complex, almost unfathomable. The economic distress, the differences of religion, the exploitation of the people, the caste systems—these are the problems not of years but of centuries. On top of these are piled the growing pains of the new nations.

And always there is that massive fact of enormous population, symbolized by the potential power of those 800 million people behind the Bamboo Curtain. And counting those on the outside, we're talking in terms of more than a billion human beings.

When you view all these imponderables and consider the ramifications in each country, you come home, not wondering why we are on the defensive, but how we've done as well as we have.

The problems of Asia are with us now and for the long pull ahead. They are ancient problems. The West will be living with them for decades, if not centuries. And the West, itself, will be ancient before they are solved.

That's for certain.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Apr. 19, 1963]

**CAN FIND PRIDE IN U.S. RECORD—HAWAII AND PHILIPPINES ARE BRIGHT SPOTS IN NATION'S FOREIGN POLICY—IMPACT ON FAR EAST—BUT BIGGEST AMERICAN CONTRIBUTION IS CONTINUATION OF STABLE ECONOMY**

(By Roy A. Roberts)

As our odyssey to the Orient ends, a little flag waving may be pardonable. I came home deeply proud of my country and the leadership it is offering in these years of swift change and a new look in the world.

Mistakes and blunders—yes, waste and millions of dollars down the drain—yes, but

overall a tremendous achievement. Personally I can't subscribe to the cult of the ugly American. It should be instead the magnificent American.

#### LOOK TO STABLE UNITED STATES

Here and now let me record not just an impression but a strong conviction I brought home: We might weather a pretty sizable military setback but the whole facade of a free world front which we have worked so hard to build in Europe and the Orient could crumble if we ever suffer a major economic bust at home.

Too much of our world position, strength and influence depends on a strong domestic economy, even granting the obvious, that our nuclear striking power today is the potent shield of the free world, in every part of the globe.

I wonder if we're paying enough attention here at home to the efficiency of our industrial complex and the soundness of our dollar. Both are just as vital, maybe more so, as more missiles, more Polaris submarines, more military bases. Don't ever forget that.

Several times now I have suggested that the basic problem of the Orient is not one of immediate urgency, but lies in the decades ahead. Our nuclear power, plus the costly chain of bases erected to contain communism in oriental waters, is strong enough to assure our national security against threats from that quarter for years to come.

Whether the billion and more people of the Far East can be galvanized into a future threat to us is unanswerable, but one thing is dead sure—you can't ignore it.

#### A BRIGHT SPOT

Naturally you notice the danger and trouble signs more than the plus values, because they hit you harder, but we have much to our credit in the Orient. The admission of Hawaii as a full-fledged, not a second-class member of our Union, is one of the smartest things we have ever done.

Its significance may not percolate down through the hundreds of millions of common people in the Orient, but it certainly has left an impression on the thinking of the leaders.

On the mainland we think largely of Hawaii in terms of a tropical paradise. Actually it represents our most definite and almost sole blood line to the Orient. The Japanese are the largest bloodstock there, the Chinese next and the native, or Polynesian, next before you encounter the Anglo-Saxon strain.

Now all this racial admixture has been accepted into our commonwealth of States. I wonder if we have made enough of this fact in trying to convey a better image of America in the Far East.

#### LED THEM ALONG

The Philippines, how we tutored them for generations—not only in education but in economics and government—until they were ready to govern themselves. And finally, without pressure, cutting the ties to give them complete independence. We can all take pride in that chapter of American world leadership.

Probably our biggest achievement in the Orient, since the war, has been our contribution in rebuilding Japan from the ashes of destruction, just as we picked up prostrate Germany in Europe.

History has recorded no such paradox: Vanquished nations, instead of being exploited and held in subjugation, restored through the assistance—and in Japan's case complete guidance—of the victor. True, we had a self-interest in both cases; the challenge of world communism now offered a greater menace than these two former foes. Helping them recover promoted world stability, and thereby, world peace.

#### CAN'T HELP US

All this struck you more forcibly in Japan than in Western Europe, because Japan is not a military ally, in any sense. We have been

her shield and still are. Given the opportunity to rebuild along democratic lines, she has made the most of it, but Japan hasn't a ship or a soldier to add to our defense line in the Far East.

These are things which we Americans, pessimistically viewing our mistakes, too often overlook.

Here and there in the Orient, seething with nationalism and racism and hanging in the balance on communism, are spots such as Formosa, Thailand, and South Korea. Turbulent South Korea, independent and still groping toward its destiny, has been given that chance by our vital economic assistance.

Of course there have been mistakes and millions lost on bad bets. You could find enough examples to make a case for failure, yet you can't help feeling that we will realize something better than regrets from it all.

#### A TOUGH COMPETITOR

Another vivid impression from the Orient: Just as rebuilt Western Europe now challenges us in world markets, so is Japan becoming a tough competitor on the other side of the globe.

It makes you almost sick at heart to enter the fine big seaports of the Orient and see so few American flags on the many ships docked there. Our continuous wage and price spiral has reached a point of real concern about our ability to keep a place in world markets and industry. It has largely driven from the seas all except a few large shipping lines which keep going only on huge subsidies at taxpayer cost.

It used to be, also, that the United States had a virtual monopoly on airplane sales over the world. It gives you a jolt to learn how this has changed now. In Australia, for instance, you see the wide use of French—not American—commercial airliners. And you read headlines about Australian purchases of new French fighter-bombers.

You wonder where it will all end and when we will begin to pay more heed to our role in a global, and not just a national, economy.

#### MUST SPEED UP

Aside from peace itself, this stands as our foremost problem today—getting our economic growth rolling once more, and on a world-competitive basis.

Folks at home can properly ask if all our billions expended for bases, aid and containment in the Far East are worthwhile. You see and feel the obvious answer touring the fringe of the Orient: Can we afford to surrender more than 1½ billion people to communism, to be exploited and built into their machine, simply by default?

I doubt that a cruise such as ours made any votes for foreign aid, though. The American businessmen aboard, most of them retired, looked at the impressive new development out there and thought, "My tax money helped pay for that." And they were probably right.

Yet foreign aid is as definite a part of our foreign policy as nuclear and military strength, and we must continue it. It should, however, be restudied and revalued continuously for realism and results. Just cutting it back indiscriminately isn't the answer.

#### NEED TRUE PICTURE

I came home also with a very definite feeling that we're not getting across in the Orient a true picture of what we seek. Our sheer good will and exuberance make us suspect in this hemisphere where backslapping and fervent handshakes evoke mistrust. Conveying the idea that our intentions are not exploitation or imperialism is an almost insurmountable job among those great, inert masses of people. A correspondent, on leave from Vietnam, put his finger on one aspect of the problem at lunch in Tokyo:

"We'd win this thing easy if the soldiers we're training—they're not bad soldiers—had

the heart and fighting spirit the Commies do. Our boys fight all right mechanically, but the unseen enemy who springs on them, usually from ambush, is a dedicated revolutionary."

Our position in the Orient is complicated by the fact that in several instances we have had to back regimes that are unpopular with their own people. It's a just criticism, but we didn't create these regimes; we have to do what we can with what we find. And this may not be our worst complication, that of being billed as new colonialists, moving in to oppress them as the French did. Bunk, of course, but it goes over in not too well informed minds.

#### KEY IN YOUTHS

It is obvious that our efforts must be directed at youth, especially the students, who are the catalyst of ferment in the East and will be the governing leaders of tomorrow. They are young and we must meet them with young people—that is why Bobby Kennedy's quick excursion through the Far East was good strategy, not so much for what he said but in the appeal to youth.

Americans have been visiting the Orient for a long time, but always cost, distance, and time have been limiting factors. Now the restless flood of American tourism, after wearing out the pathways of Europe, is veering to the Far East.

Jet travel helps this along, of course, but you are amazed, also, at the fine hotel accommodations in most of the Orient. Some of the new hotels, such as the Southern Cross in Melbourne with its fancy shopping arcade, match anything in the States. And even the most primitive ones we encountered on our trip were passable, and so interesting as to make up for any shortage of comforts.

There was one little place in Port Moresby, in the Australian part of New Guinea. It was located in a lush tropical setting, and the weather was stinking hot.

#### TO REBOARD SHIP

We had flown all night to Port Moresby to reboard the ship after leaving it in Sydney to spend more days in Australia. The waiters and other hotel help were bush boys from the interior, barefoot, wearing loin cloths, friendly grins and little else. Ordering a meal, you pointed to the number of your selection on the menu and they went after it. Yet even here they brought in pitchers of iced tea and ice water—they had dealt with our Air Force and Army boys and knew what Americans like.

As this tide of American tourists swings toward the Orient, it cannot help but cut down our long-range problem of understanding.

One other thought from that part of the world deserves mention. There is real concern over there as to how long the United States will maintain its present policy.

The anti-United Nations, anti-foreign-aid rantings of the John Birchers are creating fear that this country will retreat from its world leadership role. They point out that the U.N., which we no longer control, soon will take steps very unpopular in this country. Will we then abandon or scuttle the U.N.?

#### TAKE CALMER VIEW

You can explain that these rantings are a passing phenomenon, just like the occasional leftwing outbursts, and that the United States basically follows a middle-of-the-road policy supported by both parties.

Still it raises a question in your own mind. I can only give my personal conviction on this: After my look-see at the other side of the globe I feel more strongly than ever that, imperfect as it is and disappointing as it has been, the U.N. still is needed by the world as a meeting place and a buffer for quarrels, if nothing else. The only alternative offers a bleak prospect for peace, indeed.

Right now the United Nations carries more prestige in the Orient than ever before with U Thant, a Burmese, as Secretary General. His appointment, and his success in the job, have done more to give the Far East pride and hope than any single recent event.

A final word, on Hawaii, which was our last port of call. In my first visit since it became a State, I had heard that the influx from the States, the rapid growth, had turned it into a honky-tonk. Sheer rubbish. Hawaii is as lovely as ever. It has that beautiful tropical setting, without the picturesque temples and mosques of the Far East, but also without that awful heat.

It is certain to become one of our biggest States in both population and influence. I never saw a South Sea island I would trade it for.

In Los Angeles, our passage through immigration and customs was the most courteous ever encountered. Then, as we waited in the fine new air terminal to fly home to Kansas City, the loudspeaker buzzed and a voice said:

"Mr. Civella, paging Mr. Nick Civella."

Hearing the name of that North Side figure of considerable notoriety, I knew we were nearing home.

The biggest lesson I learned in the Orient was that we had better acquire some of their philosophy of patience—and then more understanding. Because the Orient, and the problems of its hundreds of millions of people, will be with us for a long, long time.

#### GORDON R. CLAPP, A FINE PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished families in Wisconsin is the Clapp family. For many years members of this family have served the public interest in high public office.

Gordon Clapp, formerly head of the Tennessee Valley Authority, died a few days ago. His service in the Tennessee Valley Authority will always be an inspiration to anyone who is interested in clean, honorable, effective, and efficient administration.

But Gordon Clapp was more than merely a competent administrator. He believed deeply in what the TVA stands for.

The death of Gordon Clapp has been discussed editorially in some of the leading newspapers in the country, including those in Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a fine editorial entitled "Gordon R. Clapp," which was published in the Washington Post; an outstanding editorial entitled "Dreamer With a Shovel," which was published in the Washington Star; and an editorial entitled "Society Loses a Valuable Citizen in Death of Gordon Clapp," which was published in the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis.

I may say that Gordon Clapp is survived by Norman M. Clapp, the present Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, who also has a splendid record of public service.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 1, 1963]

#### GORDON R. CLAPP

Almost all of Gordon Clapp's crowded, productive life was devoted to public service in the areas of conservation and resource de-

velopment. He was in the great tradition of the American pioneer—a pursuer of horizons and an opener of frontiers. For 20 years, from its very beginning, he played a vital role in the growth of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the last 8 of them as its chairman. His imagination and zeal contributed invaluable to the effectiveness of that beneficent agency in reinvigorating, enriching and democratizing a great region of the United States. When he left the TVA in 1954, he served for a short while as Deputy City Administrator of New York and then became president of the Development and Resources Corp., a private concern with wide interests in the promotion of progress in far parts of the earth.

Gordon Clapp combined the best qualities of the educator and the entrepreneur. He was a man of learning with much theoretical knowledge who had at the same time a knack for getting things done. He believed deeply in the best values of democracy and applied them wherever he worked so that individual freedom and improved race relations and social advancement were by-products of his efforts to promote economic development. His untimely death at 57 is a heavy loss to a Nation which has grown to greatness on the basis of just such qualities and capacities.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 1, 1963]

#### DREAMER WITH A SHOVEL

Gordon R. Clapp, dead now at 57, devoted over a third of his good and useful life to the Tennessee Valley Authority. He began working there in 1933, when it was one of the coming wonders of the world, and he did not leave it until 1954. Indeed, he probably would never have left it had not President Eisenhower, in keeping with the more or less inexorable laws of politics, decided to name somebody else as TVA's Chairman.

This was something that Mr. Clapp never resented, nor had he any reason to. As far as the political realities went, he knew what the score was, and he took it for granted. He understood the need for high-echelon personnel changes as part of the transition from one presidential administration to another. Certainly he was anything but a complainer in that sense. As he once told an interviewer, "When a public servant gets a martyr complex, chances are he has been working too hard, or his friends have been feeling too sorry for him."

Mr. Clapp was happily free of any such complex. In all the various posts he held at TVA, he liked to think of himself as one of those "dreamers with shovels" who converted the Tennessee River into a tool that gave the people "better farms, better homes, and better living." It did just that, and his role in the enterprise was big. He deserves to be remembered as one of our country's fine public servants.

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times]  
SOCIETY LOSES A VALUABLE CITIZEN IN DEATH  
OF GORDON CLAPP

Wisconsin feels keenly the death of Gordon Clapp, a member of a distinguished Wisconsin family who died in New York Sunday after a life of distinguished achievement in public and private pursuits.

The Clapp family is well and widely known in this State. Gordon was active in educational pursuits and was serving in a high administrative capacity when he went to the Tennessee Valley Authority with David Lillenthal, another distinguished Wisconsinite.

He rose to take Lillenthal's place at the head of this world-famed experiment in democratic planning and later became associated with Lillenthal in private business.

His brother, Norman, has also had a distinguished career. He was an aide to the late Senator Robert M. LaFollette, Jr., later

became an editor and publisher in Lancaster, and is now the chief administrator of the rural electrification program in Washington.

It is a tragedy for the family, but it is a tragedy for society, too, to have a man whose talents are at their peak taken by death.

#### INFRINGEMENT ON THE RIGHT OF A STATE TO ACT AND ADMINISTER ITS OWN WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on April 8, the Illinois State Senate passed a resolution in opposition to any legislation by the Congress which would infringe on the right of a State to enact and administer its own workmen's compensation law. I submit the resolution of the Illinois Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 34 OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Whereas the Congress of the United States by a series of amendments to the Social Security Act during the period 1956 to 1962, has extended and broadened the Social Security Act to provide disability and other benefits for work-connected injuries and disease; and

Whereas the State workmen's compensation laws were designed to be the basic and exclusive method and remedy providing benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases, and their administration has, for over 50 years, been the function of the several State industrial accident boards and commissions, based on the accepted principle that benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases be tailored to fit social and economic conditions at the local level; and

Whereas the extension of the Social Security Act to provide benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases has resulted in duplication of benefits; and

Whereas legislation resulting in further intrusion into the field of work-connected injuries and diseases constitute a severe threat to the survival of State-administered workmen's compensation programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Illinois State Senate is opposed to any legislation by the U.S. Congress which would infringe on the right of this State to enact and administer its own workmen's compensation law, and to further Federal encroachment into the field of State-administered workmen's compensation programs and strongly urges that the U.S. Congress again affirm that the State workmen's compensation system is the basic program for compensating work-connected injuries and diseases; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States; Secretary of Labor of the United States; Senate minority leader, EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN; Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, and all Members of the U.S. House of Representatives from Illinois.

Adopted by the senate, April 8, 1963.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,

President of the Senate.

EDWARD E. FERNANDES,  
Secretary of the Senate.

#### DEATH OF MRS. H. D. BURROUGHS, JR.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I noted that on April 28, 1963, Mrs. H. D.

Burroughs, Jr., the distinguished wife of Henry D. Burroughs, Jr., an Associated Press photographer, died at the Bethesda Hospital. She was a niece of the distinguished author, Sherwood Anderson, and achieved fame and distinction in her own right in many fields of activity.

She was on assignment to Berlin after World War II and while there organized the Ladies of the Press Corps to aid the children in a German orphanage with food, clothing, and entertainment.

She was so very well known to all members of the press photographers and her passing is noted with deep regret.

#### IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the budget for the fiscal year 1964 makes provision for implementing the Alliance for Progress for a total sum of \$900 million and in due course this item will come to the Senate in the form of an appropriation bill from the House and will then be considered first by the Senate Committee on Appropriations and ultimately by the Senate itself.

I have devoted some time to this activity and to the progress or lack of progress made under this program. To say the least, a volatile and unstable condition has been developing in Latin America which inspires grave doubts that any progress is being made whatsoever in achieving social reforms and the investment of U.S. development capital in the Latin American Republics.

A great many speeches and articles have appeared during the last year indicating diverse points of view and since the amount of money involved and requested is very substantial indeed, it is appropriate that the Congress carefully reexamine the entire program and ascertain what course of action to pursue. The very fact that private capital is leaving rather than going to Latin American Republics in larger amounts is a cause for concern. It was the hope of the authors of the program that in due course private capital in sufficient quantities would move into these countries and make it possible ultimately for the U.S. Government to disengage itself from these activities and commitments.

The further fact that private Latin American capital is moving out of these countries to find safe haven elsewhere is in itself a cause for real concern.

In order to place the whole problem before the Congress and the country, I am submitting a number of items for inclusion with my remarks, all of which deal with the Alliance for Progress.

The first is an address delivered by Dr. William J. Kennitzer, economic geologist and lecturer in Hispanic American Studies at Stanford University, at the second public affairs seminar at Elmhurst College in Elmhurst, Ill.

The second is an article by Dan Smoot, author of the Dan Smoot Report of Dallas, Tex., which appears in two parts.

The third is a specially prepared article by Mr. Simon G. Hanson, editor of Hanson's Latin American Letter, which was prepared at my request and which is

a penetrating study of what is happening under the Alliance for Progress.

The fourth is another weekly letter by Mr. Simon Hanson, dated December 29, 1962.

The fifth is a column submitted to the Tampa Tribune and published on May 18, 1962, under the caption "Before Castro, Bolivia."

The sixth is still another of Hanson's Latin American Letters, dated February 2, 1963.

The seventh is an article from the Time magazine entitled "Alliance in Danger."

The eighth is another Hanson's Latin American Letter, dated March 23, 1963, in the nature of a response to the "Report on the Alliance for Progress" prepared by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY.

The ninth is still another of Mr. Hanson's Latin American Letters dated March 30, 1963.

The 10th is the Washington report of the American Security Council, edited by Frank J. Johnson, which was issued February 25, 1963, under the caption "Brazil: The Tottering Keystone."

The 11th is an article from the New Leader by Keith Botsford, under the title "Slide-Rule Failure in Brazil," which appeared in the April 15, 1963, issue of the New Leader.

The 12th is an abstract of a report made on February 2, 1963, by Mr. J. Peter Grace, Chairman of the Commerce Department Committee for the Alliance for Progress. The full memorandum is too long to be included in the RECORD but I believe the abstracts and clippings incorporated in this memorandum will do full justice to the findings of that committee.

I believe that the cost involved in inserting these exhibits for the RECORD is fully justified in view of the obligations we have assumed under the Alliance for Progress and because it represents a heavy burden upon the Federal Treasury whether the commitments are made in the form of long-term, low-interest-rate loans or in the form of grants.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the exhibits to which I have referred.

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

**THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS PROGRAM—ITS OBJECTIVES, ORIGIN, IMPLEMENTATION, AND CHANCES FOR SUCCESS**

(Address by William J. Kemnitzer<sup>1</sup> at the Second Public Affairs Seminars, Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill., November 5, 1962)

The Alliance for Progress is a joint program of action established by adoption of the Charter of Punta del Este by representatives of 20 of the member-nations of the Organization of American States, meeting on the ministerial level of Junta del Este, Uruguay, on August 17, 1961. Cuba did not sign the Charter.

The stated purpose of the Alliance for Progress is " . . . to enlist the full energies of the peoples and governments of the Latin American Republics in a great cooperative effort to accelerate the economic and social

development of the participating countries of Latin America, so that they may achieve maximum levels of well-being, with equal opportunity for all, in democratic societies adapted to their own needs and desires."

The reasons for the Alliance are many but the main motive for it is, undoubtedly, the desire to combat communism and other social and political movements prejudicial to democratic forms of government and capitalistic systems of economy which movements have been gaining impetus throughout much of Latin America for some time.

Demagogic leaders in many parts of Latin America, many of them aided and abetted from outside Communist sources, have harangued the masses into believing that their poor plight has been due to the unequal distribution of wealth caused by "imperialists" from the United States together with their co-partners, the gringoized Latin American oligarchy.

This anti-United States propaganda poured out in an atmosphere of continuing destitution is most effective among the underprivileged which constitute the bulk of the Latin American populace. They readily believe capitalist democracy as applied to Latin America from the outside to be simply another form of colonialism, a system which exploited them for three centuries prior to their independence from the mother country.

They are told that this independence was not the result of a true revolution of the people; it was merely a transference of the same system for exploitation from one group to another. Now, with the powerful backing of the Sino-Soviet governments, they are told the time has come for the real social revolution.

The growing intensity and scope of these attacks upon democratic methods in Latin America has posed a serious problem for the Western Nations in general and for the United States in particular as virtual custodian of democracy in this hemisphere. To combat these attacks and prevent establishment of governments hostile to capitalist democracy, the Latin American Republics except for Cuba, under the leadership of the United States, hope by means of the program set up under the Alliance for Progress to create or modify conditions in Latin America which will motivate the masses to reject communism and other forms of socio-political economy alien to our desired way of life in the Americas.

The Charter of Punta del Este establishes the Alliance for Progress within the framework of Operation Pan America. Operation Pan America is a plan submitted by the Government of Brazil on August 19, 1958, to the governments of the other American Republics through their diplomatic representatives in Rio de Janeiro. It called for a reorientation of hemispheric policy intended to place Latin America in a position to participate more effectively in the defense of the West. It was, however, more than a program; it was a policy.

Operating within the framework of the Operation Pan America, the Alliance for Progress not only provides for a program designed to bring a better life to the peoples of Latin America, but it also involves actions fundamental to the defense of the West whether that defense be economic, social, political or military, against all of the forces threatening democracy.

Although it may seem that the main reason for the Alliance for Progress is to ward off the threats of communism in the Western Hemisphere, actually the origin of the basic ideas in the Alliance evolved from circumstances somewhat removed from the present communistic threat. To understand better what is taking place under the Alliance for Progress program, let us take a quick look at the highlights of its predecessors.

Prior to World War II, most cooperative hemispheric efforts were not made for the over-all economic and social benefit of the people. They were engaged in predominantly for the purpose of effecting trade and military agreements for commercial and political reasons or for dealing with problems relating to special private interests. These latter problems were generally dealt with by shows of force particularly on the part of the United States.

However, beginning with the expropriation of the properties of private oil companies in Mexico on March 18, 1938, three circumstances developed which were paramount in bringing about a change of U.S. policy toward Latin America. These circumstances were (1) the unwavering stand of the Mexican Government against all opposition to the expropriations and nationalization of the Mexican petroleum industry; (2) the desire on the part of the U.S. Government for inter-American cooperation in dealings with the world conflict now coming to a head; and (3) the activities of Nelson Rockefeller and his group in developing suggestions for inter-American economic and social improvement.

Among the largest operators in petroleum in Latin America are the Standard Oil companies in which the Rockefeller family hold substantial interests. Their operations in Argentina had been restricted for many years, their properties in Bolivia were expropriated in 1936 and as already stated in Mexico in 1938, and there was fear that their fast-developing holdings in Venezuela subsequent to 1938 could suffer the same fate.

As early as April 1937, Nelson Rockefeller, then 29 years old, made a trip to Venezuela where he observed the operations of the Creole Petroleum Corp., the Venezuelan subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. In 1939, Rockefeller went back to Venezuela. In that year, the Creole corporation hired a North American engineering firm to make a survey of the Venezuelan economy and to blueprint the bottlenecks which were stifling normal economic development of the country. The survey showed that while hundreds of millions of dollars had been pumped into the oil industry, little had been done about developing agriculture and other productive industries. Indeed, most of the food and supplies had to be imported. Wealth was concentrated in a few hands and the people were poor.

It was obvious that drastic measures were called for if the overall economy was to be developed in a manner which would benefit the entire populace instead of being concentrated principally in the hands of those exporting raw products and those importing manufactured goods. Creole management, mindful of the expropriation of oil properties in other Latin American countries was willing to do its part, but that had its limitations. Something much bigger than what could be accomplished by a single oil company or even a group of companies had to be done. This problem was one which occupied Nelson Rockefeller's intense interest for some time to come.

On return from his trip to South America in 1939, Rockefeller tried to work out terms for a settlement for the Standard Oil properties expropriated in Mexico. He arranged a meeting with President of Mexico Lázaro Cárdenas and was his house guest in Mexico. During this visit, Rockefeller apparently learned much from the man who had actually decreed the expropriations of the oil properties, and who is still Mexico's venerable liberal in political thought.

President Cárdenas told Rockefeller that the actions of foreigners in Mexico, while creating great bitterness, were not the reason for the expropriations. The real reason would not be easy for Rockefeller to understand. The Mexican President reminded Rockefeller that in the background is the seizure of Texas in 1836, the taking of New

<sup>1</sup> Economic geologist, and lecturer, Institute of Hispanic American and Luso-Brazilian Studies, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Mexico and California in 1846, and the sending of the Army against Villa in 1916, by the U.S. Government.

Then, he continued, one had to remember that the Mexican War of Independence ended the domination of the Spanish ruling class and restored self-confidence in Mexico's people. That was the liberation from direct colonial domination in our own country. There remained, however, the economic domination of the United States. The expropriation of the oil properties was a symbol of Mexican liberation from domination from without. Expropriation restored a sense of dignity and self-respect and independence—and, he emphasized, "That is often more important to our people than is their physical and economic well-being."

Rockefeller returned to the United States deeply impressed with the importance of the human element in international relations, something with which few businessmen had heretofore been concerned. Indeed, the record is clear that the Mexican expropriations marked the turning point for the petroleum companies in their attitudes and actions in the foreign field, and in U.S. Government policy toward Latin America.

After this memorable meeting with President Cárdenas, Nelson Rockefeller undertook to do something about improving the relationships between private enterprise and public welfare. He gathered around him a group of businessmen, bankers, lawyers, economists, and sociologists to survey, study, consult, and report on this problem. The "group" as it became known, had in it men of wide differences of thought which made it difficult to reach a common opinion on all facets of the problem but, nevertheless, they showed the way to a better understanding of it, especially as related to the peoples of Latin America.

By early 1940, the Axis powers were very active in Latin America, especially in Argentina. United States prestige began to wane while that of the Nazi-Fascists began to rise. Rockefeller and his group were convinced that the United States must protect its international position through the use of economic measures that are competitively effective against totalitarian techniques. If the United States was to maintain its security and its political and economic hemispheric position it must take measures at once to secure economic prosperity in Latin America; and to establish this prosperity in the frame of hemispheric economic cooperation and dependence. It is pertinent to note that at this time, the threat to the hemisphere was Nazi-Fascism and not communism, although the two sometimes worked hand in hand.

Rockefeller and his group had prepared a 3-page memorandum entitled "Hemispheric Economic Policy." On June 14, 1940, Nelson Rockefeller went to the White House in Washington where he read his memorandum to Harry L. Hopkins, one of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's closest advisers. The memorandum outlined a broad program that included emergency measures to absorb surplus Latin American products and measures to encourage investment in Latin America by both private interests and the Government. In addition, the memorandum stated that a vigorous program to improve cultural, scientific, and educational relations in the Americas with the cooperation of private agencies was essential.

President Roosevelt had made it known, mainly as a consequence of the Mexican expropriations, that he considered our economic relations with Latin American countries as affecting adversely our political relations with them. He was afraid this situation would delay or even preclude effective Latin American cooperation with us in the impending war. Something had to be done and Nelson Rockefeller's ideas were accepted.

From this time on, the ideas developed by Nelson Rockefeller and his group form essentially the bases for all programs adopted for economic and social development in Latin America and our policy in relation thereto. We do not have time here to develop the details of this thesis from Rockefeller's memorandum on hemispheric economic policy, in 1940, to the Alliance for Progress in 1961, but the highlights of efforts to effect a cooperative economic and social program for Latin America will unfold as we proceed.

On August 16, 1940, President Roosevelt established by Executive order, the Office for the Coordination of Commercial and Cultural Relations between the American Republics, and he appointed Nelson Rockefeller the Coordinator. On July 30, 1941, this Office became the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs (CIAA). The Coordinator's Office was charged with the responsibility of building up a strong mutual respect and understanding among the nations of the Americas in order that they might be better prepared to meet jointly the emergency wartime demands and plan jointly for a sound postwar structure. It expressed what is known as Roosevelt's "Good Neighbor Policy."

The Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs lasted until May 20, 1946, but Rockefeller remained with it until late 1944, when on December 20, 1944, he was confirmed as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of relations with the American Republics. In this position, Rockefeller was better able to expound his ideas for improving United States-Latin American relations.

Early in 1945, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, Ezequiel Padilla, proposed an Inter-American Conference on the Problems of War and Peace to deal with political and economic problems. The conference was called and met in Mexico City from February 21 through March 8, 1945. Assistant Secretary of State Nelson Rockefeller was designated alternate delegate by President Roosevelt and in this position Rockefeller played an important part in drawing up the agenda and negotiating resolutions.

As a result of this conference, 180 draft resolutions were drawn up, but the most important one relating to economic and social matters was the "Economic Charter of the Americas." In this and other resolutions a reaffirmation and extension was made of inter-American principles and aspirations which seek the general improvement and well-being of the peoples of Latin America.

On the death of President Roosevelt on April 12, 1945, Harry S. Truman became President of the United States and Nelson Rockefeller continued on as Assistant Secretary of State until August 24, 1945, when he resigned to go back to private business. However, before he resigned, Rockefeller participated actively in the Conference on International Organization in San Francisco at which the Charter of the United Nations was signed on June 26, 1945. At this Conference, Rockefeller was most active in bringing the Latin American nations into the new organization and in keeping them aligned in a cooperative bloc to support U.S.-postwar policies.

During the war period, Latin American countries had received large payments from the sale of strategic materials while they could spend comparatively little for imports of capital and consumer goods which were then in short supply. Consequently, most of these countries accumulated large amounts of gold and foreign exchange. However, following the war years, the situation was reversed. The demand and prices for raw materials fell while the countries spent heavily for imported goods which had been unavailable to them during the war. As a result, of unfavorable payments balances, it was not long before most of these countries were in financial straits and were suffering considerable social unrest.

The failure of the U.S. Government to take effective action in efforts to ameliorate these adverse conditions in Latin America after the war prompted Rockefeller to consider what might be done by private capital to bolster Latin American economies and thus strengthen inter-American political and cultural ties. It was a matter of record that in the last century capital went where it could make the greatest profit. Now it was apparent in the defense of capitalism that it must go where it can render the greatest service to the general welfare, especially in Latin America.

In order to implement his ideas, Nelson Rockefeller, in conjunction with his four brothers, set up in 1946, a private philanthropic organization called the American International Association for Economic and Social Development (AIA). Shortly thereafter, they established the International Basic Economy Corp., a private company to conduct business mainly in Latin America. The reasons for establishing these privately-owned organizations were stated by Rockefeller to be that the hope for future peace and security in the world depends on closer relations and better understanding among the peoples of the world, coupled with a rising standard of living and a steady improvement of conditions.

The earliest attempt to formalize Rockefeller's basic ideas into inter-American action are expressed in the "Economic Agreement of Bogotá," an instrument fundamentally not much unlike the present Charter of Punta del Este. This agreement was signed by representatives of all the member nations of the Organization of American States on May 2, 1948, meeting in Bogotá, Colombia. In this document it is stated that the purposes of the cooperation and principles which inspire it are those set forth in the Economic Charter of the Americas (March 8, 1945), the Charter of the United Nations (June 26, 1945), and the Organization of American States (May 2, 1948) thus linking the present effort with its predecessors.

Rockefeller's endeavors did not stop here. He realized that private efforts alone could effect only a small part of the necessary objectives. He now proposed what soon became known as the point IV program. When material was being prepared for President-elect Harry Truman's inaugural address in January 1949, Rockefeller's idea got into the speech as Truman's point 4 program for technical assistance. On November 24, 1950, President Truman wrote to Nelson Rockefeller that " \* \* \* any adequate and sound program for international economic development must \* \* \* lend itself to realistic and continuing cooperation between private enterprise and government, here and abroad." In the same month, President Truman appointed Rockefeller chairman of the International Development Advisory Board to recommend policy in connection with the execution of the point IV program.

In 1952, Rockefeller resigned as chairman of the International Development Advisory Board and returned to New York City. However, early in 1953, President Eisenhower appointed Rockefeller chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization; later he became Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. By December 1954, he resigned this position whence President Eisenhower asked him to become Special Assistant to the President on Foreign Affairs. Here his position was basically to assess the psychological aspects of U.S. foreign policy. Rockefeller not only believed in maintaining an adequate defense but also was convinced that money spent wisely on foreign economic cooperation would save the taxpayers huge sums of money in the future.

In December 1955 Rockefeller told President Eisenhower that personal affairs made it necessary that he resign as special assistant to the President. He returned to New

York in 1956. One of his ideas now was to make a private study of major problems that would confront the people of the United States in the next 10 or 20 years. He suggested to his brothers that they finance a special studies project under the title of America at Mid-Century. They agreed to do so through the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, a philanthropic organization they had set up in 1940 to make contributions to charities, civic organizations, educational and research endeavors.

In 1958 that part of the study dealing with the Western Hemisphere was published, and it is in this part of the report that the precepts for what became the Alliance for Progress are reiterated and amplified.

After the termination of the Korean war in July 1953, the period 1954-58 became one of almost dire neglect of our good neighbors in Latin America. The economies of most of the countries were becoming progressively worse, their governments unstable, and the populace increasingly restive. Latin leaders complained that the United States had not given them sufficient aid to ward off increasing attacks from leftist agitators. They complained that we had directed the bulk of our aid to Europe and Asia while they had received comparatively little.

Indeed, this contention was true. Of the world total obligations and loan authorizations by the U.S. Government for economic assistance for the period from fiscal year 1946 through fiscal year 1959, Latin America had received less than 7 percent; of the total military assistance slightly more than 1 percent; and for all assistance combined, a little more than 5 percent.

Something had to be done. Various emissaries were sent on trips to Latin America to ascertain the facts, to give assurance of aid, and spread good will. Among them were the President's brother Milton Eisenhower, Adlai Stevenson, and a number of Members of Congress. Although cognizant of the situation, apparently our Government did not realize its seriousness until Vice President Richard Nixon, while on a good will trip throughout South America was booed, pelted with various objects and otherwise ill-treated in some of the more distressed areas.

Indeed, it remained for President Kubitschek of Brazil to call attention to the seriousness of the situation. After Vice President Nixon's trip President Kubitschek on May 28, 1958 wrote a letter to President Eisenhower in which he said:

"I want to convey to Your Excellency, on behalf of the Brazilian people as well as for myself, an expression of sentiments of solidarity and esteem, the affirmation of which is necessary in view of the aggression and vexations undergone by Vice President Nixon during his recent visit to countries in Latin America.

"It is hoped that the unpleasant memory of the ordeal undergone by Vice President Nixon will be effaced by the results of earnest efforts toward creating something deeper and more durable for the defense and preservation of our common destiny."

In reply, President Eisenhower wrote to President Kubitschek on June 5:

"To my mind you have described accurately both the existing situation and the desirability of corrective action. I am delighted, therefore, that you have taken the initiative in this matter."

By August 1958 President Eisenhower had sent a group headed by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to Brazil to exchange views on how to promote the hemispheric solidarity of the 21 American Republics. On August 6, a joint communique was issued at Brasilia at the conclusion of talks between President Kubitschek and U.S. Secretary of State Dulles. The communique dealt with an exchange of views on the international situation but more specifically with those problems relating to the movement for hemispheric unity which President Kubitschek called "Operation Pan America" previously referred to.

Operation Pan America called for directing efforts toward increasing the average per capita income of Latin America from less than \$300 per year to \$500 per year by 1980. Brazilian planners spoke of a decade of dollar loans averaging \$600 million annually. At first this proposal was considered fantastic and was not taken too seriously but as the communistic color of Cuba developed more intensely after 1959, Operation Pan America began to seem realistic.

After a number of meetings and discussions, the Council of the Organization of American States, on July 1, 1960, set September 5 as the date and Bogotá, Colombia, as the place for a meeting. By this time, Cuba was definitely in the Communist camp and was spreading its doctrine and gaining wide support among many of the left-wing groups in the economically depressed countries of Latin America.

On the afternoon of September 13, 1960, in a ceremonial session, final approval was given to a document called the Act of Bogotá. The vote was 19 for, with 1 against. The sole dissent came from Cuba; while the Dominican Republic was not present.

As finally approved, the Act of Bogotá is longer and more detailed than the original U.S. draft, but it is consistent with the spirit and objectives of the first draft and embodies essentially all of the provisions for economic and social development originally promulgated by Nelson Rockefeller's efforts as heretofore set forth.

Thus, the measure for social improvement and economic development within the framework of Operation Pan America were established. It remained now for the Organization of American States to formalize these measures into a charter which would bind the signatory member-nations in a common effort to bring their people accelerated economic progress and broader social justice within the framework of personal dignity and political liberty.

The Eisenhower administration at the instigation of and in collaboration with President Kubitschek of Brazil had laid the foundations for the economic and social development program in Latin America which was later to result in President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress. By now the Eisenhower administration was coming to an end and that of President Kennedy about to begin.

The Alliance for Progress was first used as a phrase by President Kennedy in his inaugural address in January 1961. On March 13, 1961, at a White House dinner for Latin American diplomats, selected Members of Congress and others, President Kennedy outlined his ideas for the program and said:

"If we are to meet a problem so staggering in its dimensions, our approach must itself be equally bold, an approach consistent with the majestic concept of Operation Pan America. Therefore I have called on all the people of the hemisphere to join in a new Alliance for Progress—a vast cooperative effort, unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose, to satisfy the basic needs of the American people for homes, work, land, health, and schools."

On May 26, 1961, President Kennedy sent letters to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate relating to a plan for reorganization of the mutual security program. Meanwhile, on May 27, an authorized \$600 million fund for the Inter-American social and economic program had been appropriated by the Congress. On June 2, it was announced that the responsibility and authority for the formulation and execution of the foreign development aid programs would be assigned to a single new Agency for International Development within the Department of State. ICA was abolished by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and functions redelegated to Agency for

International Development pursuant to President Kennedy's letter of September 30, 1961, and Executive order of November 3, 1961.

On June 19, 1961, with the funds originally requested by President Eisenhower now appropriated, a Social Progress Trust Fund Agreement was made by and between the U.S. Government and the Inter-American Development Bank to administer \$394 million of the \$500 million in the Special Inter-American Fund for Social Progress. Of the balance, \$100 million went to the Agency for International Development and \$6 million to the Organization of American States; while the \$100 million additional went into the Chilean reconstruction program.

On August 5, 1961, at the ministerial level under the auspices of the OAS the special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council (IA-ECOSOC) convened at Punta del Este, Uruguay, for the purpose of formulating the Alliance for Progress. Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon headed the U.S. delegation while Senators WAYNE MORSE and BURKE B. HICKENLOOPER attended as observers.

By August 17, 1961, the special meeting of the IA-ECOSOC at Punta del Este, was concluded with the signing of the basic documents for the Alliance for Progress by 20 member nations of the OAS including the Dominican Republic which was now again in the good graces of the Organization but not by Cuba which did not choose to sign. These documents were: (1) A declaration to the peoples of America; and (2) the Charter of Punta del Este, establishing an Alliance for progress within the framework of Operation Pan America.

In addition, there were signed 16 resolutions pertaining to economic and social development, economic integration, basic export commodities, an annual review of economic and social progress and social meetings of the IA-ECOSOC at the ministerial level, and public opinion and the Alliance for Progress.

Broadly, the Alliance for Progress is a phrase which describes all of the economic and social programs through which the signers of the Charter of Punta del Este undertake on a government-to-government or government-to-private people basis in the Latin American area. Departments, agencies, offices, and organizations too numerous to set forth here, function within the program in one way or another. It is a vast setup which took AID administrators themselves some time to find out what they were doing and where they were going. Indeed, it is so vast and complicated in organization and administration that it is practically impossible to prepare a complete functional chart of the inter- and intra-workings showing all of the ramifications of the entire business.

Just where the central office of administration and implementation of the overall Alliance for Progress program lies is somewhat obscure. Much of the activity, and certainly that of the United States, is centered in the State Department's Agency for International Development where an Assistant Administrator of its Latin American Bureau functions as Coordinatory of the Alliance for Progress through a number of committees of which probably the most generic is the Alliance for Progress Committee.

The precise amount of money required for implementation of the Alliance for Progress program is not spelled out in the Charter of Punta del Este. In that document, it is written "that the supply of capital from all external sources during the coming 10 years of at least \$20 billion be made available to the Latin American countries, and the greater part of this sum should be in public funds."

At the meeting at Punta del Este, it was contemplated that the United States would

endeavor to make available to the countries in the form of loans, credits, or grants about one-tenth of the total amount that Alliance program required to be invested in Latin America over a 10-year period. The United States would, subject to certain reform measures by the Latin American countries, help them get an additional 10th from other public sources while the countries themselves would be responsible for supplying the remaining 80 percent of the funds, either by increasing their taxes and collections, selling their securities, inducing savings and investment by their own people, and attracting investment from abroad. In other words, they were talking about an investment of \$100 billion over a period of 10 years, 80 percent of which would come from the Latin American Republics themselves.

In light of the total U.S. direct capital investments in all of Latin America (including European dependencies) over the years to the end of 1961 of only slightly more than \$10 billion, the figure of \$100 billion for the next 10 years seems rather large. Yet this is the goal.

As for immediate and short-term emergency financing, the United States agreed to provide more than \$1 billion in the year ending March 1962. A total of \$1,030 million was committed to Latin American countries during this first year of operations ending February 28, 1962, but it is estimated that only about one-quarter of this sum was actually disbursed up to that time.

Alliance for Progress funds furnished by the U.S. Government are administered by a number of Government agencies of which the most important are the Agency for International Development (AID), the Export-Import Bank of Washington (Eximbank), the Social Progress Trust Fund administered by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), and Food for Peace under Public Law 480. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, obligations and loans authorized (but not necessarily disbursed) totaled slightly more than \$1,117 million in economic assistance. Of this total, AID administered \$453 million or 41 percent; Eximbank \$262 million or 24 percent; Social Progress Trust Fund \$224 million or 20 percent; Food for Peace \$147 million or 13 percent; and other unspecified agencies \$30 million or less than 3 percent.

Recipients of most of these obligations and loan authorizations were Chile with \$211 million or 20 percent of the total; Brazil with \$202 million or 18 percent; Mexico with \$150 million or 14 percent; Argentina with \$79 million or 7 percent; and Peru, Venezuela, and Colombia \$70-odd million or with about 7 percent each. These six countries combined received nearly \$872 million or more than 78 percent of the total.

These figures in themselves may be impressive until one determines how and where the money was or is to be spent, and above all, whether much of it or any of it went or would go to the underprivileged classes causing most of our troubles and whose welfare is supposed to be the objective of our efforts. Actually very little of the funds obligated and authorized have been disbursed and of the total committed during the first year of operations ending February 28, 1962, nearly 60 percent went for such nonproductive categories as refinancing of purchases, balancing of payments, budget support, reconstruction and relief, industrial credit and capital goods financing, and national companies and banks; and little of the remaining 40 percent went directly into productive enterprise in which the masses of the populace could participate.

Funds to be administered by the various above-named agencies are first authorized and then appropriated by the Congress of the United States after due justification for them as advocated mostly by the officials of the agencies concerned. The origin and channeling of the appropriated funds into the several disbursing agencies is often in-

involved but in the last analysis they are derived from the taxpayer. Thus, the taxpayers and the Congressmen who represent them have a tangible interest in seeing that these funds will accomplish the objectives for which they are solicited.

In their attempts to justify the appropriations, the administrators of these agencies argue that expenditure of them is not only straightening things out in Latin America but is of great benefit to our economy. They point out that between 80 and 85 percent of the money granted or loaned in Latin America never leaves this country but is spent here for machinery, equipment, supplies, and services which increase production and employment in, and exports from, the United States. But Representative Orto F. Passman, of Louisiana, chairman of the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations, contends correctly that if the money so spent is derived from grants and long-term non-interest-bearing loans which probably never will be repaid, then the U.S. taxpayer is in reality picking up the tab for these goods and services.

Insofar as the Alliance for Progress funds are supplied by the U.S. taxpayer to enable Latin American governments to pay for purchases in this country, these governments can utilize their own foreign exchange derived from their exports either to purchase other goods elsewhere, accumulate foreign exchange, buy gold from us, or otherwise utilize money which in effect U.S. taxpayers give them.

If these contentions are true, and certainly insofar as they are true, our financial situation is frightening in light of the manner in which our foreign assistance program is functioning, especially under the Alliance for Progress program in Latin America. During the year 1961, while our gold supply decreased \$857 million, that of Latin America increased by \$55 million; and during the year 1962 while our gold supply decreased \$304 million, that of Latin America decreased only \$25 million. During fiscal year 1962, our Government committed more than \$1,000 million in aid to Latin America of which more than \$300 million was actually disbursed.

On the other hand, even if these facts are admitted, there is the defense-policy philosophy which considers that our so-called foreign assistance program is in reality economic warfare the cost of which should be borne by the taxpayer as unhesitatingly as he bears the cost of military warfare. Whatever the viewpoint or actual cost, foreign assistance or economic warfare, whichever one prefers to call it, is with us to stay at least until this world becomes one glorious federation of peaceful peoples—and that most likely is for a long time.

The charter of Punta del Este establishing an Alliance for Progress is complete with noble aims and objectives, but as the Honorable Orto E. Passman said in hearings before his subcommittee on appropriations, "We all have the same objectives. But saying it and doing it are two different things." That means that the benefits from the money spent under the program must reach the people who are disgruntled and are causing our trouble. In order to accomplish this objective we must build up productive programs in agriculture, processing, manufacturing, and distribution in which the people can participate, earn money, purchase domestic commodities, save and invest, and vitalize their own economies. Of course, these necessities are understood by those administering the Alliance program but certainly so far, they have not directed funds into channels leading to that end.

Most of the agitation against the United States in Latin America comes from student, labor, and peasant leaders who represent the great masses of the underprivileged. The record is clear that what we desire from the masses has not been attained over the past

16 years with money per se, threats, or force. As Nelson Rockefeller realized after his first visit into Latin America more than 25 years ago, our problem is not alone an economic one but fundamentally one of human relations.

What we should have done years ago and what we must do now without further delay is to get to the people. If we must spend the taxpayers' money, let us spend it where the results of that spending will get at the roots of our trouble; and to accomplish this basic objective, the following priority program of essentials is urged:

1. Review educational and labor systems; develop and coordinate them with the democratic, economic, social, and political planning of each country.

2. Enlist students, teachers, industrial and farmworkers in popular programs geared to their economic and social welfare.

3. Set up efficient student, teacher, labor and farmer training programs; interchange leaders for purposes of mutual understanding and appreciation in efforts to achieve democratic ends.

4. Assure every student, teacher, and worker a job commensurate with his or her training and ability; make a sense of participation, human dignity, and social security the prime incentives and rewards of the common effort.

5. Encourage and assist free enterprise in establishing privately owned and operated productive agricultural, processing, manufacturing, and distribution activities in which the people can function as both producers and consumers to create and sustain a viable domestic economy.

6. Direct the bulk of assistance funds into education, health and sanitation facilities, housing, and public welfare activities; do not expend such funds on public utilities, transportation facilities, heavy industry, and other "infrastructure" facilities except when and where absolutely necessary and feasible.

7. Eliminate entirely the expenditure of foreign assistance funds on such purely fiscal matters as balancing budgets, paying off trade deficits, lending to nationalized institutions, and the like.

It is evident that the administration of our foreign assistance programs over the years has been so disunited, complex, cumbersome, and misdirected that the objectives sought have not been attained. In particular, the Alliance for Progress program is so diversified in its aims, nebulous in its structure, and bureaucratic in its organization that it is practically unworkable.

It is also self-evident that no matter what we do on our side of the picture to encourage and protect private business in entering the Latin American field, if the investment atmosphere within the Latin American countries themselves is not favorable, our efforts to enlist the aid of private enterprise will be of little or no avail.

Furthermore, expropriations of privately owned public utilities and certain natural-resource and heavy industries are bound to continue in Latin American countries under the wave of nationalism which has swept most of them since the last World War.

In order to eliminate the organizational and administrative handicaps and to better the implementation of our foreign assistance programs for the preservation and protection of democratic ideals in the Americas, it is proposed:

- I. That the U.S. Government create a Department of Foreign Economic and Social Operations in which to centralize, unify, control, coordinate, and direct all of our foreign economic, social, and technical assistance programs.

- II. That the Organization of American States effect an Inter-American Treaty for Uniform Investment and Antimonopoly Laws designed to prevent the flight of private capital from Latin American countries, and to attract private capital into these countries.

III. That within the framework of the proposed Treaty for Uniform Investment and Antimonopoly Laws, there be set up an inter-American permanent expropriation review and settlement board designed to take the sting and stigma out of Government condemnations of private property.

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Feb. 18, 1963]

#### ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—PART I

Alliance for Progress—the current program of the U.S. aid to Latin American nations—was initiated by Eisenhower; but it has become the major feature of President Kennedy's foreign policy.

The President claims that Alliance for Progress is intended to save Latin America from communism. Actually, the program is using American tax money to finance, and force upon Latin American countries, a communist-socialist revolution.

Kennedy has never given any precise estimate of what he expects to spend on Alliance for Progress; but general estimates are that the program will cost U.S. taxpayers \$20 billion in the first 10 years.<sup>1</sup>

#### ORIGINS

The origins of the Alliance for Progress program are almost as unsavory as its consequences.

On July 13, 1960, Fernando Berckemeyer (Peruvian Ambassador to the United States) and Roy R. Rubottom, Jr. (then Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs) discussed in Washington a suggestion by the Peruvian Government that foreign ministers of all 21 American republics meet to discuss the Soviet threat in the Americas.

A committee composed of representatives from seven Central and South American nations went to work on the Peruvian suggestion. The committee's biggest job was deciding upon an agenda and a meeting place that would be acceptable to Castro of Cuba. On July 26, 1960, the committee announced it had solved this major problem: the foreign ministers' conference of the Organization of American States could meet at San Jose, Costa Rica; and it would consider as its first order of business, not Communist control of Cuba or Communist infiltration of Latin America, but charges against Gen. Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic. The Government of Venezuela had accused Trujillo of plotting to assassinate Romulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela.

On August 16, 1960, foreign ministers representing 21 American nations, began their conference at San Jose.

Christian Herter, Eisenhower's Secretary of State, took the lead in getting the Organization of American States to take action against the Dominican Republic.

On August 20, 1960, the Conference adopted a formal resolution recommending that all other American nations break diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic and impose severe economic sanctions against her.

On August 22, 1960, Christian Herter initiated the second stage of the OAS meeting at San Jose, Costa Rica, by presenting a U.S. bill of particulars against Cuba.

On August 23, 1960, Julio Cesar Turbay Ayala (Colombian foreign minister) answered Herter's charges against Castro. Turbay reaffirmed his faith in the principles of Castro's revolution and denied that Castro was actually a Communist. Turbay reviewed, with interest, Castro's charges against the United States—and deplored the U.S. sugar restrictions against Cuba (that is, our cutting off the sugar subsidy).

On August 29, 1960, the foreign ministers proclaimed the Declaration of San Jose, written by Turbay of Colombia, in which the members of the Organization of American

States pledged themselves to democratic principles; to the rejection of totalitarian regimes of the right or left; to nonintervention in each others' affairs; and to support of the Organization of American States. The declaration did not even mention Cuba.

Thus the San Jose Conference of the Organization of American States—originally proposed by Peru for the purpose of discussing the Soviet threat in Cuba—achieved the destruction of Trujillo, America's only strong anti-Communist friend in the Caribbean area; but did not even scold Castro.

Christian Herter came home from San Jose, boasting that the United States had achieved a great diplomatic triumph.

The first stage of the OAS Conference of 1960 was completed at San Jose on August 20, when the delegates voted to isolate Trujillo of the Dominican Republic. The second stage was completed on August 29, when the Declaration of San Jose was adopted.

The third stage of the conference was conducted not at San Jose, Costa Rica, but at Bogotá, Colombia. The third stage, beginning on September 6, 1960, was a meeting of the economic ministers of the American Republics. This Bogotá stage of the OAS Conference was, simply, our State Department's payoff to the Central and South American Republics for what they had done at San Jose.

Douglas Dillon (then Eisenhower's Under Secretary of State) went to the Bogotá Conference with an Eisenhower promise of \$500 million of American tax money to be given Latin American nations.

Dillon began his speech to the conference by paying tribute to the role which Turbay of Colombia had played at the San Jose Conference. Remember, Turbay wrote the Declaration of San Jose, which turned out to be a victory for international communism. Turbay had praised the principles of Castro's revolution; he had viewed, with interest, Castro's charges against the United States; and he had denounced the U.S. sugar restrictions against Castro.

Before Dillon went to Bogotá, the whole world knew that Eisenhower was sending him with a promise of \$500 million in aid to Latin America. But there had been grumbling throughout Latin America that this was not enough. Castro was demanding that the United States inaugurate a \$30 billion aid program to Latin America. Brazil, and most other Latin American nations, were supporting the general tenor of Castro's demands, though the figures they named were somewhat less extravagant.

It looked as if our Latin American friends might not graciously accept Eisenhower's offer of \$500 million.

Douglas Dillon was prepared. He made it clear that the \$500 million which he had come to offer was a mere drop in the bucket—just a beginning. All of this was to be used only for social development. He promised bigger and more respectable U.S. aid to all of Latin America to continue economic development in that region.

"Social development," apparently, means schools, housing, hospitals—that sort of thing—to be built with money taken away from U.S. taxpayers. "Economic development" seems to mean the continuation of building, with U.S. tax money, roads, harbors, industrial plants (to compete with our own, of course), public buildings, and so on.

Douglas Dillon won another smashing diplomatic victory for the United States at Bogotá: the Latin American Republics agreed to accept our offer of \$500 million for social development and our promise of billions for economic development.

On September 13, 1960, the economic ministers of the American Republics signed the act of Bogotá, authorizing a massive program of U.S. aid to Latin American countries.

In his first inaugural address (January 20, 1961) President Kennedy gave this new aid-

to-Latin-America program its current name: Alliance for Progress. President Kennedy said:

"To our sister Republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge—to convert our good words into good deeds—in a new Alliance for Progress—to assist freemen and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty."

#### REVOLUTIONARY PURPOSE

On March 13, 1961, speaking to Latin American diplomats, and Members of the U.S. Congress, President Kennedy said:

"I have called on all the people of the hemisphere to join in a new Alliance for Progress. I have this evening signed a request to the Congress for \$500 million as a first step in fulfilling the act of Bogotá. This is the first large-scale inter-American effort—instituted by my predecessor, President Eisenhower—to attack the social barriers which block economic progress.

"This political freedom must be accompanied by social change. For unless necessary social reforms, including land and tax reforms, are freely made \* \* \* then our alliance, our revolution, our dream, and our freedom will fail."<sup>2</sup>

In his formal message to Congress (March 14, 1961) asking for the \$500 million to initiate the Alliance for Progress (as authorized by the act of Bogotá) President Kennedy again stressed the revolutionary purpose of this program. Acknowledging that revolutionary new social institutions and patterns cannot be designed overnight, President Kennedy implied that we must nonetheless begin at once a crash program to overturn the existing way of life in Latin America—giving our aid not on the basis of need, but on the demonstrated readiness of each government to make the institutional improvements which we require.

This theme of total revolution in Latin America, financed and enforced by U.S. tax money under the label of "Alliance for Progress," was reemphasized at a special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council (held at Punta del Este, Uruguay) on August 16, 1961. In the formal declaration issued by the delegates at this meeting, the Latin American nations receiving American aid pledged themselves.

"To encourage \* \* \* programs of integral agrarian reform.

"To assure to workers fair wages and satisfactory working conditions.

"To establish effective systems of labor-management relations and procedures.

"To reform tax laws, demanding more from those who have most, punishing tax evasion severely, and redistributing the national income."<sup>3</sup>

#### THE REVOLUTIONISTS

On November 6, 1961, President Kennedy announced appointment of Teodoro Moscoso as regional administrator for Latin America in the new Agency for International Development—that is, as head of the Alliance for Progress program. Moscoso is a Puerto Rican socialist, an early protege of Rexford Guy Tugwell, the braintruster whom Franklin D. Roosevelt made Governor of Puerto Rico. Moscoso is also an intimate friend of Romulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela, who is a Communist.

To understand the grim truth—that Alliance for Progress is a crash program with American tax money to tear Latin America apart and then reorganize it according to the Communist plan for a Marxist land—one needs a little background information

<sup>2</sup> "President Kennedy Speaks on the Alliance for Progress," a booklet published recently by the Agency for International Development, U.S. Department of State.

<sup>3</sup> Department of State Publication No. 572, Aug. 16, 1961.

<sup>1</sup> The New York Times magazine, Dec. 17, 1961.

on some of the principal actors in this revolutionary drama. At present, two of the principals are Teodoro Moscoso, Kennedy's Chief of the Alliance for Progress program; and Romulo Betancourt, Communist President of Venezuela.

Former U.S. Representative John Roussetol, Republican, of California did a great deal of research on Betancourt, and put the results of his labors into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: volume 107, part 16, pages 20941-20946; volume 108, part 3, pages 2951-2956; volume 108, part 10, pages 13185-13191.

U.S. Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 17, pages 23552-23553; and February 7, 1963 (pp. 1978-1980), more revealing information about Betancourt.

Here, in brief, is the Betancourt story:

As a young man, Betancourt worked openly as a functionary of the Communist international in Venezuela. For this Communist activity, he was exiled from his homeland in 1928. During exile, Betancourt went to Costa Rica where, with Manuel Mora, he founded the Communist Party of Costa Rica and was, for 5 years (1930 to 1935) head of that party. Working openly for a Communist revolution throughout Latin America, Betancourt discovered that communism could not thus be sold to the people. It would have to be imposed upon them by deception. Betancourt devised a hoax. He would renounce his membership in the Communist Party and return to Venezuela as an anti-Communist, and work to impose communism on his homeland by calling his program anti-Communist.

He did return to Venezuela, gathered his old Communist cronies around him, and launched his new Communist program of deception. He had made the mistake, however, of explaining his scheme in letters to Communist friends. These letters fell into the hands of Venezuelan authorities; and Betancourt was again ordered into exile. He evaded this banishment and went underground. For 9 years he remained in hiding. During that time, he organized a powerful Communist front disguised as a political party, which he called Accion Democratica (Democratic Action).

In 1945, a military junta overthrew the legal Government of Venezuela, and turned to Betancourt for leadership. Betancourt became president of the junta. Using the established political machinery of Accion Democratica, and appointing Communist henchmen to key posts in government, Betancourt ruled Venezuela for 3 years.

His rule was so corrupt and tyrannical that, on November 24, 1948, an uprising of military officers, led by Marcos Perez Jimenez, overthrew Betancourt and his stooges; and Betancourt again went into exile.

For over 9 years, Betancourt remained in exile. He spent much of that time in New York City, where he became the darling of the ultraliberal, anti-anti-Communist crowd of Socialist intellectuals—a hero to the leading liberals of the Eisenhower, and later of the Kennedy, administration.

In 1956, Betancourt's Communist connections became so objectionable that he was arrested in New York City (on information supplied by the FBI), was expelled from the United States, and denied readmittance. He was, however, permitted to live in Puerto Rico. Here, he became an intimate of Munoz-Marin, Socialist Governor of Puerto Rico, and of Teodoro Moscoso.<sup>4</sup>

Leftist groups in Venezuela (widely believed to have been directed and encouraged by Betancourt's new friends in the American State Department) overthrew Marcos Perez Jimenez in January 1958. About June

1958, Betancourt returned to Venezuela, revived his Accion Democratica, and ran for President. Again with the undercover support of the American State Department (which included widely circulated rumors, in Venezuela, that if Betancourt's party won the election, Venezuela would receive mammoth amounts of aid from the United States), Betancourt was elected.

Jimenez (who had given Venezuela the best government and had brought the nation to the highest level of prosperity in its history) was exiled. He sought asylum in the United States. Betancourt wants him returned to Venezuela so that he can be executed. He has filed outrageous charges against Jimenez, who is now in a Miami jail awaiting extradition. The American State Department and the powerful left-wing propaganda forces in the United States (including, for example, such "respected" organs as the Christian Science Monitor) have for months been conducting a massive hate campaign against Jimenez, preparing public opinion for denying him asylum so that he can be turned over to Betancourt for liquidation.

In 1961, the law firm of Dean Acheson (who is a special adviser to President Kennedy) received \$180,000 from Betancourt's government as a fee for representing Venezuela in the extradition proceedings against Jimenez.<sup>5</sup>

#### ALLIANCE SHOWPIECE

Meanwhile, Betancourt's regime in Venezuela has become a cesspool of corruption and tyranny. Despite Venezuela's enormous natural riches (and despite the hundreds of millions of dollars which Betancourt has obtained from the United States), grinding poverty, economic chaos, and wild disorder reign in Venezuela.

The reported Communist sabotage in Venezuela, and Betancourt's alleged crackdown on Communists, are merely part of a hoax—to justify Betancourt's seizure of absolute power, and to help the Kennedy administration justify more aid.

Communist Betancourt's Venezuela is the land which the Kennedy administration points to as the showpiece of the Alliance for Progress.<sup>6</sup>

Shortly after Kennedy was inaugurated, in January 1961, he appointed Teodoro Moscoso (Betancourt's old friend) to be Ambassador to Venezuela. In November 1961, Kennedy promoted Moscoso to the post of Chief of the Alliance for Progress. In December 1961, when it became apparent that Betancourt, despite his support from Washington, was in deep trouble in Venezuela, President and Mrs. Kennedy made a hastily planned visit to him, to help shore up his sagging regime. Here is an account of this disgraceful episode in American history, in the words of U.S. Representative John Roussetol (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 3, p. 2951):

"President Kennedy's trip to Venezuela was what was needed to bolster Betancourt's sinking Accion Democratica government. To the eternal humiliation of the American people, President Kennedy permitted himself to be used in this desperate Betancourt personal political maneuver. He permitted himself to be paraded through the streets of Caracas to impress upon the discontented Venezuelan populace that the United States is backing Betancourt. Before he departed, he was persuaded to deliver a series of speeches, obviously prepared for him by his collectivist aides, hailing the alleged progress of Venezuela under Betancourt and pledging generous American loans."

Mr. Roussetol's words do not adequately portray the shameful behavior of the Amer-

ican President while visiting Communist Betancourt.

President and Mrs. Kennedy arrived in Venezuela on December 16, 1961. In his welcoming speech, Betancourt (while praising Kennedy personally) insulted the United States with open arrogance. Betancourt praised Kennedy as a "U.S. President who is rectifying a long period of ignorance and lack of comprehension (in the United States)." Betancourt denounced the "arrogant belief (in the United States) that the friendship \* \* \* (of Latin America) was guaranteed to the United States by the self-appointed rulers and their courts of small oligarchies." Betancourt criticized the "bad habits of bureaucratic routine" in the United States, which had slowed down the flow of U.S. aid to Latin America, and demanded speed in satisfying the economic, social and cultural underdevelopment of Latin America.

President Kennedy answered these insults to the United States by saying:

"Your distinguished President Romulo Betancourt, is demonstrating the capacity of freemen to realize their aspirations without sacrificing liberty or dignity.

"He has reestablished democratic government after a decade of dictatorship—and he has carried forward a solid and responsible program of economic progress.

"I come (to Venezuela) to take counsel with your leaders \* \* \* to witness the magnificent example of vital democracy which is being carried forward in Venezuela."

In another speech at LaMorita, on December 17, President Kennedy said:

"Here in Venezuela the meaning of the new Alianza para el Progreso is being demonstrated, for you have made a tradition and transition from depressive dictatorship into a free life for the people of this country to progressive democratic rule under the grant of the great democratic statesman of the Western Hemisphere—your distinguished President Romulo Betancourt.

"Today 86 families will receive their titles to their own homes under a program which has already settled 38,000 families on 3,800,000 acres of land.

"This is your program—the program of your progressive far-seeing Government—and the people of my country will share in this program by making available more loans to build rural homes and more credits to finance your crops.

"This program is at the heart of the Alianza para el Progreso."<sup>7</sup>

#### AGRARIAN REFORMS

It is rumored in Venezuela that farmers who want to get a piece of land under Betancourt's "agrarian reform" must kick back 10 percent of the value to Betancourt's political party (Accion Democratica). But even if we ignore the graft (at our expense) what do we find, on close examination, in the agrarian reform which President Kennedy praises extravagantly, and which he says is the heart of our Alliance for Progress program for all of Latin America? Here is what U.S. Representative Roussetol found:

"The United States is the greatest example that could be cited of a nation which has enriched itself through a constructive agrarian program. Our program was inaugurated with the Homestead Act after the Civil War.

"Through this act, vast stretches of rich virgin land in the West were brought into cultivation. The act did not propose to take over the productive farms already in operation in New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, and cut them up into small uneconomic holdings. Instead, it directed the new farmers to uncultivated land or the frontier, which increased rather than decreased the Nation's crop production.

"Does Betancourt propose to do this in Venezuela with the aid of the agrarian reform

<sup>4</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 7, 1963, pp. 1978-1980, remarks of WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

<sup>5</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 17, pp. 23552-23553, remarks of WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

<sup>7</sup> The New York Times, Dec. 17, 1961, p. 37.

millions which President Kennedy promised him? No indeed. Venezuela has enormous stretches of uncultivated and good government-owned land in the Provinces of Sucre, Monaga, Ansoategui, and Bolivar. They are served by convenient transportation facilities. For the more distant future, it has the empire sweep of the vast area beyond the Orinoco.

"Did Betancourt propose an agrarian plan, like that of the United States, which would open up this abundant government-owned land through an orderly, wealth-producing program? He did not. Instead, he launched a program to buy up land already in successful cultivation and cut it up into small, uneconomic plots. These plots were mostly near Caracas where they could be used as showcase exhibits for credulous visitors. President Kennedy was taken to one of these cut-up farms and induced to make a speech enthusiastically hailing the Betancourt land program, and promising far-reaching aid."

The agrarian and other social reforms which our socialist planners are devising, and financing with our money, throughout Latin America, have sinister aspects.

A Mexican businessman, deeply disturbed about our Alliance for Progress program, sent me the following account of what is happening:

"In many Latin American countries the vast majority of the land areas taken away from the large landowners is reportedly divided up among peons or poor rural peasants. This sounds lovely to the people who read it and especially attractive to the American people who through their Government and Government banks finance with loans and grants these so-called agrarian reforms which appear to give the land to the peasants.

"However almost the exact reverse is the case. Most of the land taken away from the large landowners is not given to the peons or peasants, but the ownership is kept by the governments and only assigned year by year to the peons. Thereby the former landowner is replaced by a much bigger landowner whose local representative is a political appointee who is able to assign a small piece of land each year to each peon or refuse it to him or change him to another piece as he (the political appointee) sees fit.

"The result is, in practice, that the peon has lost his old patron, who in many cases was a humane sort of person, and generally lived on the property at least a part of the year, and whose ear could be reached by the peon, as those who have lived in Latin America in the past can testify. In exchange he has a new patron who is a 'faceless, cold, impersonal' government office represented by a frequently changing political appointee who has no direct interest in the productivity of the soil and frequently is principally interested in enriching himself while he holds on to his insecure job.

"The peon does not own any land, he has no feeling of ownership, does not know how long he may be permitted to work the same plot and hence can have no interest in improving the land, and does feel totally dependent on the whim of the politicians, which is just what the Communists desire and in this way attain. All the land belongs to the government.

"The same is true of most of the government housing schemes. The houses are not sold to the people but are rented to them. All the houses belong to the government and this added to the government control of transportation, telegraphs, movies and the press, is perfect preparation for the establishment of the totalitarian state or communism. Government intervention is

creeping forward all the time, and the money which the Alliance for Progress gives to these leftist governments only speeds up the march down to socialism and eventually communism.

"American citizens should give as much importance to stopping the socialistic policies of the Alliance for Progress as they do to impeding socialistic legislation in their own country. U.S. taxpayers have already spent many hundreds of millions of dollars on the Alliance for Progress, in promoting policies which are absolutely against the best interests of the Latin American countries concerned, against their economic and political freedom, and against the best interests of the United States into the bargain."

#### WHO IS DAN SMOOT?

Dan Smoot was born in Missouri. Reared in Texas, he attended SMU in Dallas taking BA and MA degrees from that university in 1938 and 1940.

In 1941 he joined the faculty at Harvard as a teaching fellow in English doing graduate work for the degree of doctor of philosophy in the field of American civilization.

In 1942, he took leave of absence from Harvard in order to join the FBI. At the close of the war, he stayed in the FBI, rather than return to Harvard.

He worked as an FBI agent in all parts of the Nation handling all kinds of assignments. But for 3½ years, he worked exclusively on Communist investigations in the industrial Midwest. For 2 years following that, he was on FBI headquarters staff in Washington, as an administrative assistant to J. Edgar Hoover.

After 9½ years in the FBI, Smoot resigned to help start the Facts Forum movement in Dallas. As the radio and television commentator for Facts Forum, Smoot, for almost 4 years spoke to a national audience giving both sides of great controversial issues.

In July 1955 he resigned and started his own independent program, in order to give only one side—the side that uses fundamental American principles as a yardstick for measuring all important issues.

If you believe that Dan Smoot is providing effective tools for those who want to think and talk and write on the side of freedom, you can help immensely by subscribing, and encouraging others to subscribe, to the Dan Smoot Report.

[From the Dan Smoot Report, Feb. 25, 1963]

#### ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—PART II

In 1950, an American dollar was worth 18.3 Brazilian cruzeiros. By January, 1962 (despite inflation of U.S. currency), the dollar would buy 350 cruzeiros.

In January 1963 (shortly after the United States had granted Brazil another special loan of \$30 million to help stabilize the currency), I visited Brazil. The night I arrived, an American dollar would buy 600 cruzeiros. My guide advised me not to exchange any money that night, however, because, he said, I would probably get a better rate of exchange the next day. I did. The next morning, I bought 650 cruzeiros for 1 American dollar. When I left Brazil 8 days later, the rate was fluctuating between 750 and 800 cruzeiros to 1 American dollar.

During my stay in Brazil, I interviewed numerous people (middle-class Brazilians, resident Americans, an official of the U.S. Information Agency, and so on.) All of them cited the building of Brasilia as the primary reason for the inflation.

#### GOVERNMENT EXTRAVAGANCE

Brasilia is the new capital of Brazil, located in the wilds of Goias, on the Brazilian highlands, about 600 miles inland from Rio de Janeiro, the former capital. Construction on the city was begun in 1957, during the

administration of President Juscelino Kubitschek. There were no inhabitants in the region and no roads to it. Construction steel and most of the heavy machinery were brought in from the United States. Highways were built through hundreds of miles of uninhabited country to the major coastal cities of Brazil. And Brasilia was dedicated as the new national capital in 1960.

I examined the city of Brasilia, closely and carefully, in January 1963, when it was less than 6 years old. Decay and dilapidation have already set in. It is probably the world's foremost contemporary monument to the folly of a politically motivated, socialistically planned economy.

Oscar Niemeyer, Brazilian architect who helped design the United Nations Building in New York, designed all buildings in Brasilia. Photographed from a distance, they make striking postcards and fine illustrations for an article in National Geographic; but, examined at close range, as places where people are supposed to live and work, they are ugly. Niemeyer himself apparently shares my opinion. He does not live among the modernistic oddities which he designed for other people to occupy: he built for himself and old-fashioned Brazilian colonial outside the city. The futuristic buildings, of spectacular design, reveal inferior construction. Most are still empty and unfinished. Some apartment houses that are occupied, already show signs of becoming slums.

Most of the people in the Federal District of Brasilia still live in the construction-camp slums that formed when workers were first brought in 6 years ago. The costly highways running to the coastal cities are, like the wide avenues of Brasilia, empty of traffic.

President Kubitschek, a leftwing socialist, practically bankrupted his nation to build this preposterous monument to himself. The political argument for his folly was that, by placing the national capital inland, the Government would spur migration from the crowded coastal cities to the vacant interior, where the climate is good, and fertile soil is abundant.

The scheme has failed miserably. Brasilia is a modernistic ghost town, where no one wants to live. Brazilians prefer the fleshpots of Rio.

Without exception, every Brazilian I talked to about Brasilia called it a white elephant. Yet the nation is now stuck with it. Although there is a vast quantity of unfinished construction in the city, there is little construction work presently being done. I doubt that it will ever be finished; and the cost of maintaining it as is, for a national capital, is quite enough to overburden the Brazilian economy.

It is impossible to say how much Brazilian tax money and how much American tax money went into the construction of Brasilia. During the 6 years of its existence, we have given the Brazilian Government more than enough to pay for the whole thing; but it is obvious that all of our foreign aid money was not diverted into this gigantic fiasco. Our money has been spread around a bit, to underwrite the activities of other leftwing Brazilian politicians, to line their pockets, and to encourage harmful extravagances on the part of government, and reckless spending on the part of the people.

#### PRIVATE EXTRAVAGANCE

Aided and encouraged by a foreign government to spend money it does not have, the Brazilian Government feeds the fire of inflation which is consuming the nation. Some of the consequences are obvious, despite thick layers of propaganda, which misrepresent them to the world. Look, for example, at São Paulo, largest city in Brazil, generally called the Chicago of South America, and frequently rhapsodized as a place which inspires

<sup>7</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 3, p. 2954.

awe, a very model of modern municipal grandeur, a vision of the 21st century.<sup>1</sup>

In fact, São Paulo is a grim, and dangerous, monument to reckless economic activity artificially stimulated by a socialistic government. From the downtown hotel room I occupied in São Paulo, I could count upward of 50 unfinished skyscrapers. A casual glance at such evidence of boom and bustle does inspire awe. But a closer look inspires something else.

Work has obviously been abandoned on most of these unfinished buildings. Some of them have been under construction for more than 10 years; and shabby masonry is already crumbling in many buildings which may never be finished and used. No structural steel is used in any of these new skyscrapers. They are built of reinforced concrete columns. The walls are made of a soft, cheap looking locally made brick, poorly laid by unskilled hands. The brick is covered with plaster, and the whole building (those, that is, which have reached this stage of completion) is faced over with a brilliant Brazilian tile which gives an appearance of solidity and beauty.

No one knows whether such buildings could stand a moderate earth tremor, or even a wind of hurricane proportions. An American engineer, who works in São Paulo, expressed to me the fear that one good shock would leave São Paulo a vast heap of broken concrete and shattered masonry. As to that, no one can definitely say; but the economic, social, and political consequences of such construction activity—throwing up, in reckless profusion, costly buildings which are abandoned, to decay and ruin before they are ever finished—are obvious.

Some of the unfinished buildings of São Paulo were built with Government money—that is, American tax money, given to the Brazilian Government as foreign aid, and then lent to private speculators. But, apparently, most of the buildings were privately financed.

Why would individuals put their money into such construction, much of which is never finished? Having lost confidence in their currency, they were trying to put it into real estate, something of permanent value. They could get enough money to start a building, from private syndicates which charged interest rates ranging as high as 48 percent per year. But often, before completion, interest and further currency depreciation had consumed all working capital—and no more was available.

#### AS BRAZIL GOES

Occupying about half of the land area of South America, Brazil dominates the continent. As Brazil goes, so may go the rest of Latin America. And Brazil, in the hands of pro-Communist politicians, whose policies are being financed by American tax money through Alliance for Progress, is headed straight for communism.

A look at recent Brazilian political history should make this clear.

From 1934 to 1945, Getulio Vargas ruled Brazil as a dictator, his administrative system patterned after the corporate state system of Fascist Italy. During his reign, he set up the Brazilian Labor Party, which continued to dominate Brazilian politics even after Vargas was overthrown by the Army in 1945.

Vargas returned to the Presidency in 1950, having won in the elections by an overwhelming majority. In the name of economic nationalism, he socialized the Brazilian petroleum industry and extended Government control over all other industries—even to the extent of limiting the amount of profit which foreign corporations could withdraw from Brazil.

<sup>1</sup> "Giant Brazil," National Geographic, September 1962, p. 306.

Nonetheless, the U.S. Government set up, with Vargas, a joint commission for economic development in Brazil, and supported his schemes. Fear that Vargas (with U.S. aid) was restoring his dictatorship, caused criticism which grew until, in August 1954, Vargas' palace guard attempted to assassinate him. Vargas committed suicide on August 24, 1954.

Elections for a new President were held the following year, 1955. Two of Vargas' followers—Juscelino Kubitschek and Joao Goulart (who had been Secretary of Labor under Vargas)—won the offices of President and Vice President.

Kubitschek and Goulart were inaugurated in January 1956. During the elections of 1955, they had been formally supported by Communists. After their inauguration, they repudiated the Communists, and announced a policy of friendly cooperation with the United States.<sup>2</sup> This, of course, opened the sluice gates for a flood of American tax dollars which enabled Kubitschek to start the building of Brasilia—and to initiate other policies which sped the chaotic depreciation of Brazilian currency.

Under the Brazilian Constitution, Kubitschek could not succeed himself as president. In the elections of 1960, Janio Quadros was elected President, Joao Goulart was reelected Vice President. They were inaugurated in January 1961.

Quadros proclaimed a neutralist foreign policy. He resumed diplomatic relations with the Communist regimes of Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania; he expressed support for the original aspirations of the Cuban revolution of Castro; he exchanged trade missions with Communist China and the Soviet Union—and sent financial envoys to the United States.

Quadros stirred up a storm of protest in Brazil by publicly decorating Che Guevara, Castro's Communist Minister of Finance. The storm never died; and on August 25, 1961—having been in office less than 7 months—President Quadros abruptly resigned and left the country.

The office of President fell to Vice President Goulart, who was on his way back to Brazil from a visit to Communist China.

Goulart's record of leftwing activities—of working with and through Communists and their sympathizers—aroused the fears of many Brazilians, including the military, who opposed his succession to the presidency.

Before Goulart was permitted to become President, the Brazilian Congress adopted a constitutional amendment which set up a parliamentary form of government, transferring principal executive authority from the President to a Council of Ministers.<sup>3</sup>

When finally inaugurated as President, Goulart surrounded himself with pro-Communist assistants, proclaimed his devotion to the neutralist foreign policy of Quadros—and then made a state visit to the United States. In Washington, he spoke to a joint session of Congress, scolding the American legislators for giving so little money to Brazil, and demanding a new and immediate gift of another \$500 million.<sup>4</sup>

Returning to Brazil with almost groveling assurances, from the Kennedy administration, of increased Alliance for Progress aid, President Goulart, thus elevated in prestige, took immediate steps toward eliminating the parliamentary system so that he could become a virtual dictator.

<sup>2</sup> Encyclopedia Americana, vol. 4, p. 451 c.

<sup>3</sup> This Changing World: For Commanders: Armed Forces Information and Education, published by the Department of Defense, vol. 1, No. 8, Nov. 1, 1961.

<sup>4</sup> Newsletter of U.S. Representative RICHARD H. POFF (Republican, Virginia), dated Apr. 16, 1962.

His Communist and pro-Communist underlings, working through the Brazilian Labor Party and the unions, incited a series of riots and strikes throughout the nation.<sup>5</sup> The resulting chaos and economic stagnation created a demand (planted and nourished, of course, by Goulart's henchmen) for elimination of the cumbersome parliamentary system, and for restoration of a strong Presidency which could do something in the crisis.

The Brazilian Congress resisted, but eventually decided that the issue must be put to the people in a national plebiscite, to be held on January 6, 1963.

Goulart played his trump card just a short time before the voting occurred. In December, 1962, he proclaimed a law ordering all business firms operating in Brazil to pay an extra month's salary to all workers.

This fine bonus, for which Goulart got credit, did the job it was supposed to do: Goulart won by a 5 to 1 margin in the national plebiscite of January 6, 1963. All obstacles against Goulart becoming an elected pro-Communist dictator—with promises of American Alliance for Progress tax dollars to back him—are now removed.

I talked to responsible Brazilians, and to resident American businessmen, about the December bonus which Goulart ordered all business firms to pay. How could the firms stand such a blow? Simple. American firms (many of which are operating under guarantees-against-loss from the American Government) paid the bonus and took the loss, which would in due course be passed on to American taxpayers.

Brazilian firms which would not stand to pay the bonus were permitted to go under—if their management was not friendly to the Goulart regime, or if the administration wanted to gain control of their properties. Brazilian firms friendly to the Goulart administration were given Federal tax rebates large enough to cover the enforced bonus payments. The resultant loss to the Brazilian national treasury was covered by Alliance for Progress money from the United States, and by more worthless printing-press Brazilian currency.

#### ALLIANCE FOR POLITICIANS

American aid money enabled Kubitschek to build Brasilia, for the purpose of spurring Brazilians to migrate inland; and American aid money has helped guarantee the failure of the migration scheme.

With American aid money, Brazilian politicians periodically feed and entertain the lazy and illiterate thousands who crowd into the squatters camps of Rio and other large coastal cities. If they moved to the interior, they would have to work—and they would miss all the free fun.

With American aid money, the Brazilian Government also caters to the urban vote by subsidizing certain food costs for certain groups of city voters. Some low-rent Alliance for Progress housing (owned and controlled by the Brazilian Government) has already been completed in the big coastal cities; and vast quantities more are promised. Why should easy-going Brazilians give up the reality and prospects of such easy, American-subsidized living, to face the rigors of work and self-support in the undeveloped interior?

An article entitled "United States Betting on Mexico—But There's Trouble Ahead," in the February 25, 1963, issue of U.S. News & World Report, reveals that the same sort of thing is happening in Mexico. Indeed, it is happening all over Latin America.

#### ONLY LEFTWINGERS

The only Latin American politicians which the Kennedy administration will support

<sup>5</sup> "Toward a Soviet Brazil," by Robert Morris, "The Wanderer," Jan. 17, 1963.

with our Alliance for Progress tax dollars are the leftwingers—Socialists and pro-Communists. Note, for example, this significant item from the front page of the December 17, 1962, issue of the News, an English-language newspaper published in Mexico City:

"President Jorge Alessandri of Chile today wound up a week-long visit to the United States, which he is confident helped dispel impressions that his government is too conservative to lead in the drive to bring economic and social reform to Latin America.

"Chile and Colombia have been singled out by the Kennedy administration for large-scale aid under the Alliance for Progress."

These leftwing politicians use American money to create socialistic enterprises, thus destroying private enterprise. Note, for example, these passages from the U.S. News & World Report article on Mexico, mentioned above:

"Mexican businessmen and foreign investors are concerned \* \* \* over steady and increasing inroads by the Government into industry and manufacturing \* \* \* a gradual expansion of Government ownership of a vast network of businesses \* \* \* (ranges) from railroads, electric power, petroleum and natural gas, steel mills, and airlines to automobile production and drug manufacture.

"As a result, a new class of public officials has developed in Mexico. These are the directors and administrators of the Government-run industries. They have all the prestige and power of business ownership, plus the power of Government—all without risk of their own money.

"To this new type of managers and administrators, it seems perfectly normal that the Government continues to expand its participation in the economy and to regulate that which it does not own. The result has been a marked increase in Government control of business through legislation, decrees, import controls, and licenses."

American tax money is financing this communizing of Mexico—and an even greater program is being planned. Note these passages from the same U.S. News & World Report article:

"Mexico, it now appears, is to be built up as a showplace of the Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

"Plans for injections of huge sums—up to \$3 billion—into the Mexican economy are under study here by officials of the U.S.-sponsored Alliance and the World Bank."

#### RESULTS

And what are the results of these injections of huge amounts of American tax money, through the hands of leftwing politicians, into the economy of Mexico? From the U.S. News & World Report article on Mexico:

"Private businessmen, alarmed by this trend (toward Government ownership and control of business) have reacted by spurning new investments in Mexico and turning to less vulnerable investments abroad. Flight of capital from Mexico in 1961, mainly due to concern over this factor, is conservatively estimated at \$150 million."

Private capital in Latin America is the only hope for gradual transformation of agrarian, semifeudalistic societies (through an orderly process of growth) to the point where the people can understand, sustain, and perpetuate modern industrialism.

Our Alliance for Progress money is rapidly driving out all of the private capital and encouraging governments to spend money they do not have. As we pour our tax money in, private investors pull theirs out and stash it away in Swiss banks, or invest it in European industry. At the same time, our aid money is financing the destruction of governmental systems and social arrangements which are the only protection against wild disorder and bloody violence.

And when blood runs in the streets, we will get the blame, because we are so closely identified with the policies producing the disorder. One by one, the Latin American nations (with Brazil, perhaps, in the vanguard) may turn to outright Communist dictatorships as the only way to restore "law and order."

#### THEY KNOW WHAT THEY ARE DOING

It cannot accurately be said that our governmental leaders do not understand what is happening in Latin America. In the latter part of 1961, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD (New Frontier Democrat from Montana, who is Senate majority leader) spent a few days in Brazil as a member of a Senate study mission. On January 22, 1962, he reported his observations on Brazil to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Here are extracts from Senator MANSFIELD's report:

"Inflation \* \* \* discourages personal savings and impairs long-term investment in productive enterprise. It has pushed interest rates up to 3 and 4 percent a month. A great deal of capital has been diverted into speculative, if spectacular, real estate construction and other enterprises with low social value.

"It is impossible to form an estimate of the amount of indigenous capital that has fled the country and is now held in Europe and the United States. Nevertheless, in informed circles in Brazil, the belief is general that the amount is very great. At the same time, foreign capital is showing hesitancy in flowing into Brazil. It is not unreasonable to suppose that the hesitancy is likely to grow if financial chaos continues to threaten in Brazil and if the recent indications of political hostility to foreign business persist. Within Brazil, moreover, credit has flowed very loosely, encouraging speculation and profiteering. At the same time, there have been large deficits in the Government budgets, year after year.

"For the most part, the \* \* \* poor have poured into and around the cities from rural areas, in the hope of finding living conditions which might be superior to those in the impoverished countryside.

"The northeast contains 25 million inhabitants, more than a third of Brazil's population. It is a region of immense stretches of empty lands, forests, and a few vast agricultural estates, and innumerable subsistence farms. The region has characteristics which are similar to those in impoverished agricultural sectors of the Mediterranean countries \* \* \* and in some underdeveloped regions of Asia. Per capita income is in the neighborhood of \$100 a year. Infant mortality rates are high and average life expectancies short. Illiteracy is widespread. There is a very limited availability of modern medical care and other social services.

"The planning agency for the development of the northeast \* \* \* is known in Brazil as Sudene. The Sudene concept \* \* \* will involve vast outlays of funds, Brazilian and foreign.

"Neither technical shortcomings nor financing, however, may be the major question mark as to the feasibility of the Sudene plan. The more fundamental difficulty may lie in Brazilian society."

There, Senator MANSFIELD puts his finger on one fatal flaw in all of our aid programs to underdeveloped countries. A nation of people who are incapable of producing a complex, modern industrial society are quite incapable of maintaining one. They have had enough contact with modern society to yearn for its material benefits; but, in this yearning, they are like small children who wish for a high-powered automobile to do with as they please. Outside efforts (such as we are making) to give the underdeveloped

peoples an industrial economy (before they have gone through generations of slow self-development that is necessary to produce one) will be harmful to them and to others, just as giving the child an automobile would be.

Senator MANSFIELD touches on some of the dangers involved in our aid programs to Brazil (and, similarly, to other Latin American countries). He says:

"This Nation's policies with respect to Brazil tread a very delicate line, particularly as they pertain to the Alliance for Progress. What is not yet clear is whether aid can, in fact, contribute to evolutionary change. On the contrary, there is a strong presumption in present circumstances that significant assistance will not do much more than prolong and intensify the present unsatisfactory situation.

"Moreover, such assistance will link us very closely with that situation, and if it then collapses, all of our interests are likely to be more adversely affected than would otherwise have been the case."

Yet, Senator MANSFIELD continues among the foremost in supporting Kennedy's massive Alliance for Progress aid program.

#### WHAT SHOULD BE DONE?

I do not know—and, obviously, no one else knows—how to solve these critical problems in South America. Our Government has no constitutional right to try to solve them. We should, therefore, compel the Congress of the United States to stop the Alliance for Progress program abruptly.

Would not all the Latin American nations then turn to communism? Perhaps. But now we are speeding their march toward communism with our aid.

If we pauperized the United States by giving all of our wealth to the cause of promoting a prosperous, stable Latin America, we would still fail; and, by our effort, we would hurt the people of Latin America more than we would help them.

Even if the Latin American people were capable of absorbing and using constructively the help we give them, there is not enough wealth in the United States to raise a nation like Brazil to the level of educational, scientific, cultural, commercial, and industrial development that prevailed in Czechoslovakia in 1948. But even if our aid could uplift Brazil to that extent—would that keep the Communists from taking over, as they took over the advanced and highly developed nation of Czechoslovakia?

The fact is that the disease of communism does not breed in the bellies of men.

#### STATISTICS

Direct U.S. aid to Alliance for Progress countries from 1946 to August 1962 is as follows:

Argentina.....	\$1,027,300,000
Bolivia.....	286,400,000
Brazil.....	3,193,400,000
Chile.....	904,700,000
Colombia.....	576,100,000
Costa Rica.....	136,700,000
Dominican Republic.....	9,400,000
Ecuador.....	139,000,000
Guatemala.....	207,900,000
Haiti.....	127,700,000
Honduras.....	54,300,000
Mexico.....	1,246,500,000
Nicaragua.....	\$98,400,000
Panama.....	121,100,000
Paraguay.....	68,600,000
Peru.....	630,600,000
San Salvador.....	23,400,000
Uruguay.....	120,400,000
Venezuela.....	333,600,000
Total.....	9,305,500,000

\*Brazil and United States Policies: Report of Senator MIKE MANSFIELD to the Foreign Relations Committee, U.S. Senate, U.S. Government Printing Office, February 1962.

†"Our Crazy Foreign Giveaway Program," extension of remarks of Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 11, pp. 15511-15513.

## ON THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

On December 30, 1962, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, in his year-end report on progress of the Alliance, asserted that "we cannot afford to waste time by thinking about whether we shall succeed."<sup>1</sup>

I am of course delighted when any Government official decries the wasting of time.

But recent reports in the press and recent technical analyses would seem to indicate that the time spent on a reassessment of the objectives of the Alliance and a restatement into more realistic terms would be time well spent;<sup>2</sup> that a public appraisal of the lessons learned in the course of disbursing \$1.3 billion, including perhaps expanded activity by the General Accounting Office to determine the efficacy of our policies and of their execution, would be time well spent.<sup>3</sup>

For, the Alliance is not a short-term program. In the Alliance, we are embarked on a program whose duration may be measured in decades rather than in single years, and whose ultimate cost may involve tens of billions of dollars. Under these conditions, it is time well spent to determine whether we are merely working with old disproved remedies in a new overpublicized wrapper, and it is time well spent to investigate the effects of the largesse which the American people increasingly view as indiscriminate, as the information agencies of the Government departments grind out the interminable announcements of the movement of U.S. taxpayers' funds southward. To operate in a climate of panic that does not permit public evaluation of the facts (or public disclosure, to be more exact), and constant reappraisal of the policies, would be to doom the program to inglorious failure.

This is the more true because the Alliance for Progress enjoys the sympathy and support of both parties. There is no political issue dividing us on the sympathy of this country for accelerated economic development in Latin America to the end that all Americans, South Central, and North alike, shall enjoy higher living standards commensurate with the resources with which a bountiful nature has endowed them.

But, I am disturbed by recent reports which picture inter-American relations, as one writer in the London Times recently put it, as "panting with gift-hardened arteries."

I am disturbed by the findings of one of our country's most honored specialists in inter-American relations who could write that the failure of our program in Bolivia "has fed skepticism in Latin America about the viability in Latin America of the whole system, both economic and political, represented by the United States." \* \* \* This skepticism has in turn rendered Latin Americans more responsive to exaltation of the authoritarian nation-state which sacrifices freedom to forced drought economic development and social reform.<sup>4</sup>

I am disturbed when an experienced journalist on one of our finest papers can report from the field: "There is an alarming tendency (in Colombia anyway) to view the problems of the local economies as essentially a thing for the Alliance for Progress to deal with. Almost like: Thank God, the big

brother has finally come to the rescue—let him handle it."<sup>5</sup>

I am disturbed when a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System returns from Latin America to report that "we may be mistaking the symptoms for the disease which is really more deep seated. If this is true, our prescribed remedies will be ineffective, and they may in some cases be harmful."<sup>6</sup>

And I am disturbed when, after an expenditure of around a quarter-billion dollars in a small country like Bolivia, Bolivian officials could accuse us of "ulterior imperialistic motives," and a Bolivian official on whom AID relies largely for implementing its program can charge that "the Alliance for Progress had evolved in response to the circumstances of the strategic expansion of U.S. capitalism," that it was essentially a method to unload surpluses for which our economic system had been unable to provide an outlet.

Since the Alliance is largely concerned with more effective mobilization of domestic resources in Latin America, the role of private U.S. investment, the establishment of suitable priorities in the expenditure of Government funds, the preparation of national plans, and integration through the Latin American Common Market, let us look at recent reports under these headings:

## DOMESTIC CAPITAL: THE FLIGHT FROM LATIN AMERICA

One of the deficiencies in the Latin American economies which the Alliance purports to seek to correct is the shortage of developmental capital. But are we doing anything more than replacing domestic capital that is fleeing from the Latin American countries, or even facilitating that flight?

Early in January, an official of the International Monetary Fund reported that "in the 5 years ending 1961 private residents of Latin America, other than banks, increased their investments in the United States by approximately \$1 billion."<sup>7</sup> Since this does not include the flight of capital to safe havens in Switzerland and other European safe havens, nor the variously concealed movement of hidden assets that is hard to identify statistically, we are clearly confronted with a major obstacle to any serious success from the flow of U.S. Government funds which is merely compensatory with this outflow. For, in the period cited, U.S. Government assistance to Latin America totaled around \$1.3 billion, clearly not enough to balance the flight of domestic capital to Europe and the United States.

And since that time the flight of capital from Latin America has expanded.

Are the policies of the Alliance serving to generate a flight of capital or are they discouraging it?

Mr. James L. Robertson, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, writes: "I suggest that the remedy for this does not lie in the substitution of government-provided capital for private capital. It does not lie in the attempts to locate and forcibly repatriate Latin American capital deposited in American or Swiss banks. It does not lie in exhortation or special tax measures designed to persuade Americans

to step up their investments in the less-developed countries."<sup>8</sup>

## Net assistance to Latin America by U.S. Government

(Millions of dollars)

	Economic	Military
1st quarter, 1961.....	90	31
2d quarter, 1961.....	83	17
3d quarter, 1961.....	252	57
4th quarter, 1961.....	277	18
1st quarter, 1962.....	162	26
2d quarter, 1962.....	190	16

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

In December, an economist associated with the National Planning Association estimated that the flight of capital from Latin America had been \$700 million in 1961 and perhaps at the rate of \$600 million per year in the first 6 months of 1962.<sup>9</sup> This estimated flight of \$1 billion in 18 months compares with United States net assistance to Latin America during that period of \$1.05 billion.

To view this situation with complacency, to conclude that AID's "accepted remedy" of infusion of still larger amounts of U.S. Treasury funds is unchallengeable, and to assert that there is no time to waste in considering whether the program thus conceived will succeed, is for me a bit too disdainful of the sweat and blood that go into the accumulation of money by our taxpayers.

## ROLE OF U.S. PRIVATE CAPITAL

If there is one thesis which carries through virtually all congressional hearings on the Alliance for Progress, it is that which pertains to the vital and decisive role of private capital. Over and over, we have been told that unless private capital flows into direct investments at a sustained and significant pace, the Alliance must fail of its objectives. Most frequently, the administration has cited \$300 million as its minimum expectation for the annual flow of private capital from the United States into direct investments in Latin America.

In the first 6 months of 1961, the net direct investment by private capital in Latin America was \$143 million. In the 15 months ending September 30, 1962, not only has there been no direct investment, but actually there has been a net withdrawal of some \$35 million.

## Net direct investment in Latin America

(Millions of dollars)

1st quarter 1961.....	50
2d quarter 1961.....	93
3d quarter 1961.....	1
4th quarter 1961.....	3
1st quarter 1962, withdrawal.....	-29
2d quarter 1962.....	5
3d quarter 1962, withdrawal.....	-13

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

In other words, while a flow of \$300 million was labeled the decisive element for success of the Alliance for Progress, there has been instead a withdrawal rather than a net investment.

The response of the administration to this disastrous turn of events has been first, to substitute even more Government money for the flow of private capital which had failed to materialize, and second, to search out devices for guarantees, tax avoidance, etc., that would shift all the risks onto the U.S. Treasury and create a situation of private investment at public risk.

<sup>8</sup> Op. cit.

<sup>9</sup> Frank Brandenburg, National Planning Association, "Looking Ahead," December 1962. He puts the flight at \$500 million annually from 1953-59, \$750 million in 1960, \$700 million in 1961. There are no reliable data on this subject.

<sup>1</sup> AID press release No. A-112.

<sup>2</sup> Editorial in Business Week, Dec. 22, 1962: "The administration has clearly discovered from bitter experience, especially with the Alliance for Progress, that its original goals were unrealistic."

<sup>3</sup> Moscoso said that "since July 1961 the United States has committed \$1.5 billion to the Alliance for Progress, and has disbursed \$1.3 billion." That is, July 1961 to December 1962.

<sup>4</sup> Prof. Arthur Whitaker (University of Pennsylvania), "Nationalism in Latin America" (University of Florida Press, 1962).

<sup>5</sup> Hunter S. Thompson, the National Observer.

<sup>6</sup> James L. Robertson. His paper has been widely reprinted in Barrons, the National Observer, Banking magazine, etc.

<sup>7</sup> Graeme Dorrance, "The Effect of Inflation on Economic Development." He notes, surely with significance as to current trends in Latin America, that "a particularly unfortunate feature has been the large flow of private capital from those less-developed countries which have tolerated inflation to countries frequently wealthy which have maintained financial stability."

I suggest to you that this approach neglects completely the underlying factors, that it is the bureaucrat's familiar device of seeking out the easiest remedy which is always deemed to be a fresh addition to the burden on the U.S. Treasury, and I suggest that it must ultimately prove ineffective.

For, this approach fails completely to attack the factors that discourage the flow of capital into Latin America. It is for the Latin American governments to comprehend which of their policies are responsible for the discouragement of investment and to act so as to correct them. If they are, instead, determined to prejudice their development by constant threat of expropriation and discrimination against private investment, they must accept the consequences of a slowdown in the pace of economic development.

Recently, a very experienced executive in oversea operations, who happens to work in my State of Illinois, commented that "the United States would not have to be offering insurance on investments abroad if it had done a proper job of protecting such investments earlier. If the United States really supported oversea investments other nations would be afraid to attempt expropriation."<sup>10</sup>

It is typical of the course of the Alliance for Progress that when the Congress passed the Hickenlooper amendment in order to discourage confiscation of U.S. investments, an attempt was made to avoid its implementation. As you will recall, or a reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 2, 1962, will refresh your memory, testimony was adduced by affected businessmen to the effect that our representatives were told that the U.S. Embassy had received instructions not to make representations to the Government based on the Hickenlooper amendment, and the senior Senator from Oregon was prompted to remark on the floor of the Senate that "the law is crystal clear. There is a deliberate attempt on the part of the State Department to ignore and evade the law. I consider the State Department to be guilty of malfeasance in office with regard to the situation in Honduras."

It may well be that we are on the way to finding out from the methods of the Alliance for Progress that giving makes beggars. It is certainly already clear that closing our eyes to the causes of the present impasse on private-capital flow and throwing onto the U.S. Treasury the burden thus created by economic ignorance and/or prejudice in Latin America can only bring about an even greater deterioration by encouraging the very prejudices and misconceptions that have already gravely damaged the hopes for success of the Alliance.

To substitute U.S. Government funds for private investment on the theory that it is too difficult for Latin Americans to achieve an understanding of the requirements for economic development, and to insist that there is no time to evaluate whether this defiance of principle fatally prejudices our program, is a reckless abandonment of the pledges made to the Congress during the appropriations hearings and shows all too careless a spirit of "apres moi, le deluge."

#### THE ROLE OF THE LATIN AMERICAN COMMON MARKET

Already, the catering to this prejudice against private capital and the willingness to reward such prejudice with an expanded flow of U.S. Government money has contaminated still another phase of the Alliance that had been stressed by the administration as of decisive importance; namely, the role of the Latin American common market (LAFTA).

Mr. Moscoso has said that "the only reasonable hope of attaining what we desire (from the Alliance for Progress) depends

upon the creation of a Latin American common market."

But the Latin American common market had hardly been conceived on paper, when prominent Latin American officials and technicians began to worry aloud about the potential beneficiaries of accelerated economic development, particularly about the possibility that foreign-owned ventures within the area might benefit from the reduction of tariff barriers within the Latin American common market.

Already, then, there is an extension of the violent and uneconomic nationalism that has continually frustrated Latin America's economic development. Even so widely respected an economist as Raul Prebisch, long the area's most distinguished economist, has written: "Some apprehension is felt lest the benefits of the common market be reaped mainly by foreign instead of domestic enterprises. I share these misgivings and I do so not merely in imagination."<sup>11</sup>

Now, the Latin Americans know that the proportion of U.S. employees to total employment provided by oversea investment of U.S. firms is very small and tends ever smaller. In 1962, it was reported that only one in every hundred oversea workers employed by U.S. firms (including the executive structure) were U.S. citizens, and the pressure of self-interest on the part of the companies is making for acceleration of reliance on nationals of the countries where the investments are located, as quickly as suitable training can be effected.<sup>12</sup> Thus, in terms of jobs which a foreign firm would provide within the Latin American common market, it is unlikely that anyone could support the contention that foreign firms frustrate economic development.

The Latin Americans know that in terms of wage policy, or the relationship of taxes-paid to profits or sales or investments, or the degree of abstention from corruption, it is unlikely that anyone could support the contention that foreign firms frustrate economic development.

They know that the area is deficient in capital, and it must long remain so if the challenges for a better life for more people in Latin America are to be met. Thus, in terms of drawing on the savings of the more industrialized nations, it is unlikely that anyone could support the contention that foreign firms contribute to a frustrating of economic development.

And in terms of technology, in a world where technology advances continuously and often at breathtaking speeds, the Latin Americans know that maximum mobilization of every technological advance that can be adapted to the needs of their area is vital to development. And that it is most likely to come in a climate of competitive pressure for productivity (and its source, technological advance), which means inviting production by companies with the skills and techniques most recently evolved.

Has development been frustrated by the fact that one-tenth of the gross product of the Latin American area is accounted for by sales of U.S. companies' direct-investment properties in Latin America? Has development been frustrated by the fact that roughly one-third of Latin America's exports originate with the direct-investment companies? Has the employment provided to roughly 1 million persons been prejudicial to them, as against alternative outlets for their talents? Is it likely that tax collections would have been greater if the area had been able to avoid the approximately one-fifth of its government revenues which come from these U.S. direct investments?

<sup>11</sup> Raul Prebisch, "Economic Aspects of the Alliance," the Alliance for Progress (Johns Hopkins Press, 1962) p. 35.

<sup>12</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 13, page 18174.

If, then, it is clear that foreign private investment is an immense accelerating force for development, the misgivings which already dominate Latin American technical thinking on the subject of the place of foreign investors in economic integration raise serious doubts as to the real objectives of the common-market movement.

Surely, it would be time well spent to determine whether the support that is to be given the common market by the United States is actually designed to provide the final blow to private-capital flow, not only in terms of the loss of opportunity for U.S. firms, but also and much more importantly because it might strike heavily at the hope for economic development at the pace which the Alliance purports to believe vital.

#### THE USE OF U.S. FUNDS

On January 12, the Economist (London) noted that "40 percent of the money that was provided for development in Latin America in the first year of the Alliance for Progress has been spent in propping up budgets and stopping up holes in the balance of payments \* \* \*. How little permanent economic or political good is done by such help has just been demonstrated by the latest emergency in Brazil."

A study prepared for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported that the "misuse of our public assistance dollars" was such that we were bailing out European creditors who have gained markets in Latin America in competition with American firms, that we were providing loans to enable Latin American countries to meet their credit obligations to European creditors while at the same time we have no control over the original expenditures.<sup>13</sup>

A business newsletter notes that top priority in use of U.S. official donations to Bolivia has apparently been designated to the servicing of defaulted dollar bonds held by speculators either here or in Europe, bonds denounced from the White House as early as Franklin D. Roosevelt's early term. This, on condition that Bolivia would not be expected to service its obligations at the Export-Import Bank (some \$35 million), and that it would be provided with the \$929,000 for the purpose on top of the tens of millions of dollars being provided that country.<sup>14</sup>

A distinguished foreign correspondent of the Chicago Tribune and countless other reporters out of Argentina have referred to the quickness with which an official investigation into corruption in the use of public funds was terminated when suspicion began to attach to officials still in the government with respect to award of public contracts without open bidding which had resulted not only in discrimination against U.S. exporters but also in delivery by competitors of unsuitable and unusable goods. Yet, every such waste of foreign exchange serves only to enhance the dollar gap which AID is filling out of the U.S. Treasury without complaint against such practices.

If, indeed, there is no time to be spent on thinking about whether we shall succeed, shall we conclude that 10 cents on the dollar is the most that is needed for success in this program, that is to say, that we need spend effectively only 10 cents out of every dollar drawn from the U.S. Treasury to make the program successful? Is the financial requirement of the Alliance for Progress so small and the resources of the U.S. Treasury for the purpose so great that only 10 cents of every dollar needs to be expended efficiently?

Can we finance a mounting corruption in an area where corruption in the expenditure of public funds had long been a deterrent to development, and still achieve the aims of

<sup>13</sup> Senate Foreign Relations Committee: United States-Latin American Relations: Some Observations on the Operation of the Alliance for Progress. Aug. 3, 1962.

<sup>14</sup> Hanson's Latin American letter, No. 930.

<sup>10</sup> H. A. Davies, International Harvester Co., Chicago Daily News, Nov. 15, 1962.

the Alliance? Can we finance the proliferation of the bureaucracy, national and international alike, in an area where the swollen bureaucracies had long taken their toll of the economic potential, and still achieve the aims of the Alliance? Can we finance our competitors in foreign trade at the expense of U.S. exporters, even where it involves simultaneously great waste of foreign exchange, and still achieve the aims of the Alliance? Can we meet local currency expenditures for purposes that properly fall within the ordinary budgets of these countries in order that the local citizenry may run free of taxes and even have a surplus of capital to hide abroad, and still achieve the aims of the Alliance?

After a decade of such a program in Bolivia, we are defraying a large part of ordinary budgetary expenditures, we are paying wages directly to the swollen work force in government entities, we are underwriting the sale of German mining equipment, we are encouraging expropriation without compensation, we are swelling our donations in order that the international agencies should not have to suffer defaults on their loans, we have even bolstered the Communists' interest in delivering equipment by our promises of unlimited financing for the foreign-exchange gap which is created largely through the Bolivian official policies. (The Communists had lagged in negotiations because they wanted gold clauses and other assurances of payment, until the Bolivians were able to point to the certainty of U.S. funds in abundance). And after all this activity, we find that the standard of living in Bolivia has fallen steadily, we find ourselves profoundly disliked, and only last month, the press reported that some 29 organizations in Bolivia had petitioned the CIA to investigate the use of U.S. aid money to create the Marxist economy in Bolivia.

#### NATIONAL PLANNING

Nor does it suffice to justify such a performance by reference to national plans. Admittedly, the Alliance has stressed the making of national plans to assure maximum effectiveness in use of available resources.

Let us be frank. If conditions for an inflow of private capital are deliberately avoided, if conditions stimulating an outflow of capital are deliberately encouraged, if corruption is encouraged by the willingness of the United States to supply funds to cover any amount of waste, if government enterprises are to be encouraged to maximize their ineffectiveness by the availability of U.S. funds at virtually no cost, if trade competitors for the available foreign exchange are to be allowed to wrest the business away from lower-price offers (whether American or other) in order to provide a pork barrel for officials, what in the world is the sense of harping constantly on national plans as the key to accelerated economic development?

Recently, a Fulbright scholar in company with a member of the faculty of the University of Chile referred to the much-cited Chilean 10-year plan as a "book of prayers; it simply projects various quantities in various sectors to achieve a desired growth figure; there is no discussion of how the goal is to be reached."<sup>15</sup> And each recent announcement of additions to the donations to Bolivia have been identified as part of the national plan adopted by Bolivia, even though members of the U.S. aid team have long since ceased to come to the Hill with their reports of economic progress in Bolivia, after the long years of protesting that "just another year" would show the expected results.

#### SOME CONCLUSIONS

Some weeks ago it was announced that funds would be provided for a public-rela-

<sup>15</sup> Becket & Griffin, "Revolution in Chile?" New Republic, Dec. 29, 1962.

tions campaign for the Alliance for Progress to gain greater acceptability among Americans, North and South alike.

We need something far more than we need a public-relations campaign. This program needs a shakedown in objectives to realistic terms, it needs far greater honesty in presentation of the operational facts, and it needs acceptance by the administration that the taxpayers will not be satisfied with a 10 cents on the dollar performance not only because they resent the waste of funds but also because such a performance dooms the Alliance for Progress to failure.

Above all, in a program of such extended duration and of such heavy cost, let us have the truth. When we make a loan for 40 years, with a 10-year grace period, with interest at 1 percent, let the debtor know, as well as our own people, that this money is going to be costing us perhaps 4 percent per year, that it will involve an enormous cost to the American people. When we make a loan repayable in the currency of the borrower and with the understanding that the borrower will continue to use that local currency, let the debtor as well as the American people appreciate that we are making in effect concealed donations. Last year Mr. Fowler Hamilton, Administrator of AID, said that "we use the word 'loan' sometimes in a very Pickwickian sense." Perhaps it would help if we restored the old meanings to the words "loans," "donations," "economic progress," "economic retrogression." And above all, let us never get the idea that we lack the time to measure the progress of this program and the likelihood of its success.

[From Hanson's Latin American Letter, Dec. 29, 1962]

#### YEAR OF DECISION FOR PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN LATIN AMERICA—1963: END OF AN ERA

In the first 21 months of the Kennedy administration, net private direct investment in Latin America declined to \$5 million per month. In the same period, the amount of short-term credit outstanding for Latin America expanded by some \$5 million per month. But in the 9 months ending October 1, 1962, net private direct investment ceased, and there was instead a withdrawal of some \$4 million per month. In the same period, the banks were shortening their credit lines by some \$3 million per month. Under the cessation of the most effective form of developmental assistance, the Latin American economies stagnated.

#### U.S. direct investment in Latin America (In millions of dollars)

	Net withdrawal of capital	Net capital flow to Latin America
9 months to Oct. 1, 1962	37	144
9 months to Oct. 1, 1961		

#### BASIS FOR ONLY CONCERN?

"There is a basis for concern but not for alarm," the head of the great international trading firm of Anderson Clayton & Co. was quoted in Daily News Record (Fairchild publications), "and our company has sought during the year to exercise particular care in hedging and safeguarding its operations in Latin America." The data on cessation of net investment as issued by the U.S. Government confirm the widespread "concern," but for the year 1963, it is the significance of the larger trends in investment climate that warrants alarm.

#### ISSUE SHIFTS TO EXISTING INVESTMENTS IN 1963

For new private direct investment in Latin America, an era ended in 1961-62. Now, in 1963, the capacity of existing captive investments to survive profitably will be tested in most strenuous fashion. The outlook is not

bright. When the Kennedy administration took office, it was willing to forecast that unless private capital flowed into direct investments in Latin America at the rate of \$25 million per month and was sustained for a decade at that level or higher, the Alliance for Progress was dead.

Now, the climate for direct investment having been destroyed partly by the fumbling of that very Alliance for Progress, the issue is being blanketed in meaningless rhetoric such as the President offered up on December 26; namely, that change in Latin America is going to come through either "revolution and communism or through peaceful democratic means."

#### VIABILITY OF ECONOMIC SYSTEM REPRESENTED BY UNITED STATES

As the great test moves from stagnation through cessation of new investment to retrogression through withdrawal or weakening of existing investment, there is basis not merely for concern but for alarm, because we are moving to the core of the problem. And we have already had a demonstration of what this means. Had the administration not limited itself to conduct of our Latin American policy by persons without experience in the field, it would know that the prospective retrogression stemming from discouragement of private investment has already been tested:

"The failure of the U.S. program in Bolivia," writes a former officer of the State Department who has been showered with countless academic honors here and abroad for his expertness in the field, "has fed skepticism in Latin America about the viability in Latin America of the whole system, both economic and political, represented by the United States. \* \* \* This skepticism in turn has rendered Latin Americans more responsive to exaltation of the authoritarian nation-state which sacrifices freedom to forced draught economic development and social reform."

"Economically," writes this famed expert on Latin American affairs, "the (Bolivian) experiment has hardly justified itself, for despite a substantial and steady flow of aid from the United States, Bolivia is nevertheless today on the verge of bankruptcy, so that even politically its prospects are not promising."

Significantly, the Bolivian economy collapsed precisely because of the expropriation of the leading private industry. And it is precisely expropriation, though possibly in the form of silent (discouragement of effective operations) expropriation, which is in prospect elsewhere in Latin America now.

And it was the Kennedy-Eisenhower decision to solve the Bolivian situation with "a conciliatory policy which may be characterized as one of killing Marxism and Yankeeophobia with kindness," to use Professor Whitaker's words, which fostered the skepticism about the viability of the system represented by the United States in Latin America. And it is precisely this policy which is about to spread its effects to the other countries.

#### THE KEY?

For Senator HUMPHREY, who sometimes seems to be trying to usurp the role exercised by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin America, the success or failure of our Latin America program may rest with the experience in Mexico and Venezuela. But informed analysts continue to believe that Brazil is the key country. And, unfortunately, nowhere has the administration failed so badly as in the major decisions regarding Brazil.

#### WHY THE PUBLIC ATTACK ON BRAZIL?

On December 12, after almost 2 years of intervention by our Embassy in Brazilian politics in a manner that would once have led to expulsion of the Ambassador, the President of the United States chose to single

out Brazil for a public branding as a country where now "there is nothing really that the United States can do that can possibly benefit the people of Brazil." Why Brazil? Was Brazil the only country in Latin America where "inflation eats up our aid," where there is a flight of capital, where inflation diminishes the stability of the state?

Only a few days before, the Agency for International Development had been compelled secretly to order Argentina to restore to it certain of the funds (from the \$20 million balance-of-payments loan) that had been illegally and improperly used by the Argentines in willful disregard of the stipulations regarding the loan. Had the President publicized this? Instead, simultaneously the State Department had approved additional enormous concealed grants for Argentina.

Again, the flight of capital involving almost a tenth of receipts from export earnings in Argentina exceeded the flight from Brazil. Had this been regarded as a fit subject for White House propaganda?

Again, inflation in Argentina at a pace as meaningful as that of Brazil, had not been accompanied by the terrific economic growth seen in Brazil so that the decline in real wages had been much more acute. Had this been publicized?

Or, take the case of Chile. Only the day before the blast at Brazil, the President had lauded "the untiring effort of the Chilean Government to improve the life of the people of Chile." And he had personally furthered the negotiations for an immense flow of concealed donations to Chile.

How had the President reached his differentiation between Brazil and Chile? The Chilean economy was stagnating despite the fact that it had suffered no such adverse alteration in terms of trade as Brazil was struggling with. The flight of capital from Chile had been greater relatively than from Brazil and in no small part had involved a two-step maneuver involving the movement of U.S. aid money to Chile and thence to safe havens in Europe. Uncontrollable inflation had been virtually a Chilean characteristic for all the years of this century. And if there was stability politically, it remained true that informed analysts in Washington considered the prospect of a Communist-oriented regime taking office in Chile to be greater than the prospect of such a disaster in Brazil.

Again, Chilean trade with Castro had been greater than that of Brazil with Castro.

And what of the reforms that were used to justify the new inflated program of concealed donations for Chile? No one in Washington challenged the recently published view that "Chile's 10-year plan is just a book of prayers for which there is no discussion even of how the goal is to be reached \* \* \* that the tax reform program does little more than restore the efficiency of a collection system that had already existed 5 years before and might in any case never be accepted in practice \* \* \* that the agrarian reforms will not change the distribution of income and power nor increase investment and instead were more likely to benefit a very small minority at the expense of the great majority." Was it Brazil's failure to parallel this Chilean achievement that so disturbed the White House?

In Washington, reporters are given to understand that the President was speaking after a briefing by the U.S. Ambassadors and that in some mysterious way the blast at Brazil ties in with some political strategy devised by the American Embassy.

But to what end?

#### THE DEMANDS OF GOULART

A clue may have been provided in the subjects on which the younger Kennedy is alleged to have informed President Goulart that the White House wants action: a settlement on the expropriated properties and a

promise to implement with compensation a scheme for the full withdrawal of U.S. interests from the utility field, discouragement of the expansion of trade with the Communist bloc, fiscal reforms, accelerated social reforms.

In themselves, these subjects reveal the confusion and ineptitude that is dooming both this relationship with Brazil and in the course of it the whole Latin American program. Some facts are clear:

1. For at least a decade and maybe more, Brazil will have no funds whatsoever to devote to disinvestment by foreign interests. If, then, there is a position to be agreed upon, it is that in the absence of capacity to compensate promptly and effectively, what is needed now is a deferral of the aspiration for nationalization of utilities. Instead, the Embassy and the President are putting the interests of the American Foreign Power Co. ahead of the interests of the United States in relations with Brazil, in anticipation of the fact that means can be found to have the U.S. Treasury indirectly pay off American Foreign Power Co. at the expense of genuine developmental assistance.

2. Since all of the major allies of the United States are engaged in shipping to the Communist bloc goods which would be considered of strategic assistance to the Communists if an American manufacturer wanted to ship them, it is rather childish to attempt to interfere with the movement of commodities having no strategic importance from Brazil to the Communist bloc. And since it is U.S. assistance to the Communist bloc countries that enables them to divert resources into exports to Brazil, it is rather ridiculous to attempt to interfere with Brazilian trade relations.

But above all, there is a need, first, to realize that the United States cannot set one standard for Brazil and another standard for all others. Sometime, somehow it is going to be necessary either to approach the Brazilian situation with the standards used in Argentina, and Chile, and Bolivia, or to bring our treatment of these other nations to the stern test which allegedly the administration proposes to use on Brazil.

As the year 1962 ends, the United States is so deeply embroiled by choice in internal politics in Argentina, in Brazil, in Chile (and not so long ago in Peru in that memorable fiasco of diplomacy) that every investor should realize that he now must expect to be confronted not only with the traditional and deepening displays of nationalism, but also with resistance stemming from the fumbling of the U.S. Government through our embassies. It is not only what the left is doing to the climate of investment that is a cause for alarm rather than mere concern, as the year 1963 opens. It is the total confusion regarding "specific and attainable goals" in Washington that should alarm and prompt caution on the part of the investor.

#### ARGENTINE TRADE

P.S.—We recommend to our Argentine readers that they study carefully a publication titled "Foot-and-Mouth Disease in U.S. Policy," published by the Food Research Institute of Stanford University. The report was written by an extremely able researcher, E. Louise Peffer, and reaches some very important conclusions for everyone interested in Argentine-American trade.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, May 18, 1962]

#### BEFORE CASTRO, BOLIVIA

TAMPA.—Someone should tell Drew Pearson that Bolivia shows signs of distress, not progress.

It is true that on April 9 the Government and MNR Party of Bolivia celebrated the 10th anniversary of the revolution. This revolution plunged the entire country into misery and hunger, and into the hands of Commu-

nist followers, just as the Cuban revolution has done. Herein lies a lesson for those who did not believe Castro was a Communist and still think that you have to carry a card to prove it.

Bolivia illustrates this problem, and it had as many problems and handicaps. The MNR with the help of its members (among whom there are several that carry cards of the International Communist Party, including Vice President Juan Lechin), took over the Government after a bloody and long revolution.

What was their first step? You guessed it. Expatriate their opponents, and eliminate the most dangerous ones, including 200 cadets of the military academy. They established concentration camps and the infamous Gestapo-like militia.

Later, they took over the mines from the famous tin barons, and did not pay them (in the Castro manner) 1 cent of indemnity. They took over the land from the so-called land barons, who in their immense wealth owned a few acres of land, cultivated this acreage and helped to give work and food to hundreds of thousands of the exploited Indians.

The United States of America under the Eisenhower administration poured millions of taxpayers' dollars into Bolivia. Where did it all go? Not to help the miners, because in spite of the money, production stopped and they had to pay salaries without producing an ounce of tin. The money did not help to improve the agriculture, import machinery, or build schools.

In fact, it helped no one. Hunger was soon felt and the monetary currency dropped from 120 bolivianos for each dollar to 4,000 bolivianos. A pound of meat was bought before the revolution at 21 bolivianos and after 2 years of progress at 4,000 bolivianos, so where did the money, your money, go? It went to banks in Switzerland to the accounts of members of the Government like Mr. Paz-Estensoro and Juan Lechin. I knew for a fact the latter gave a party celebrating his first million dollars in the bank.

The U.S. dollars well intended no doubt, but badly managed, helped to strengthen the militia, and sent thousands of party members on trips to Europe and the United States. It gave their children cars and money to spend on parties. It helped corrupt the morals of the hungry ones. This small party and its members have been in power for 10 years now. It is the same story as in Cuba. People are hungry, prices are exorbitant, and people are being killed without protest from anyone. Just now, the latest help from the American Government went to help strengthen the militia, who in turn destroys homes and robs and kills.

How do I know these things? Because I am a Bolivian citizen, a refugee from the first Communist government in Latin America. I'm thankful now to be here enjoying the liberty that many take for granted in this wonderful land.

How does Mr. Pearson know the things he has recently written? Has he lived there year after year? Does he still have his family there like we do? Has he been informed of the wonderful progress of my poor country at a banquet given by their oppressors, or by Juan Lechin on his visit to New York? Answer please. I would like to know his erroneous source of information.

Mrs. G.S.S.

[From Hanson's Latin American Letter, Feb. 2, 1963]

#### AID SETS THE GUIDANCE FOR U.S. DONATIONS

The Agency for International Development (AID) has at long last provided Latin America with a definitive guideline for qualification for major Alliance for Progress assistance. On January 21, 1963, Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress, asserted that "one of the most encouraging elements in the forward march

of the Alliance for Progress" has been "Argentina's remarkable effort to develop her economy;" that is to say, "the dynamism of Argentina's efforts to tackle the difficult social and economic problems."

Thus, every country in Latin America is invited by AID to compare its economic achievements with those of Argentina, and to try if possible to match the record made in the Plate. Here is the Argentine achievement as outlined by reports from the American Embassy in Buenos Aires:

#### THE MODEL: ARGENTINE

1. The cost of living rose by more than 2.5 percent per month in 1962, but by the end of the year, as the momentum of the remarkable effort accelerated, the increase in cost of living rose to 3.7 percent per month; i.e., roughly 45 percent per year.

2. Unpaid bills of the Argentine Treasury have risen by 35 percent in the year 1962, the cash deficit of the Argentine Treasury is running double that of a year ago, Argentine tax revenues are falling to cover as much as two-thirds of public expenditures, the Government has consistently been in arrears on payment of salaries to public employees despite the fact that it used monkey money (the 9th-of-July bonds) to pay wages in some months. And just as importantly, as the remarkable effort continues, the deterioration in accelerating in all areas of public finance.

3. The tax reform and tax reorganization which were played up to the U.S. Congress during the 1962 hearings on foreign aid have turned out to be a hoax. On July 25, when the remarkable effort had brought Argentina to bankruptcy, Mr. Moscoso told the House Appropriations Subcommittee that "Argentina is in about the worst financial condition it has been in for some time," but that thanks to the tax reforms initiated in response to the Alliance for Progress, tax collections had risen from \$800 million in 1959 to \$1.8 billion in 1961. Now, the reforms in public finance, which were never as publicized, are in a state of open collapse.

4. No agricultural or land reforms of serious content have proven acceptable, and instead AID has now indicated that it is prepared to use U.S. dollars to buy land from the large landowners on behalf of tenant farmers, thereby providing a concealed subsidy on balance of payments, and providing ready cash for the wealthier elements of the community to accelerate their flight of capital from Argentina.

5. Both the short-term outlook for export earnings and the long-term outlook and deteriorating. With the grains and hides in trouble for 1963, the remarkable effort will find it difficult to maintain \$1.2 billion of exports, of which some 8 percent is being lost to Argentina by a flight of capital which may accelerate as the elections approach.

It must be remembered, as the British financial weekly, the Statist, correctly warns, that it is nonsense to assert that "all will be well if there is a return to democratic government," for "Argentina was well within the grip of economic crisis before the end of 1961." This letter was among the "minority of observers" who rejected the bullish talk regarding the Argentine situation in the late Frondizi period, which we pointed out at the time stemmed largely from wishful thinking by the State Department and seemingly a collapse of technical analysis by the IMF.

(6) U.S. officials have been apprised by the bulk of the petroleum community in Argentina that an orderly revision of petroleum contracts held by the newcomers to Argentina is inevitable and even desirable in the interest of long-range stability for developmental activity. But the regime has chosen instead to reject the demands for concession revision and thus intensified the ultimate political explosion which may drive all companies from the country.

(7) Most important to the objectives of the Alliance for Progress, the Argentines by their "remarkable effort" have succeeded in reducing gross national product in a single year by 4 to 8 percent, which is a tremendous single year achievement, hardly surpassed by its previous "accomplishments" in lowering gross national product. In addition, since this has been accompanied by a decline in real wages, Argentina can correctly claim to have widened the disparity between the upper income groups and the lower income groups in 1962, which again is a tremendous achievement.

#### QUID PRO QUO: BRAZIL

The sarcasm, with which we outline the "achievement" which the State Department asserts to be the model that it will reward with disproportionate assistance, and is in fact already rewarding, is not diluted by consideration of the quid pro quo about which the press has been informed. Before the Argentine Foreign Minister reached Washington, a leak was planted with the press to the effect that the State Department planned to discuss with the foreign minister ways and means of dealing with the Brazilian situation "because of his intimate knowledge of the Brazilian situation."

After the talks with the Argentine Foreign Minister, it was revealed that Argentina had agreed to reorganize some of its army units so that a brigade would be available as a troubleshooting force to rush into Latin American countries when the extreme left threatened. Virtually all readers of this letter are experienced Latin Americanists. Despite the comedy of errors to which our Latin American policy has been reduced in the past 2 years, they will be amazed now to learn (if they have not already studied the story in the Washington newspapers) that the administration feels that an Argentine army brigade could be used, for instance, in Brazil should the extreme left threaten. Nothing could more quickly drive Brazil into the Communist camp than the use by Washington of Argentine troops on Brazilian soil.

Since the Congress is known to look with disfavor on ventures of the type involved in the Argentine brigade or brigades, initial press comment suggested that the administration feels it may be able to equip the brigade without going to the Congress for money and may thus escape the scrutiny of the Congress.

#### THE BRAZILIAN SITUATION

Our comments are not intended to minimize the importance of the administration's view of the Brazilian situation. Only last week, the Chicago Daily News quoted the Senate minority leader as saying that "it would not surprise me at all if within the next 60 to 90 days we had a crisis of major proportions in Brazil." And Senator DRUKSEN has a reputation for being well briefed by the White House.

#### SHOWDOWN SOUGHT BY WHITE HOUSE IN BRAZIL

There is every evidence that the White House is pushing for a showdown in Brazil. And success for the White House is by no means assured, for the Brazilian people, like most Latin Americans, may choose their own politicians in preference to U.S. politicians, if the showdown reduces to such a choice. As this letter is written, reports are reaching the United States of the latest participation by Brazil's new political party (the American Embassy) in internal debate of local issues. This time the American Embassy has gone out of its way to blast a paper drafted by a Brazilian diplomatic official who is definitely not anti-United States as a device for entering into local debate in the harshest manner. Oddly enough, the paper had been drafted only as a contribution to repair of the image of Brazil in the United States. Have we reached the point where the White House

is opposed to efforts to restore the traditional relationship with Brazil?

It ill behooves the State Department to slap Brazil's face publicly for its failure to effect "complementary policies in the budgetary, monetary, and foreign exchange fields," at a time when it is setting up Argentina as a model to which disproportionate assistance is to be given as a reward for its success in steadily reducing its gross national product per capita, increasing the gap between the rich and the poor, displaying a collapse of public finance policies which makes the Brazilian public finances look good by comparison, increasing the rise in cost of living to a pace of 45 percent per year, taking measures in export production that reduce chances for expansion of exchange earnings.

It ill becomes the White House in an open press conference to slap down Brazil hard by saying that there is now nothing left that can be done for the Brazilian people, and a few weeks later, to say that "we are analyzing what we can most helpfully do to be of assistance to Argentina," when the Argentine economic and political collapse is if anything worse than that of Brazil.

It has become an imperative of U.S. policy that the American Ambassador to Brazil demit office now. Whatever his Embassy may have accomplished on behalf of I.T. & T. and the American Foreign Power Co., it has failed dismally in the central task of the American Embassy in Brazil.

#### INTEREST OF THE INVESTOR

Let no American investor think that he has been aided by the Embassy's pressure on Brazil to surrender in the case of I.T. & T. and the American Foreign Power Co. Every other investor in Brazil will pay through the nose for the manner in which these settlements are making Brazil the laughing stock of Washington. Barron's, the major U.S. financial weekly, did well this week to call the settlement on behalf of I.T. & T. a "sham settlement which will scarcely deceive the U.S. Congress, Members of which will know that ultimately the American taxpayer will pay the compensation, since the country is bankrupt."

The surrender of Brazil to Embassy pressure on behalf of the two companies means ultimately less developmental assistance for Brazil and it means ultimately vastly increased pressure upon every American legitimate investor remaining in Brazil.

#### FURTADO'S CALCULATIONS ON EXCHANGE EARNINGS

We are not offering you a detailed analysis this week of the Furtado plan for Brazilian development. But we do want to make one comment on a section that has apparently aroused some skepticism. Furtado believes that Brazilian exports can total \$4.3 billion in the 3 years 1963-65. And this has been immediately greeted as "unrealistic." We believe there is every reason to anticipate, having regard for coffee prospects price and volumewise over this period, as well as other leading export commodities, that Brazil can exceed and will exceed this figure substantially, unless undervaluation of exports for reasons of flight of capital is permitted to expand from its present very sizable magnitude.

Again, in the case of imports, Brazilian minimum essential requirements could be compacted even more without reaching the degree of stagnation which the IMF achieved in Argentina and Chile.

There is some weakness and unrealism in the Furtado aspirations, but the export section is not the place to pick on.

#### INVESTMENT GUARANTEES: ARGENTINA

Agency for International Development reported last week that in the fourth quarter of 1962 it issued investment guarantees for \$32.1 million of investments in Argentina.

This brings the total guarantees for investments in Argentina to \$165 million.

	(Millions of dollars)
Cabot Corp.....	10.4
Eaton Mfg. Co.....	6.4
International Packers.....	13.0
Ramsey Corp.....	0.5
Thompson Ramo Woolridge.....	1.8

In previous quarters, guarantees had been issued as follows: American Motors \$13 million; Ford Motor Co. \$69.2 million, PASA \$50 million.

#### TRACTOR BUSINESS IN ARGENTINA

Klockner-Humboldt-Deutz Agencies reports that in the year 1961-62 its associated company in Buenos Aires, Deutz-Cantabrica S.A. had a "satisfactory year." Its tractor output "rose according to plan and turnover increase from \$11 to \$17 million, and a further increase in both production and turnover have been registered during the first few months of the present year." In Brazil, its Otto Deutz S.A. has raised its production of engines on schedule and its Demisa S.A. "continued with its preparations for the production of tractors and the first units were delivered in November 1961."

Agar, Cross & Co., has reported about its ACSA Agar Cross Tractors y Maquinaria Agricola S.A. that "the deteriorating conditions in Argentina have led to a radical reduction in the immediate profit expectations of ACSA. The local manufacturer by John Deere of a medium-size tractor is expected to make up some of the lost ground later."

#### NEW FRONTIER NOTE

Dr. Jose Figueres, former President of Costa Rica and the most influential Latin American ever to advise on U.S. policy, will be a visiting professor of government at Harvard University for the fall term of 1963-64.

#### IMPORTANCE OF MILITARY

Here is a table of some interest showing relationship of military budget to gross domestic product and to gross domestic fixed capital formation: Base period is 1957-59.

	Military budget as percentage of—	
	Gross product	Fixed capital formation
Argentina.....	2.4	13.0
Brazil.....	2.8	22.4
Chile.....	2.6	25.6
Colombia.....	1.4	8.8
Mexico.....	.8	5.3
United States.....	9.8	58.3

#### HANSON'S LATIN AMERICAN LETTER, Box 181, Benjamin Franklin Station, Washington 4, D.C.

[From Time magazine]

#### THE AMERICAS: ALLIANCE IN DANGER

In conceiving of the Alliance for Progress as a bold 10-year program to develop Latin America, planners counted on massive U.S. Government aid—but also on at least \$300 million a year in direct U.S. private investment. Instead of plunging in, U.S. investors are pulling out of Latin America; in the first 9 months of 1962 brought home \$37 million more than they invested. From three sources last week came ringing indictments of the Alliance and its failure to generate any enthusiasm among businessmen.

#### PROFITS LOW, RISKS HIGH

The first indictment came from the 26-man Commerce Committee for the Alliance for Progress (COMAP) appointed by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges to make a businesslike appraisal of the program. Reported COMAP's Chairman J. Peter Grace, 49, international-minded president of W. R.

Grace & Co.: the Alliance "in its present size and form cannot succeed." Investors are frightened away by the "unfavorable business climate" in Latin America. Profits are low, risks high. The United States, continued Grace, should adopt a "carrot and stick approach," with grants and loans to encourage Latin Americans to enact laws more hospitable to private investment. The committee recommended greater tax incentives and deductions as a cushion against heavy losses. Even then, concluded Grace, "it is unlikely that normal conditions attractive to foreign capital can be created for a number of years."

In a separate opinion—later endorsed by Grace—David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and two other COMAP members argued that the incentives and grants are only "stopgap" remedies. In the long run, "encouragement of private enterprise, local and foreign, must become the main thrust of the Alliance." The United States, says the Rockefeller group, "should concentrate its economic aid program in countries that show the greatest inclination to adopt measures to improve the investment climate, and withhold aid from others until satisfactory performance has been demonstrated."

#### NO JOINT EFFORT

Still a third powerful criticism came from the Harvard study group of businessmen and intellectuals who in 1960 sounded the original call for a hemispheric "alliance of progress." The study group complained that the Alliance "is not an alliance. It has lapsed into a unilateral U.S. checkwriting program." The solution, said the group, is for Latin Americans, like Europeans during Marshall plan days, to join in a regional organization to establish priorities for spending aid money.

In 18 months the United States has committed \$1.6 billion to the Alliance. But the results so far, as COMAP's Grace says, indicate only that "we are in great danger of suffering a major defeat to our strategic interests in this hemisphere."

#### HANSON'S LATIN AMERICAN LETTER,

Washington, March 23, 1963.

DEAR SIR: This week the Senate Appropriations Committee issued a report on the Alliance for Progress prepared by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY. HUMPHREY is rapidly outdistancing Senator MORSE as the liberals' spokesman on Latin American policy, and already leads MORSE in the support of policy positions that are causing the collapse of U.S. relations with Latin America. Two points in the new report merit consideration by the business community:

#### MORE EXPROPRIATIONS

(1) HUMPHREY predicts that the trend to expropriate public utilities and firms in the extractive industries will continue, and he approves the method adopted by the State Department in the American Foreign Power Co. case, wherein the U.S. Treasury is to provide the compensation for the company by means of concealed donations to the Brazilian Government, which are deducted from amounts that would otherwise be made available to Brazil for constructive purposes.

#### ALLENDE VIEW SUPPORTED

In effect, HUMPHREY accepts the view, of Presidential Candidate Allende in Chile that "since Cuba, the United States can no longer impose its will in the matter of expropriations." Allende points out that he "does not any longer anticipate any bitter dispute over expropriation" and he promises upon election to take over the American copper companies. Compensation would be for value of non-depreciated capital and since Chile is on the dole, the funds would come from the U.S. Treasury, that is, from the U.S. taxpayer. Again, the amounts thus awarded to American companies by the U.S. Treasury would be

deducted from funds that might otherwise under the Alliance have gone to Chile for constructive purposes.

In the case of Chile, the effect of the Humphrey-Allende thesis is to make it impossible for any candidate in the election to refrain from expropriation of the American companies.

#### DEFEATS ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Two qualifications must be made immediately to the HUMPHREY thesis: First, the device is wholly improper as a subsidy by the U.S. taxpayer to selected stockholders in selected companies. And it is economically unsound and actually destructive of the objectives of the Alliance for Progress because it constitutes simply a substitution of public foreign for private foreign capital rather than meeting the deficiency in capital which is a prominent barrier to economic growth and social reform. This escapes Senator HUMPHREY completely.

#### NO FUNDS FOR COMPENSATION

The second qualification is a very practical matter: When HUMPHREY expresses his confidence that "the trend toward local ownership of utilities and extractive industries is likely to continue," he forgets the statistics of the problem. There is not now in the President's budget and there is not in the budget that the Congress is likely to approve anything like the magnitudes needed to pay off the owners of the utilities and the extractive industries in Latin America.

This accounts for the haste of some members of COMAP to demand a rise to \$2.5 billion per year for the Alliance for Progress, lest the Treasury run out of money to pay for their particular foreign investments. What is important and what is not at all debatable is that such financing in such magnitudes is not going to be available.

We have, then, the evolution of the perfect device to destroy the objectives of the Alliance for Progress as far as Latin America is concerned, and also to accelerate confiscation without compensation as far as the bulk of U.S. investors is concerned.

#### DOOMING THE ALLIANCE

For HUMPHREY, the inconsistency in advocating the objectives of the Alliance and simultaneously supporting steps that will prevent economic growth and democratically achieved social reform is not at all unique. When, for instance, there occurred the Bolivian expropriations which touched off the present era of confiscation cum approval of the U.S. Treasury, HUMPHREY rejected the accepted dictates of international law, enthused at the challenge to the owners of the tin mines, and even wondered how they had avoided even worse punishment so long for their alleged errors of judgment and policy.

Yet now, a decade later, \$250 million later in U.S. donations, with the confiscated properties a shambles, HUMPHREY does not oppose paying the owners of the Patino properties out of the U.S. Treasury and indeed he supports their desires for higher prices for minerals from their mines in other countries, even though it involves serious damage to U.S. balance of payments by preventing the orderly movement of suitable magnitudes of U.S. stockpiled minerals at a time when supply-demand conditions warrant such movement.

HUMPHREY has also failed to protest the millions of dollars committed from U.S. loan funds to service the defaulted Bolivian dollar bonds which have been the object of criticism since FDR sounded off on the Bolivian issues. He apparently considers this a proper use of taxpayers' funds perhaps on the theory that even speculators in defaulted bonds have one vote each.

#### THE FRUITS OF NATIONALIZING

The U.S. Government has reported after a year of the triangular operation to rehabilitate Comibol that the losses of the nation-

alized venture in 1962 mounted to \$11.5 million, from \$10 million in 1961. This makes a total of \$33 million in losses of the venture in 3 years, to say nothing of the enormous losses of previous years, all of which have been paid for by the U.S. taxpayer. On March 16, 1962, the House Appropriations Committee was told that a 3 year program would put Comibol onto a profitmaking basis, and would total "something like \$35 million." It was told that the first year's burden would be \$16 million. On February 28, 1963, the Embassy reported that the first year program had run \$22.8 million, that the second year would run \$20.5 million and that the total would go well over \$50 million.

The promise now is that the Comibol venture will become a profitmaker by 1964 early, but only if the United States promises to fix a price for tin, by the manipulation of its tin holdings, that will permit immense and excessive profits for all other producers of tin the world over, among whom would be the interests whom HUMPHREY once criticized and now is willing to have subsidized.

#### COMPETITION?

Meanwhile, Bolivia's Minister for Peasant Affairs, who had already denounced the U.S. purpose and execution in the Alliance for Progress, told the press in London that the U.S. aid was embarrassing to the Bolivian regime and that Bolivia and other Latin American nations were turning to Europe for aid in order to avoid too great a dependence on the United States. Nothing could please the U.S. taxpayer more than to be rid of the Bolivian burden and it is all too unfortunate that no European nation has risen to the call. (The German participation in the triangular operation merely consists of credits for exports underwritten and guaranteed by U.S. donations. In that sense, they are counter to the U.S. policy of promoting U.S. exports.)

#### THE COST OF EMOTIONAL HOSTILITY

(2) Senator HUMPHREY's second policy-finding or discovery was that "If our relationships with Brazil deteriorate to the point of emotional hostility, then whatever we seek to do in the Western Hemisphere will be endangered." It must be clear that direct intervention in the internal affairs of any Latin American country is the simplest way to create emotional hostility. Yet, in his curious inconsistency, HUMPHREY himself intervened in the Peruvian election with advice calculated to arouse hostility on the part of any independent minded Latin American. And he was curiously quiet when the State Department in an adventure of characteristic clumsiness last week staged the fiasco in Brazil:

Was this sequence calculated to prevent or to stimulate deterioration of our relations with Brazil to the point of emotional hostility?

(1) On the eve of the visit of the Brazilian Finance Minister, favored press leaks of the White House were given a briefing on the extent of Communist infiltration in the Goulart regime. Their published accounts follow closely the testimony of the American Ambassador before the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

(2) Although the State Department had full authority and opportunity to edit out or delay publication of any testimony the ambassador had given before the committee, it permitted publication during the visit of the finance minister of the charges of Communist infiltration.

(3) When even pro-U.S. newspapers in Brazil reacted by suggesting that it might be advisable not to allow Ambassador Gordon to return, the Department sought to "manage the news" by stating that the State Department and not the Ambassador had given the hostile testimony.

(4) A few hours after this attempt to manage the news failed, the Department said that the Ambassador and the Department held the same views.

(5) A day later, both the wire services and the Washington Post were attributing the statement to the Ambassador and not to the Department.

Emotional hostility? The new policy of intervention in Latin America is calculated to stimulate emotional hostility on a scale never before seen in this hemisphere. What does Senator HUMPHREY expect to happen when the Guatemalans learn that the White House is supporting Arevalo for the presidency in Guatemala? That the same Arevalo was even linked with protests by White House favorite, Figueres, and others against Peru holding an election without outside observers?

In an exclusive interview published March 17, Assistant Secretary of State Martin said that "there are Communist sympathizers in various places in the Brazilian [Government] structure, which is a matter which creates some difficulty for us."

#### BASIC ELEMENT IN BRAZILIAN NEGOTIATION

The fact which both the Brazilian press and the American press failed to cope with was that the visit of the Brazilian finance minister, in the minds of Amembassy Brazil and the State Department, has only one purpose and that is to button up the deal for American Foreign Power Co. And the price that will be paid by the United States for this perversion of American foreign policy, and the price to be paid by American firms in Brazil, is yet to unfold.

#### U.S. INVESTMENTS

Meanwhile, the State Department reported to the House Foreign Affairs Committee that in the first 9 months of 1962, American firms invested in Brazil at a pace almost 3 times as great as in the full year 1961. The pace was \$2 million a month, compared with \$0.7 million in 1961.

#### U.S. direct investments—9 months, 1960

	(Millions of dollars)
Argentina.....	77
Brazil.....	18
Colombia.....	18
Mexico.....	14
Venezuela (withdrew).....	191
Chile (withdrew).....	7
Panama (withdrew).....	21
Guatemala (withdrew).....	2

#### GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

The State Department also reported last week that Brazil's gross national product had increased by 3.5 percent in 1962 while Argentina's gross national product decreased by 6 percent. It reported that Bolivia's gross national product increased by 5 percent, but the Embassy qualified this to point out that virtually all of the increase was made up of the increase in donations from Washington.

#### HUMPHREY'S OTHER VIEWS: OIL, ETC.

We have ignored some other recommendations of Senator HUMPHREY for obvious reasons. He is, for instance, disturbed at Brazil's purchase of Middle East oil and seems to be getting close in his thinking to hemisphere preferentials which would be a step backward in the administration's effort at freer world trade. Again, he is unhappy that U.S. firms with plants in Latin America and the United States have in some cases chosen to ship from the United States rather than from Latin America. Senator HUMPHREY's interest in Latin America may ultimately turn out to be a great disaster for Latin America as well as for the United States.

#### GOULART EVALUATION

Here is an odd note in a week in which the Communist infiltration in Brazil is a

front page story across this country. The leading U.S. socialist magazine reported that the left has no confidence whatever in the Goulart regime.

HANSON'S LATIN AMERICAN LETTER,  
Box 181, Benjamin Franklin Station,  
Washington 4, D.C.

HANSON'S LATIN AMERICAN LETTER,  
Washington, March 30, 1963.

DEAR SIR: The U.S. Government reported this week that assistance to Latin America in the calendar year 1962 had been reduced by \$170 million, as compared with calendar year 1961. It reported further that at the end of the year, the annual pace was running less than \$600 million per year, as compared with \$677 million in 1962 and \$848 million in 1961. Again, whereas outright grants had constituted only 17 percent of assistance in 1961, they constituted 26 percent of assistance in 1962. It should immediately be noted also that a large proportion of the so-called credit assistance is merely in the form of concealed grants so that the proportion of donations is actually larger than these figures indicate.

#### U.S. relations with Latin America

(In millions of dollars)

	1961	1962
Net Government credit aid including concealed grants.....	701	501
Outright donations.....	147	176
Capital outflow to private direct investments.....	141	-18
Earnings remitted by direct investors.....	711	756

In addition to the reduction in assistance obtained from the U.S. Government, Latin America suffered a deterioration of \$159 million in the matter of direct investments. For the calendar year 1962, U.S. companies reduced their investment by withdrawing \$18 million net, whereas in 1961 they had increased their investments by sending down another \$141 million.

At the same time, earnings remitted from Latin America were increasing substantially from \$711 to \$756 million. (In 1960, \$641 million was remitted.)

All assistance data cited here refer to assistance actually rendered rather than to commitments entered into.

#### THE BRAZILIAN DEAL: BLACKMAIL

Some weeks ago, the Director of Studies of the Royal Institute of International Affairs warned that unless the West "is prepared to accept the risk of accident, namely, that some country may go Communist, the donor countries will be chronically vulnerable to blackmail from the least competent and most oppressive governments of the underdeveloped world." With official evidence published of Communist infiltration in Brazil, there was no effort in Washington this week to conceal the fact that the plan of financial aid represents precisely such a response to demands for blackmail. As an associate of the White House wrote: "The policy decision to negotiate the substantial loan (sic) is based largely upon the fact (sic) that no political alternative to President Goulart exists presently on the scene." The idea that there is an absence of a political alternative would be challenged vigorously by the pro-West political forces in Brazil who oppose Goulart.

#### THE BRAZILIAN DEAL: THE CRUZEIRO

You will recall that in May 1961, when the administration was seeking to maximize the propaganda values of the so-called billion dollar bailout for Brazil, we pointed out that the facts did not jibe too well with the propaganda, and that reservations regarding the deal were very much in order, on the part of the business community. At the present time, a more precise appraisal

of the new Brazilian deal is very much in order. What actually did Brazil get in the sense of impact on the deteriorating situation? After all, the \$70 million in Public Law 480 is merely a continuation of policies existing even as the deterioration was making itself felt, so there is nothing new in that:

(1) Brazil got \$84 million, part of it from a previous commitment to Brazil, and part of it replacing in effect an earlier \$30 million commitment made to button up the I.T. & T. compensation arrangement.

But a large part of this \$84 million is in fact mortgaged by the Brazilian commitment to provide the windfall for stockholders of American Foreign Power Co. which is extremely disadvantageous for Brazil and wholly out of order at a time like this. In other words, on the part of the United States, a large part of the assistance is in effect assistance to a particular group of U.S. stockholders which is a wholly improper use of foreign aid funds. And on the part of Brazil, the effect of the assistance is in large part nullified by the new mortgage on Brazilian legitimately earned exchange accepted thus by the Brazilian negotiators.

(2) The heart of the arrangement, then, rests with the \$200 million in concealed donations from the Agency for International Development. But immediately note well that this part of the program depends on the wishes of the Congress and will depend on fresh appropriations from the Congress. And the Congress in the foreign aid bill may well introduce stipulations limiting the flow of such funds to Brazil.

For, politically, the Congress generally considers the Goulart regime to be untrustworthy and infiltrated with Communists at very high policymaking levels. Against this position, with which the executive branch actually agrees in private, the executive branch has argued that the very weapon poised over Goulart's head of the bribe if he acts as the American Ambassador dictates will cause Goulart to shake off his Communist advisers. At this stage it remains uncertain that Goulart wants to shake them off, and if he should want to, whether he can.

But this is not simply a matter of political speculation. The economic measures contemplated by the new program envisage a substantial economic slowdown in Brazil, a sloughing off to economic and business activity such as took place in Argentina and has quite demoralized Argentina. Should this happen in Brazil, public opinion would undoubtedly attribute it to the dictates of the American Embassy and act very unsympathetically toward the political aspirations of the arrangement. Perhaps Goulart's leftist advisers count on this.

Economically, the \$200 million in concealed donations constitutes a new era in bailouts. Formerly, bailouts and balance-of-payments assistance were largely conceived on a commercial basis, i.e. as temporary assistance to tide over to corrections in the balance of payments and as such rendered in the form of repayable loans on commercial terms. This time there is the extended grace period, the lack of interest (the arrangement will cost the U.S. Treasury some \$250 million in interest payments on the money it borrows to hand Brazil), and the 40-year term.

But this does not exhaust the analysis of the concealed donations of \$200 million. U.S. officials readily concede that the \$200 million will serve to bail out European creditors of Brazil and thus actually worsen the competitive position of U.S. exporters in the Brazilian market. Secondly, a large portion will be absorbed by oil company arrearages, in a form of retroactive insurance, without cost to the companies, which has never been formally approved by the Congress as an appropriate use of foreign aid.

You will recall that in 1961 the Treasury tried to soften the impact of the gigantic gouge on the U.S. Treasury by referring to expectations that \$150 million of assistance would accompany the deal from Europe and Japan. This never materialized, and the Finance Minister revealed that only \$23 million had been obtained from Europe, and even that on hard commercial terms. The Brazilian hope is that the \$200 million in concealed donations from AID will underwrite the European credits and that thus there will be forthcoming from Europe and Japan \$23 million in repayable credits at commercial interest rates in addition to the \$77 million previously withheld. That is, that the Europeans will accept export business when it is underwritten and in effect financed by U.S. donations.

Again, the reaction of the Congress to this arrangement, economically, may well be as hostile as it is to the arrangement on political grounds.

#### THE SETTING OF THE BRAZILIAN DEAL

Meanwhile, it would be well for every business firm to remember the setting of the present arrangement in the historic words of the Finance Minister which have been published in so many major U.S. newspapers this week. "Foreign aid should be considered as a means of indemnity for the damages caused by the exploitive process." The "exploitive" being a reference to the activities of foreign capital.

In a sense that is a more meaningful indicator of the setting of the U.S. relationship with Brazil currently than the whistling which one finds in the report to stockholders of Caterpillar Tractor Co.: "Business in Brazil continues to be fraught with the risks usually associated with rapid inflation in wages and prices, very substantial deficits in the national budget, unfavorable terms of trade, deficits on balance of payments, and general political instability. Caterpillar Brazil however has demonstrated that it is possible to conduct a business with a reasonable measure of success under these conditions. It has been able to protect itself so far against major loss as a result of foreign exchange devaluation, and to employ retained cruzeiro earnings for worthwhile expansion of the business. For this reason and with continuing faith that Brazil could become a very substantial market for its products, Caterpillar is undertaking further investment in and identification with that country."

#### MAXWELL HOUSE DRAWS FIRST BLOOD FROM COFFEE AGREEMENT

On March 20, Maxwell House announced increases in the price of coffee, effective March 22. It said that "the steady rise of green coffee prices over the last 5 months" made the increases necessary. The cost to the consumer of the price changes led by Maxwell House is put at \$60 to \$100 million per year. Inventory profits for the industry are put at \$16 to \$20 million.

Immediately, agencies of the U.S. Government noted that the allegations of green coffee price increases necessitating the price rise do not appear to be well founded. And they released official indexes of the movement of coffee prices as follows:

#### Indexes of prices

	Wholesale price, Colombian coffee	Wholesale price, Brazilian coffee	Retail price in United States
February 1963.....	73.1	70.4	77.1
January 1963.....	74.0	71.0	77.2
December 1962.....	74.0	71.0	77.1
July 1962.....	74.0	72.6	79.2
January 1962.....	79.1	72.0	79.3

And the Department of Commerce reported that the trend of coffee import prices from

September through January 1963 (latest data available) has been downward. This was true for total coffee imports, as well as for Colombian and Brazilian imports.

It must be clear that the timing of the price rise on the eve of effective date for the International Coffee Agreement is suggestive in the extreme. If the path or procedure for price increases by the coffee countries under the price fixing mechanism to be run by the U.S. representative is thus being established, it is time that the Congress demanded an official investigation, regardless of the status of the International Coffee Agreement. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee failed dismally to hold proper and appropriate hearings on the coffee agreement, and if there is to be any protection for the consumer at all, and for the U.S. balance of payments, some agency of the Government must be brought in to hold hearings on the fixing of coffee prices in this country.

It will be recalled that during the hearings on the coffee agreement, with no doubts by anyone connected with the committee that prices were going to be raised, the National Coffee Association piously testified that "the responsibilities of our members as U.S. citizens transcend their personal interests. We are willing to make sacrifices." The first "sacrifice" contemplated was perhaps acceptance of the \$60 million in inventory profits which is envisaged by the position taken by leading Latin American advisers to the administration as to the level at which coffee prices should be fixed.

The chairman of General Foods Corp. (Maxwell House) on March 27 said that he saw "signs of broader public understanding of the economic facts of life." It is time that public understanding made itself felt in the matter of coffee prices. It would appear as it did during the rape of the consumer in the two previous great upward movements of prices in the past 15 years that the coffee industry still relies on the inability of the consumer to make his voice heard.

#### HANSON'S LATIN AMERICAN LETTER,

Washington, D.C.

P.S.—Communist propagandists have found very useful for their purposes in Latin America a press release put out by the World Coffee Information Center alleging that the Central American countries suffered losses of \$593 million since 1957 because of the drop in coffee prices. This thesis of losses has, of course, been totally rejected both by analysts of the U.S. Government, by the U.S. Ambassador to Brazil in a major address, and by one of the most prominent Latin American economists with an international reputation. It might be well for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to examine into the fountains of propaganda in the course of its current investigation of foreign agents and foreign propaganda in this country. The World Coffee Information Center is the information branch of the International Coffee Agreement.

P.S.—Here is Senator HUMPHREY'S evaluation of the State Department's handling of the testimony on Communist infiltration in Brazil: "rather amateurish, unprecedented and unwarranted handling of very difficult and sensitive relationships between our country and Brazil."

#### BRAZIL—THE TOTTERING KEYSTONE

WASHINGTON, February 25, 1963.—"If the Alliance for Progress goes into operation fully, if reforms, social, economic, and political, are put into effect, then communism and Castroism will collapse in South America. However, if effort is not made and reforms are not forthcoming, we will have problems in South America even if there is no Cuba or Castro" (Robert Kennedy, interview in U.S. News & World Report, Jan. 28, 1963).

The above quotation from the Attorney General typifies the broad feeling within the U.S. Government that communism in Latin America is exclusively a product of economic and social discontent. According to this view, communism can be tolerated in Cuba because it is irrelevant to the final outcome of the Communist challenge in the Western Hemisphere. All will depend, in this view, on the success or failure of the Alliance for Progress.

Others feel, however, that the political warfare being waged by the Communists is far more important than social and economic discontent. For example, a little known drama is taking place which could, in a matter of months, render the entire Alliance for Progress irrelevant. This is the developing struggle for power in Brazil. If the pro-Communist and leftist forces should win, the largest and most powerful state in Latin America might soon be lost to the free world. With this keystone gone, nothing could prevent the loss of the entire continent. The issue may hinge on the political attitude of the United States toward the contending factions.

The Brazilian situation became critical after President Quadros resigned in August 1961. A civil war was nearly fought in Brazil after a number of military leaders attempted to prevent Vice President Goulart from taking power on his return from a visit to Communist China. While regarded in some circles as a mere opportunist, Goulart was and is deeply suspected by many others as a doctrinaire leftist who is opening the way toward a Communist takeover of Brazil.

The facts lean heavily toward this evaluation. The 1961 crisis was solved by a compromise which limited the presidential powers in favor of a "parliamentary" form of government. Economic and political chaos followed as Goulart set out to reacquire full power by proving the parliamentary system unworkable. He surrounded himself with pro-Communist or "neutralist" advisers, restored amicable relations with the Soviet Union, maintained friendly relations with Cuba (Brazil abstained on the Punta del Este resolution which barely got the two-thirds vote necessary to expel Cuba from the Organization of American States), and began to build his support within the all-important armed forces.

Last September the struggle between Goulart and the conservative-oriented Brazilian Congress came to a head over the question of a plebiscite to restore the full power of the President. Communist-infiltrated labor unions staged pro-Goulart strikes and riots. Pro-Goulart military commanders threatened a coup. Congress gave in and agreed to the plebiscite, which was held on January 6, 1963. The issue was not Goulart as such, but the form of government. With inflation mounting and matters generally going from bad to worse, Goulart shrewdly worded the question as "yes" or "no" to the existing parliamentary system. Brazilians voted 5 to 1 against it, and the new Brazilian Congress must now restore the full presidential system. Goulart has thus thrown off the shackles placed on him in 1961.

No one can know Goulart's innermost motivation. He says he has no intention of permitting a Communist Brazil, but the moderates who hoped he would rid himself of the Communists surrounding him and reverse the leftist trend have been disappointed. Goulart is moving to consolidate his power, crush his opposition, and make himself a dictator—already the Brazilian free press is virtually destroyed. There is still a chance that he can be blocked or overthrown before his victory is complete, but it will probably require unconstitutional means. The U.S. attitude could be critical to the success or failure of such an effort.

The lineup of forces now looks like this: Ranged on Goulart's side are many of the

labor unions (two out of five of the labor confederations are controlled by Communists); the National Union of Students; Castro admirer Francisco Juliao, leader of the "peasant leagues" of impoverished north-eastern Brazil (it has been announced that he will visit Cuba at Castro's invitation); some anti-U.S. Army officers; and of course Goulart's brother-in-law, Leonel Brizola, Governor of the State of Rio Grande Do Sul. It was Brizola who confiscated the southern Brazilian subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph in February 1962. He traces all of Brazil's problems to "the occupation of our nation by the United States," and recently booted a U.S. Peace Corps group out of his state.

Against Goulart are most of the senior military officers, much of the business community, the National Democratic Union (UDN) political party, and the middle classes which have been suffering so heavily under the runaway inflation. Also strongly anti-Goulart, and high on the Communist target list, is Carlos Lacerda, staunchly anti-Communist Governor of Guanabara State (which includes Rio de Janeiro). Early last year he warned Brazilians of the rise to power to Communists among Goulart's advisers. More recently, he declared on television that "It seems that the plan of the men in power is to hand Brazil over to Soviet Russia, with U.S. money, thus betraying the trust of the people who voted in the farcical January 6 plebiscite."

How much truth is there in this charge? There is ample reason, certainly to fear the rise of communism under a Goulart dictatorship even if he is not personally another Fidel Castro. If the Communists fail to take over the country from the top, there is always the chance that they will do so by revolution from below if there is not a strong anti-Communist leadership to oppose them. Brazil is a primary object of Cuba-originated subversion. Paneloads of Brazilians are taken to Havana on all-expense trips. Brazilian students are offered free scholarships provided they also take guerrilla-warfare training at Cuban universities.

Last November Cuban Raul Cepero Bonilla was killed in an air crash in Peru. Documents were found in his briefcase which were turned over to Brazil and never made public. The documents consisted of a report to his superior by a Cuban agent on the status of various guerrilla training camps in six Brazilian States, particularly in Goias. These camps were financed by Cuban money and were under overall Cuban military direction. To be sure, many problems were being encountered in organization and personnel. One problem concerned the fact that the location and purpose of the training camps was becoming obvious to too many people, including the police. But the police were doing little or nothing to crack down on the revolutionaries.

Such apathy by the Government bodes ill for the future. The Brazilian Communist Party itself is small, with an estimated 50,000 members, but its power is widespread. One of the two labor federations controlled by the party is that of the industrial workers with 5 million members. In the city of Rio alone, the Communists now control the metalworkers, bank clerks, tailors, textile workers, stevedores, teamsters and electrical workers. Party leaders in Sao Paulo were elected last October when all five politicians who had official Communist Party support were elected to office.

Under Goulart's policies of improved economic and political relations with the Soviet bloc (trade is to be increased substantially to lessen economic dependence on the United States), and the general tide of anti-American statements by demagogic politicians (and even some businessmen), the climate for communism is steadily improving. And now it appears that Goulart will get his money

from the United States. Prodded by a quick trip of Robert Kennedy to Brazil last December—which reportedly produced a stormy interview—Goulart agreed to a tentative compensation plan for I.T. & T. and announced an austerity program to put Brazil's financial house in order. The United States promptly granted a short-term credit of \$30 million. More will undoubtedly follow.

But, if the political situation is not changed, we may be pouring money into a future Communist state. Such a change could come soon by means of a military coup against Goulart. A good indication of the attitude in the military showed up recently when Governor Brizola and several other prominent leftists were awarded the naval merit medal. In the following weeks, 33 admirals and other officers turned back to the government their own merit medals.

Matters are building to a climax in which the U.S. attitude may be crucial. If they are to act at all, senior military leaders will have to act quickly, and they will probably need at least the tacit approval of the United States.

Goulart's plan is evidently to ease out officers opposed to him and replace them with his own men. In July 1963 many generals are due for retirement and the way will be open for the promotion of pro-Goulart colonels to general rank. A key indicator to Goulart's strategy may be the appointment of the leftist first army commander Gen. Osvaldo Alves, as Minister of War. This would alienate almost the entire general officer corps as well as the moderate and center political forces. If the appointment is made, it will be because Goulart feels strong enough to neutralize his military opposition.

This time, the U.S. Government is at least genuinely concerned with the developing situation in Brazil. The question is what to do. Do we steadfastly uphold "democratic" procedures which may be paving the way toward a very undemocratic accession to power of communism in Brazil—which will seal the doom of all Latin America; or do we encourage the only elements which may yet be able to stop the dangerous drift toward disaster? It is an old choice with which we seem congenitally unable to cope. In a world in which no government is perfect, we all too often sacrifice the substance of democracy in order to preserve or promote its form. In the end, both may be lost.

FRANK J. JOHNSON,  
Editor.

#### SLIDE RULE FAILURE IN BRAZIL

(By Keith Botsford)

RIO DE JANEIRO.—After an eventful week in Brazilian-American relations—during which the President was believed to have ordered the recall of his Finance Minister and the suspension of negotiations with the United States; the Nationalist bloc in Congress was hunting for Ambassador Lincoln Gordon's head, or at least his credentials; and the Salguero sambistas held a silent parade of protest—all is now sweetness and light. The State Department, most sensibly, has assuaged Brazilian pride; the Washington Post has come out for Brazil; and Joao Goulart is trying to muzzle his brother-in-law, Leonel Brizola.

This typical profile of a Brazilian crisis—gloom and optimism, confusion, doubt and euphoria—began in a U.S. House subcommittee, where testimony had been taken to the effect that Communists had infiltrated Brazilian society and even branches of its Government. Now it is not exactly news that Brazilian Communists, thanks to the apathy and division of their opponents, are able to control the student movement or many of the unions with a tiny minority of activists. Nor is it surprising to learn that the armed forces of Brazil have been undergoing a process of renovation along Goulart-Labor Party-Nationalist lines. After

all, the President's power has been challenged ever since he took office; he has always needed to find support. Likewise, no one denies that there are several Communists or useful fools in Goulart's immediate entourage. His press secretary, Raul Ryff, who was probably responsible for the fictitious breaking off of the talks in Washington, is an avowed and active Communist.

This is but a small part of the trouble, however. A proper panorama of the Brazilian situation cannot leave out dissension within the armed forces over promotions and pay; the navy's smuggling past Federal Customs planes with which to fit out its phantom aircraft carrier; and a crime wave in Rio which revealed that there are twice as many convicted criminals walking the streets as there are in the prisons. A continuing inflation, a sag in productivity and an enormous accumulated debt indicate that twice as much money is needed as is in the bank. To the public this means restricted credit, prices out of reach and development at a standstill: or, to make it clearer, no new car or TV, less food, and dipping into savings.

Until very recently, the Brazilian Government solved its economic problems by printing new money. Now the tendency is to plans. There is to be an anti-inflationary plan and a 3-year plan; Government expenses are to be cut nearly in half. Whether this resolves the problem is a matter of conjecture. Federal outlay in some fields, particularly education, is disastrously low; the great bulk of the deficit is due to an inflated bureaucracy. Recently I was privileged to observe that it took 21 employees 2½ hours to clear a package through customs. This labor netted 65 cents for the Federal Government, in itself an unusual amount, since the more general practice is to pay one of the employees and pay the Government nothing.

A thread runs through these apparently disparate reflections: the shapelessness of Brazilian society. It is simply impossible to judge this country according to European or North American standards. Everything here works by tangents and approximations. Subcommittees of the U.S. House of Representatives, with their slide rules and multiplication tables ( $x$  number of Communists equals subversion), are far out of the picture.

In defending its interests, the first thing the United States ought to know is who its real enemies are. The Communists in Brazil are few and infinitely less dangerous in the long run than the kind of wordy opportunists who have, in fact, taken up strong positions in the present administration. Professional Communists can be left to the Brazilians. But who is going to cover the great Brazilian blindspot, the incompetent get-ahead intellectual masquerading as a patriot?

If the subcommittee had had a potted biography of each so-called Communist, it would probably have approved of the type: corporation lawyers, journalists, professors, industrialists, and, in the northeast, overseers for the great fazendeiros. These men are radicals, nationalists, or what-have-you simply because they believe this will give them position, power, prestige, and money. Meanwhile, the center is firmly occupied by ripe old senatorial types with long locks and fine speeches—the traditional parties and the traditional elites.

Where is a young man to go? Latin American intellectuals are more prone than most to take the path of least resistance. If a few speeches, a badly written pamphlet, and a couple of heroic attitudes will obtain a department or a ministry or a reputation at the least, why waste time on honest work? The facility with which the young rise in Latin America is a symbol of intellectual corruption.

It has, for instance, cost Francisco San Tiago Dantas, the present Minister of Fi-

nance, no inner debate to alter his political position from that of the "brain" of the integralist dictatorship of Getulio Vargas to that of the theoretician of a sovereign Brazil: The two are not really so very different. But, at the same time, it bothers him little to follow a nationalist line when it suits him and yet continue his legal practice for the North American corporations his colleagues denounce.

Similarly, whenever Jango Goulart has met too much resistance to his tactics, when he has understood that he has gone too far, he has simply backtracked temporarily and reassured the country, which really profoundly dislikes radicalism of any kind. No assurance, however, is provided that after Brazil has been lulled, the cycle will not begin again.

On the other hand, no country today can demand of another unswerving support of its own foreign policy. Brazil, like Ghana or Burma, wants a policy of its own; indeed, often the policy's only justification is its independence. Nevertheless, it is time the United States recognized that Brazilian society is based on democratic principles. When North American demands do not violate or threaten Brazil's economy, its social structure or its longstanding political commitments (whatever the United States may think of these), the two countries will generally be in agreement. In the cold war, this agreement is a matter of where the United States lays its emphases, and how much it insists on areas of disagreement.

If Brazilian loyalty to the free world rests on taking up a firm position on the Cuban question, the United States is only providing ammunition for the nationalists, who see the U.S. challenge to Cuba not in terms of freedom and justice, but as a desire on the part of Washington to reaffirm its control over the island. In North American insistence on the "menace" of Cuba, they see only an irrational obsession with communism. As the United States has never stated what alternatives it backs, what people, what platforms, or what it will do about Cuban land reform, the expropriated companies, or the emigration, Brazilians, like Mexicans and many other Latin Americans, presume the worst. And the worst has a tangible form—the status quo ante represented by the redoubts of Miami.

Finally, U.S. insistence on internal "reform" verges on the impossible. The Brazilian Government constantly promises reforms—they now go by the name of "basic" reforms, in keeping with the new jargon—but the idea of reform remains more important than the practice. Reforms in Brazil are power plays, like everything else. They call forth predictable reactions from some sections of the voting public, which is what they are for.

Change and reform are by their nature slow processes. The one way to make sure they will not work is to put them in abstract, generalized terms and to prefer the vast, global plan to any kind of modest beginning. Words are the escape valve of progress. On this score, it is hard to see how the United States, which from the beginning has conceived of the Alliance for Progress in the vastest possible terms, and as a great "slogan" to prove its interest in Latin America, can criticize Brazil when it, too, thinks in terms of "bigness" and reforms that remain words. Nor is it easy to be told to put one's house in order when one of the advisers of the Alliance is Juscelino Kubitschek, who by ambition and greed, started the whole inflationary spiral in Brazil.

Failing the example of small successes that the "people" can see and benefit from, and put pressure on the Government to emulate, the result is likely to be big failures. Instead of trying to "solve" the problem of the Northeast, which may well be insoluble, why not make tangible progress—which is quite

possible—on other problems, equally or more desperate? In many parts of Brazil, small, almost insignificant projects have gained public support and materially benefited the "people." Each of these is a resounding blow against the mainstream of empty talk that flows about the Brazilian "left"; and each is a proof that the United States need not preach "revolution."

"Revolution" is not a very safe word if you cannot provide the goods, and modesty in demands and plans—things that can be achieved—is always preferable to ambitious dreams that fall. Starting from this axiom, it should not be hard to see how Brazil can be linked to its sister-democracy, the United States. It cannot be done by ramming a Cuban position down its throat or by conjuring up menaces that do not exist and by-passing the very real dangers that abound.

#### MISCELLANEOUS STATEMENTS

On February 2, 1963, the chairman of the Commerce Department's Committee for the Alliance for Progress, J. Peter Grace, stated: "The program, in its present size and form, cannot succeed and we are in great danger of suffering a major defeat to our strategic interests in this hemisphere.

"The amount of aid which it proposed to provide is grossly inadequate and the manner in which the aid is to be made available, mainly on a Government to Government basis, raises extreme doubt as to the effectiveness of any amount of aid in attaining our objective."

In a news conference on March 18, 1963, in Mexico City, former Brazilian President Juscelino Kubitschek held that he found throughout the continent of Latin America "an absolute lack of faith in the Alliance and its results among the popular classes."

Labor leaders from 11 Latin American countries meeting in Mexico City for their third annual meeting sponsored by the Inter-American Regional Labor Organization, asserted that workers are not getting the benefits they expected from the Alliance for Progress program.

Delegates from Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Uruguay, El Salvador, Panama, Paraguay, and Honduras issued a statement saying, "the working class has been completely disregarded in the plans of the Alliance."

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 10 1963]

#### ALLIANCE IS RAPPED

NEW ORLEANS, April 10.—Top news executives of Latin America and the United States wind up a 3-day clinic today at the second annual Pan American press seminar.

A Chilean newspaper executive said yesterday the Alliance for Progress is dying in Latin America.

Raul Silva Castro, editor of *El Mercurio* in Santiago, questioned the fact that under the Alliance "underdeveloped countries must raise taxes to the same level as that in the United States" and predicted the Alliance will fall of its own weight.

Earlier, Senor Silva Castro had objected to a Bolivian editor's remarks about the free trade zone in South America.

Hugo Gonzalez Rloja, editor of *La Nacion* in La Paz, Bolivia, blamed the lack of television in his country on the fact "we are not allowed to participate in the free trade zone of South America." He added that Bolivia is underdeveloped and will remain so until it is allowed to participate in the free trade zone.

Senor Silva Castro jumped to his feet, pounded the table, and shouted, "No, no. It's a lie."

Joseph L. Jones, vice president and general foreign manager of United Press International, said the primary reason for the Alliance for Progress not developing to fullest

expectations was that Latin American private investors are not investing as they should.

Vicente Machado Valle, of El Dia in Tegucigalpa, Honduras, praised the Peace Corps for reaching the rural people, but he said for many the Alliance for Progress was only "the change of the tax system."

[From the New York Journal-American, Oct. 6, 1962]

#### ALLIANCE CHIEF EGGED

BOGOTÁ, COLOMBIA, October 6.—Teodoro Moscoso, Alliance for Progress coordinator, and his party were hit by eggs hurled by six youths yesterday at a housing project being built with Alliance funds.

Shouting anti-American slogans, the youths let fly with eggs and rocks when the party emerged from inspecting a house in a Bogotá suburb. One egg hit Mr. Moscoso on the back of the head.

Five of the youths fled, but residents caught the sixth and beat him before police arrived.

#### POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, to liberty-loving and independent Poles their Constitution of 1791 is almost as important as their political independence. They have always attached extraordinary significance to this historic document because they felt, and still feel, that by the implementation of its liberal, sweeping provisions they were to be freed from the shackles and obstructive intricacies of their old, unwieldy, and inefficient regime. With that worthy goal in mind their leaders framed, adopted, and promulgated that Constitution, which by its democratic and progressive provisions was considered a moderate and model charter for the Poles.

The Constitution drastically limited the powers of the King and made Poland a constitutional monarchy. Responsible cabinet form of government was established; the old system of class distinctions was eliminated. The upper legislative chamber lost some of its powers, and the second chamber was vested with genuine legislative authority. Economic barriers existing between the nobility and the bourgeoisie were practically obliterated, and the peasantry was taken under the protection of the law. In many ways the Constitution abolished the worst abuses from which Poland had been suffering for centuries. Its promulgation was hailed not only by the Poles, but it was also acclaimed by liberals in other countries.

Unfortunately, the Poles were not given the chance to test the efficacy of this Constitution. Soon after its promulgation the country was overrun by its inveterate enemies; it was partitioned, and Poland's independence was no more. But the spirit of the Constitution of 1791 lived in the hearts of the Polish people, and today they celebrate the 172d anniversary of the Constitution's adoption and promulgation. I am indeed glad to join them in the anniversary of this truly epochmaking event.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, for almost 200 years American and Polish patriots have experienced a common bond in their love of freedom.

The spirit of comradeship was first initiated through the contributions to American independence by the 18th cen-

tury Polish patriot, Count Casimir Pulaski. It was strengthened when, on May 3, 1791, Poland adopted its national Constitution only 2 years after the ratification of the U.S. Constitution. That the same spirit animates both of these great documents of liberty is evidenced by the following statement from the Polish Constitution:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

One hundred years ago, Mr. President, when our own Nation was engaged in a dreadful contest of survival for the Union, Polish patriots staged their greatest and bloodiest uprising against Russian tyranny. As in other uprisings against foreign domination—German or Russian—the gallant Polish struggle was finally overwhelmed by superior forces. But as in the other insurgent efforts also, the spirit of Polish liberty remained unquelled.

Therefore, my colleagues, this day of May 3 has significance not only for those of Polish origin, it is an anniversary which provides another monument for all men in their quest for freedom and liberty of the human spirit.

#### WILLIAM R. McANDREW WINS VFW AWARD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, just a few weeks ago the Veterans of Foreign Wars held their annual dinner in Washington honoring Members of Congress who served in the Armed Forces. It was my privilege to serve in the Armed Forces in World War II and now to be an active member of the VFW. Like so many Members of the Congress, I was once again deeply impressed by the entire program. Certainly, it is a fact that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has become one of the most influential and important veterans organizations in our country, and for that reason, I was especially impressed by the award which the VFW presented to Mr. William R. McAndrew, executive vice president in charge of news for the National Broadcasting Co. At this time I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record the introduction and citation of Mr. McAndrew by VFW Commander in Chief Byron B. Gentry, and Mr. McAndrew's acceptance remarks.

There being no objection, the introduction and citation were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### INTRODUCTION FOR WILLIAM R. McANDREW, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NBC NEWS

Many of you may remember that at this congressional dinner 1 year ago our organization paid tribute to Mr. Robert Kintner, president of the National Broadcasting Co. At that time Mr. Kintner informed us that his organization was working on a series of programs to be called "Profile of Communism." As in all organizations, the boss makes the announcements but it is left to others to carry out the assignments. Tonight we honor the man who carried out Mr. Kintner's assignment to produce an interdepartment study of communism. How well he performed his task can be attested to by the fact that after the second of the

"Profile of Communism" programs, the National Broadcasting Co. was asked to close its Moscow bureau and leave Russia. In other words, they hit the Russians where it hurts—with the truth. Our honored guest was also responsible for the remarkable program, "The Tunnel," which told with film the dramatic story of the people of East Berlin escaping to the West.

Mr. McAndrew has played a role at all levels of the continuing revolution in communications—as a Washington correspondent, as editor, bureau chief, and for the past 10 years as operating head of NBC News, which is widely regarded as the leading broadcast news operation.

Under Mr. McAndrew's guidance, NBC News has undergone a continuing expansion of staff and facilities that started 5 years ago. Its roster of correspondents and cameramen has grown from 400 to 700 and new foreign bureaus have been opened in Hong Kong, Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro, New Delhi, Leopoldville and Ottawa.

During this same period, NBC News programming has been expanded until today it accounts for 25 percent of the entire NBC-TV network schedule and amounts to some 100 hours a month. In a single year, from 1960 to 1961, the number of hours of nighttime news programming increased by 22 percent.

In spite of a heavy administrative schedule, working on budgetary, personnel and programing matters, Mr. McAndrew keeps a close, hour-by-hour watch on news developments around the world. For major news events, such as a national convention, election or manned space launching, he frequently supervises the coverage from inside the control room itself.

As private citizens all of us should feel extremely grateful that we have a man such as William R. McAndrew heading up one of the world's largest news networks. The programing of the National Broadcasting Co. leave no doubt in the mind of anyone about which side of the fence they are standing on. These are people whom we are proud to call fellow Americans.

The citation reads as follows:

"In recognition of his outstanding accomplishments in the field of news and informational programs for the National Broadcasting Co. and as exemplified by such series as 'Profile of Communism' and the special program, 'The Tunnel.'"

#### ACCEPTANCE BY MR. McANDREW

Thank you for your warm and courteous welcome. It recalls a story that is told of the presidential campaign of 1928. Al Smith was making a paid political broadcast one night in Boston and was apparently all too conscious of the cost of the air time. As he began his remarks he held up a hand and told the studio audience:

"Save your applause until the end of the speech. It doesn't cost anything then."

In accepting this award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I want to express my personal appreciation and that of all of the NBC news staff, including those who spent several agonizing months under the wet earth of Berlin to film "The Tunnel," and those who also, in a sense, went underground to research the subterranean maneuvers recorded in the four programs of "Profile of Communism." You may recall some of the repercussions touched off by these programs: the protests from Berlin that preceded the showing of "The Tunnel" and the closing of our bureau in Moscow which followed the programs on Stalin and Khrushchev.

You may have noted some of our other overseas skirmishes during the past year or so—skirmishes, incidentally, which have prompted some at NBC News to consider founding our own "veterans of foreign news wars."

Its membership would include, of course, Piers Anderton and Gary Stindt, who headed

our coverage in the tunnel, as well as Russ Jones and Frank Bourgholtzer who were expelled from Moscow.

I would also propose the names of Grant Wolfkill, who was captured by the Communists in Laos and held prisoner for 15 months; James Robinson, who was refused renewal of credentials in Vietnam; John Rich, temporarily labeled "persona non grata" in France; Welles Hangen, threatened with expulsion from Pakistan, and Richard Valeriani, John Hlavacek, and Robert MacNeil, each of whom was imprisoned by Castro and finally expelled from Cuba.

These incidents have caused some of our people to suggest that we may be running out of friendly countries. What will happen, they ask, if our president, Bob Kintner, sets out on his annual tour of our foreign news bureaus and finds that he can cover them all in 3 days?

Others at NBC have expressed concern over David Brinkley's plans for a program to be titled "Our Man in Washington." Brinkley will cover, in his own special way, the political and social life of the Nation's Capital. However, I am not suggesting that in the wake of this program NBC News will be doing business from Silver Springs, Md.

My outlook is more optimistic. I suspect we will continue to have our problems with any who would manage the news, whether abroad or here at home. But I am convinced that it would take an extraordinary amount of attempted news managing to stop, or even slow down, the expanding coverage of broadcast news.

At NBC News, for example, we doubled our staff within a period of 5 years—from 400 full- and part-time news gatherers to a total of 800 in all parts of the world. In the same 5 years, we have nearly doubled the number of our permanently staffed foreign offices opening new bureaus at locations ranging from Ottawa to Buenos Aires to Leopoldville.

This expansion has permitted steady and substantial increase in our programing, an increase of more than 70 percent in 5 years. We now produce and broadcast more than one-fourth of all programs on the NBC television network. We recently discovered, with some surprise, that NBC news is now the largest supplier of network television programs, larger than any network program department, larger indeed than any of the great television production companies in Hollywood.

What brings us the greatest satisfaction, however, is the accumulating evidence that our news and informational programs are reaching more and more viewers. A recent study shows that each of 8 special nighttime programs presented by NBC news in the fourth quarter of last year attracted an audience averaging some 22 million viewers. "The Tunnel," which was 1 of these 8 programs, did even better than the average and drew an audience of more than 28 million.

One reason for these growing audiences, I believe, is the increasing skill of our writers, correspondents, producers, directors, and cameramen. They have learned, for example, that one way to look at medicine is through the eyes of an intern during a night's work in the Bellevue emergency ward, that one way to see Elizabethan England is to let the camera roam through the countryside as Shakespeare might have done, that a way to show the oppressiveness of communism is to follow a handful of students as they burrow their way into East Berlin in an attempt to save their friends and relatives.

We have learned not only to vary our techniques, but to vary our approach, our attitudes. It is interesting that two of our programs, almost diametrically opposed in their approach, recently won honors from the same group, the Thomas Alva Edison Awards. One was "David Brinkley's Journal," which is noted for casting a bright

light on America's flaws and imperfections. The other was "U.S. No. 1: American Profile," a poetic and admiring look at American history along Route 1 from Maine to Florida.

Finally, we have learned that news cannot be conveniently separated from history, or neatly compartmented into pigeonholes labeled "Politics," "Foreign Affairs," "Economics," "Science," and so on. We believe that past, present, and future are one continuous stream, that yesterday's politics in California can affect the economy of southern France tomorrow. We hold therefore that our province as newsmen embraces anything of significance that happens anywhere at any time.

Thus we are now working on special programs for next season on such diverse subjects as the French Army and its influence on French political life, the training of a professional football player, private art collections, the life and culture of modern India, the history of one of the world's great rivers, a train journey through the Iron Curtain, the way of life in modern Australia, and an examination of the progress being made toward the discovery of life in outer space.

We believe in sum that a society which is served by an instrument as powerful as television, one which reached tens of millions of people with a single program, and which looks with an unblinking gaze into the Kremlin, or under the Berlin wall or even into certain committee rooms of the Congress—that this society stands an excellent chance of remaining free.

#### WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE PEACEFUL ATOM?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, earlier this year David E. Lilienthal, speaking at Princeton University in the Stanford Little Lecture series, delivered an address which merits high priority consideration as we study and develop a national fuels and energy policy and as we make allocation of our financial and technical resources in implementing such policy.

In his lecture entitled "Whatever Happened to the Peaceful Atom?" Mr. Lilienthal traces the development of atomic energy policy from the early postwar period of optimism and illusion to the present period which has been tempered by reality. The burden of his theme is, in Mr. Lilienthal's words, to bring "the atom, both peaceful and military, back into perspective in the light of the facts not of 1945 or of 1950 or 1960, but of today."

There are, in my opinion, Mr. President, few persons in America today who speak with greater knowledge or a wider background in the entire spectrum of energy resources. As a former Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority from its beginning in 1933 to 1946, and as Chairman from 1941 to 1946, Mr. Lilienthal exercised high authority and assumed heavy responsibility for the development of both hydro- and coal-generated electrical power. Then, as first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission from 1946 to 1950, David Lilienthal was one of the chief architects of our national policy in the field of atomic energy and the peaceful development of the atom. No one familiar with the background and philosophy of this statesman can question his competency in the energy field or his commitment to the peaceful utilization of the atom.

It seems to me, therefore, that it is of the utmost importance that the Congress and the executive branch give serious consideration to the appraisals of Mr. Lilienthal, as when he stated:

Today no one expects or even predicts that some magic of technology will be found whereby electricity from the atom can be produced so cheaply and abundantly as to cause profound changes in our way of life. Somewhere along the line the goal has shifted. Now the objective is a quite different one: To try to produce atomic electricity that is or will be just as good as electricity from coal, oil, or falling water; or to use more formal language, "competitive," meaning competitive in cost.

Mr. Lilienthal pointed out, however, that in view of the hazards of accident, human error or sabotage, and the "furiously radioactive" character of waste materials from atomic powerplants, the label of "just as good" is a misleading one, even if and when atomic power can be generated at a cost competitive with that of coal generated electricity.

In measuring the present level of achievement against the early dreams of unlimited optimism, Mr. Lilienthal observes:

Everyone now knows there is no magic in uranium as a source of energy. The glamour, the excitement of the boundless possibilities of power from the peaceful atom is gone. The sooner we face up to this the better, for living in a world of unreality is as bad for technology and politics and to the peaceful atom as it is in the field of nuclear weapons.

But, as the former Chairman of the AEC comments:

In 1963 we still have an organization—the AEC—that in magnitude of expenditures and personnel is geared to the objective of 1946: A revolution to bring this magic into reality, bring on a new world.

Mr. Lilienthal then poses the question of what the action of Congress would have been in 1946, if we had known then what we now know. Accepting the valid and constructive, but not revolutionary, achievements of atomic research in medicine and chemistry, and acknowledging that the reality of atomic power development has fallen far short of the dream, would we now authorize such a radical departure as the Atomic Energy Commission and the outlay of some \$15 billion? That is, would we at that time have authorized such a massive outlay of financial and technical resources largely on the grounds of ultimately developing a fuel source competitive in cost with that of coal, oil, or falling water? Mr. Lilienthal doubts that Congress would have so acted, and he offers persuasive reasons in support of his opinion.

Mr. President, I do not presume to speak with any particular authority on matters regarding the development of the atom. There are other Members of this body, and particularly the distinguished senior Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], and the distinguished junior Senators from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]; they, as Senate members of

the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, speak with greater understanding and authority in this field than I. However, I can confirm, on my personal knowledge, the statement of Mr. Lillenthal that—

Improved technology and economics in the mining of coal and its transportation, greater efficiency in the transformation of coal's heat into electricity, and in long distance power transmission, have made coal in many parts of the country—including the Ohio Valley—by all odds the least costly source of energy except for some of the better water power sites. The U.S. supply of coal, with the new methods of mining and transportation of coal, and of electricity, seems at the moment to be more than adequate for decades at least—even in the face of the steeply mounting energy needs of this country.

In light of these facts regarding the adequacy and efficiency of coal as a major source of energy, Mr. Lillenthal then questioned whether the national interest justifies the current level of expenditure of funds for atomic power development.

In view of the extensive burden placed on our resources of both scientific manpower and money by space research, defense needs, and the development of the atom, I share in considerable degree Mr. Lillenthal's reservations about the wisdom of continuing to foster an atomic policy developed in the period from 1946 to 1950.

This certainly is not to say that our development of the atom has been a failure. On the contrary, as Mr. Lillenthal so properly stated:

Nothing has changed the majesty of the basic discovery or its theoretical potential. The trouble is, rather, with ourselves for allowing our determination that the atom should have a peaceful use as a source of energy to so grossly inflate our hopes. There are some who would say that what we need is a revised timetable of when these hopes may be realized. But in the meantime—and it may be many years—several other potential sources of energy and the improvement of existing sources may, as a consequence of the imperative of change, relegate atomic energy as a cost-competitive source of power to only specialized and limited applications.

Mr. President, in his Princeton University lecture, "Whatever Happened to the Peaceful Atom?" Mr. Lillenthal has drawn from a deep reservoir of experience in the field of energy and power development. He has presented a closely reasoned argument in his eloquent appeal to American policymakers to cease thinking of the atom as opening the door to some magical transformation of our world, and to bring our atomic energy policy back into the mainstream of American scientific and technological development.

When the lecture—No. 3 in the Stafford Little Lecture series—was first brought to my attention, I addressed a communication to the President of Princeton University, requesting that the institution waive its copyrights to the extent of allowing the publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the complete text of the Lillenthal lecture. I stated in that communication my belief that it would be in furtherance of the national interest to have this material before the

Congress as we study and debate our national fuels and energy requirements, and as we inquire into the possibilities of the development of a national fuels and energy policy. It is satisfying to report—and I am grateful for the opportunity to report—that Princeton University officials have been most cooperative in this matter and have authorized the publication of Mr. Lillenthal's text in the RECORD.

Shortly after this authorization message reached me, I received the following telegram from Mr. Lillenthal:

I am happy to note that the Princeton Press has notified you that my lecture on the peaceful atom is one that you may insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I was gratified to note that as a Senator you regard the subjects discussed by me in this lecture as ones that should be discussed in the national interest.

Respectfully,

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the complete text of Mr. Lillenthal's lecture on the subject "Whatever Happened to the Peaceful Atom?" And, Mr. President, consistent with the authorization I received from the Princeton University Press, I request that the printed RECORD shall indicate that the text of this third of Mr. Lillenthal's lectures in the Stafford Little Lecture series is copyright 1963 by Princeton University Press.

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

[Copyright, Princeton University Press, 1963]

WHATEVER HAPPENED TO THE PEACEFUL ATOM?

(Stafford Little Lectures 1963, No. III, Princeton University, by David E. Lillenthal)

In my opening discussion I said that the one great overriding imperative of mankind is change. I recalled from my own observation some of the specific ways in which, in the 20 years since the towering achievement of the first controlled release of the energy in the atom, the world of men and their ideas have undergone and continue to undergo swift and sweeping change.

The world of 1963, I said, is a world in motion, fluid, moving and responsive to the passions, needs, desires, evil and good, that lie in the heart of man. In contrast to this world of change, I asserted that our outlook and perspective on the atom had not changed in any substantial degree; that it was still dealt with as a thing apart from the whole fabric of human affairs. It is my theme in these lectures that such an outlook needs changing. I hope I can contribute to a new perspective in which the atom would be made an integral part of the mainstream of men's affairs.

Earlier I proposed that where the facts of the world of 1963 are in conflict with the way in which we think and deal with the atom, we should jettison and junk those outmoded ideas.

The burden of my theme then, is that we should begin the process of bringing the atom, both peaceful and military, back into perspective in the light of the facts not of 1945 or of 1950 or 1960, but of today. This theme applies with particular force to the peaceful atom, the subject of this third and concluding discussion.

A few days before Christmas of 1945 a young Senator from Connecticut, Brian McMahon, introduced a bill which some 8 months later was enacted into law and is known as the McMahon Act. The introduc-

tory words of this bill expressed a common conviction: that a revolutionary period based upon the peaceful use of atomic discoveries lay just ahead. I quote from the congressional declaration of policy of the McMahon Act:

"The effect of the use of atomic energy for civilian purposes upon the social, economic, and political structures of today cannot now be determined. It is reasonable to anticipate, however, that tapping this new source of energy will cause profound changes in our present way of life."

The declaration then concludes: "Accordingly it is hereby declared to be the policy of the people of the United States that the development and utilization of atomic energy shall be directed toward improving the public welfare, increasing the standard of living, strengthening free competition among private enterprises so far as is practicable, and cementing world peace."

A year later almost to the day, in the midafternoon of December 31, 1946, I was in President Truman's office in the White House with a group of my associates. I sat at the President's elbow as he signed a document that transferred from the Manhattan project, as it was called, the complex of wartime atomic energy facilities of factories, laboratories, and weapons to the five-man Atomic Energy Commission of civilians. At midnight on that same day, the forceful and dedicated Army officer, who had carried the responsibility for producing the first atomic bomb, issued a farewell message. This message included these words: "Five years ago the idea of atomic power was only a dream. You of the Army's Manhattan project have made that dream a reality." General Groves' statement then concluded: "With regard to peaceful applications, you have raised the curtain on vistas of a new world."

These declarations of the McMahon Act and of General Groves' farewell message reflected quite accurately the expectations widely held at the time they were made in 1945 and 1946. American domestic policy, and America's first efforts toward atomic disarmament, in which I participated, were erected on the foundation of just such expectations.

I fully shared these views, at that time, else I could not have with such conviction and intensity of effort joined in the work of trying to bring these expectations of a "new world" to reality, by the tapping of this new source of energy for civilian uses. More than once, as AEC chairman, in addressing an audience of fellow laymen, I began my remarks somewhat in this fashion: "This object that I hold in my hand," I used to say, holding up a short black cylinder, "is purified uranium metal. The energy in this handful of metal, when it has been converted through a controlled chain reaction in an atomic pile, is the equivalent," I used to say, "of umpteen train loads of coal." The actual number I forget, and it isn't important. This was a way of trying to bring home to my fellow citizens the high stakes in finding scientific, technical, and economic means of realizing the great discoveries that had produced the atomic bomb. That was in the period of the late forties.

More than 15 years and hundreds of millions of dollars later, in 1963, what is the state of affairs?

Today no one expects or even predicts that some magic of technology will be found whereby electricity from the atom can be produced so cheaply and abundantly as to "cause profound changes in our present way of life." Somewhere along the line the goal has shifted. Now the objective is a quite different one: to try to produce atomic electricity that is or will be just as good as electricity from coal, oil, or falling water; or to use more formal language, "competitive," meaning competitive in cost.

I have used the phrase "just as good." But the potential hazards to life and health, of hundreds of thousands of people in densely populated areas adjacent to powerplants (such as that projected in the New York City's Borough of Queens) make it inaccurate to label atomic powerplants as "just as good" as conventional powerplants, even where the cost is virtually the same. In the event of accidents, human error, or sabotage, such atomic plants certainly present greater hazards than conventional powerplants.

The insurance industry of the United States refused to write insurance against so widespread a potential peril to human life and property damage that an atomic powerplant presents. So the Federal Government, by special statute, now underwrites this hazard. No such insurance problem exists as to nonatomic powerplants, of course.

Moreover, the waste materials from atomic powerplants—the atomic ashes, so to speak—are furiously radioactive. After all these years no entirely satisfactory technical way has been found to treat them so they will be safe, or even for their safe transportation from powerplants to underground storage. The underground storage of these deadly and massive wastes continue to constitute a potential source of danger to the population, and a source of considerable expense, as compared to the ashes of a conventional thermal electricity plant.

So "just as good" is far from the whole story. But except for these greater perils of radioactivity, hard to measure precisely, atomic electricity may well prove in time to be "competitive," or nearly so, as to cost, with energy from other sources.

The preamble to the McMahon Act explicitly set the expectations and premises of 1946: we were on the threshold of a new source of energy believed to be revolutionary in its profound consequences. It is interesting to recall that the Russians expressed much the same euphoric expectations about atomic energy at that time.

On this explicit premise radical and unprecedented measures were adopted by the Congress and the people. It was because of these expectations that for the first time in our history a new technical development became a monopoly of Government, its future entrusted not to normal competitive forces but to a single Government agency—the Atomic Energy Commission—armed with billions of dollars and the broadest of powers. This was for America a radical step, and was recognized as such. Nothing of this nature had ever been resorted to in order to further other technical discoveries, discoveries or inventions that did in fact revolutionize our way of life: the dynamo, the electric light, the automotive engine, the aeroplane, the radio tube.

Why did we make this radical departure from our time-tested method of developing a new technology? Certainly not just to produce something just as good as we had before. No, it was because of a conviction that there was an overriding national interest in development of a new source of energy expected to have a profound effect on our way of life. This was the national interest that was thought to be at stake, that justified these extraordinary measures. It was this national interest that justified a prodigious scale of effort, unheard of expenditures of public money, fantastic absorption of a large portion of the scientific, and technical and industrial resources of the Nation.

The scale of effort today, in 1963, continues unabated. The AEC is actually pressing for a new program, to cost \$2 billion over a decade. Not just improvements in existing reactors, but a whole new line of technology, the so-called breeder reactor, is now being boomed, with predictions ranging from nebulous to conservative. But the goal, the expectations that justified the earlier scale of effort, and our departure from our tradi-

tional ways of furthering technology has proved long since unattainable.

Does what made sense in 1946 still make sense in 1963? This is what I ask that we consider.

Suppose in 1946, when the McMahon Act was passed, Congress had been told what we now know but did not know then: that if you will vest great powers in a special and unique Government agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, if you build great research and development laboratories all over the country, explore for, find and buy uranium here and abroad, subsidize the costs of uranium fuel, bear large development costs and part of capital costs for manufacturers of electric equipment and utilities—if you do these things at the cost of billions of dollars for 20 or 30 years the country will have a new source of civilian electricity that is just as good and costs no more than what would be produced without the AEC, without these facilities and expenditures? What would Congress have said? My guess is that the Congress and the people would have gone any lengths for military objectives of the atom, such as weapons and the submarine, but would have said "nothing doing" on such a prospectus for peaceful civilian electricity. Of course, no one could confidently predict in 1946 that the revolutionary expectations would turn out not to be realizable. The effort was certainly one that well deserved a hard try. The quality of men and work has been superb. But it is relevant to ask how much longer is the Government justified in pursuing this will-o'-the-wisp of power so cheap that it will profoundly change our way of life?

There was and is a great national interest in a new source of energy that would be revolutionary. There is no such overriding national interest in the same kind of electricity even at the same cost, though with far greater risk to the population, since private and public power utilities, manufacturers and fuel producers are perfectly capable of meeting that need in the foreseeable future whether by conventional or atomic plants.

Everyone now knows there is no magic in uranium as a source of energy. The glamour, the excitement of the boundless possibilities of power from the peaceful atom is gone. The sooner we face up to this the better, for living in a world of unreality is as bad for technology and politics as to the peaceful atom as it is in the field of nuclear weapons, a subject discussed earlier in these lectures.

But we have failed as a nation to recognize and give effect to this realization that the profound changes, arising out of a revolution in atomic energy supply, just aren't in the cards. And yet in 1963 we still have an organization—the AEC—that in magnitude of expenditures and personnel is geared to the objective of 1946: a revolution to bring this magic into reality, to bring on a new world.

The facts of 1963, in my opinion, show that the time has come for drastic and perhaps painful reevaluation of the peaceful atom in two respects:

First, the concept of what the peaceful atom means to us today, and the realistic prospects in the immediate future.

Second, a reevaluation of the functions of the Atomic Energy Commission itself, the establishment we have built up to bring to reality the hopes and expectations we had a right to hold 15 years ago.

Where do we stand today?

Immediately President Truman had signed the Executive order transferring the wartime properties of the Manhattan District to the civilian Atomic Energy Commission, we proceeded to fortify and expand an already extensive atomic establishment. A good deal of this expansion and additional investment, indeed most of it, was attributable to research and production plants in order that

atomic bombs could be improved in design and their production speeded up.

But the nonmilitary Atomic Energy Commission program claimed a very great deal of attention and investment of many facilities and of human talents. The universities of the southeast were brought together in a great expansion of the Oak Ridge Institute, and of the nonmilitary facilities at Oak Ridge. A similar program bringing in universities but emphasizing national laboratories has been carried out at the Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago, the Brookhaven National Laboratory on Long Island, the laboratory at the University of Iowa at Ames, the scientific complex in New Mexico, the laboratory and facilities at Berkeley. One could continue this tabulation even further.

Never has there been, anywhere in the world, so broad and generously financed an attack on the technical and economic problems of bringing a new scientific discovery into the realm of reality and of widespread use. This prodigious effort was predicated on the belief and hope that this great new source of energy for mankind could produce results as dramatically and decisively beneficial to man as the bomb was dramatically destructive.

This vast establishment of laboratories and institutes, of scholarships, or huge atom-smashers—accelerators—and of nuclear power reactors—all these today we have. This program continues and, expands, the total sums spent being very great.

But there are differences. The difference is in goals and objectives I have mentioned. But there is also, significantly, a difference in mood. The enthusiasm, the sense of being in an heroic period, the sense of dealing with a benign force of revolutionary consequence, much of this has eroded. In contrast now we are told of possible savings of a mill or two a kilowatt-hour, in another 5 or 10 years, or of conserving our fuel resources in another fifty or a hundred years. Even those who laid their technical reputations on the line, and who made enthusiastic predictions of a few years ago are becoming disenchanted.

A newspaper story of May 18, 1962, sums up, in lay terms, the spirit of today. A great naval officer, noted for his achievements and self-confidence, was a witness before a congressional committee. Admiral Rickover "advised Congress to make an initial investment in a big 500,000 kilowatt nuclear powerplant—but not with the idea that it would produce economically competitive power." The witness' statement on the proposed plant's capability, the story commented, "was in contrast to glowing predictions given to the committee in the past about proposed powerplants."

In the 1940's it was reasonable to join in General Groves' and Senator McMahon's view of the possibility of a "new world" that peaceful applications of atomic energy might bring. Responsible men spoke of atomic power so cheap it wouldn't pay to meter it. Most of us were less exuberant by far. Yet even those with a less euphoric outlook had ample grounds to believe that the expectations of the 1940's and the early 1950's should be given a hard try, and that such an effort had a good chance of paying.

Even in those early days the AEC's general advisory committee, for example—a group of giants—uttered words of caution about this new world. Others, such as Phillip Sporn, reminded the country and the scientific community that power from the atom is like any other power: that the atom is just another kind of fuel, not a magic short-cut to almost costless electricity. But for the most part these voices were not heeded.

A great satirist, Frank Sullivan, had himself a very good time kidding the clichés of exuberance of those days. Some of you

will remember the testimony, in question and answer form, of Frank Sullivan's creation, the cliché expert, Mr. Arbuthnot. Here are a few excerpts from Mr. Sullivan's piece entitled "The Cliche Expert Testifies on the Atom," written in 1948.

From the witness stand Mr. Arbuthnot, the cliché expert, told his examiner that he'd better learn to use the words "harness" and "unleash" if he expected to talk about the atom. "They are two words frequently used. With pea, of course."

Question: "Why pea?"

Answer: "Our everything is in terms of the pea. You know how much U<sup>235</sup> it would take to drive a car to the moon and back?"

Question: "No, sir. How much?"

Answer: "A lump the size of a pea."

Question: "You wouldn't settle for a lump the size of a radish or a bean?"

Answer: "Sorry. The pea is the accepted vegetable in these explanations."

Reading some current atomic power predictions, the colloquy with the cliché expert—if Mr. Sullivan will look the other way—might continue in this way:

Question: "After 17 years, where are we in 1963, Mr. Arbuthnot?"

Answer: "Threshold. That is the correct cliché today. We are on the threshold of cheap atomic power. You'll have to learn that word if you expect to be an atomic expert, my friend."

Question: "But didn't you, in 1954, testify that we were then on the 'threshold'. And then again in 1960, didn't you say the same thing?"

Answer: "Yes, of, course I did. Threshold it was and threshold is still the correct cliché."

Question: "And how high is that threshold in 1963?"

Answer: "High? Oh, the same height as in 1954. Hundreds of millions of dollars a year high. Breeder."

Question: "Breeder, Mr. Arbuthnot? This is a mixed audience and I'll ask you to watch your language."

Answer: "Take it easy. Breeder, that's the newest atomic cliché. When you get asked hard questions about the old-fashioned atomic powerplant, just say 'breeder' and you're off the hook, because a breeder atomic plant has never yet been built so who can dispute the lovely forecasts? You'll learn this atomic cliché thing yet, my friend."

The ease with which Mr. Sullivan made fun of the clichés of 1948 may have indicated that perhaps there was more than a little puffing in the buildup of atomic energy. Or perhaps it simply shows that even as to great scientific discoveries a little kidding now and then is healthy. It might be useful—and fun—if Mr. Sullivan turned his considerable talents for satire loose on some of the purple clichés about the space age, current successor to the atomic new world.

To recapitulate: what then is the record? In the effort to produce economic atomic power the U.S. Government in the past 20 years has invested great sums in plants, laboratories, reactors and in incentives. Note that incentives cost as much as subsidies but avoids that naughty word.

For the country as a whole, except where the costs of producing electricity from other sources of heat are high, atomic power is not cheaper but costlier than conventional power.

The main reasons for this, to oversimplify, appear to be three. First, the amount of investment in plant to produce atomic power turned out to be far greater than could have been anticipated. Second, problems of safety to the population are by no means solved, and require expense of considerable magnitude. But the third reason is probably as important as these two. To most everyone's surprise the cost of elec-

tricity from coal has been drastically reduced in recent years, and is continuing to be further reduced as the reserves of coal in locations that new technology makes economic, are ample for a considerable period.

The story of the second coming of coal as a source of energy in the past 10 years is a good illustration of how difficult it is to predict a specific change on a long-range basis.

The most recent report of the AEC on atomic power predicts the state of our coal and oil reserves in a century or less and also predicts the state of affairs two centuries hence. This is worth no more, I fear, than a prediction made in 1763 before the automobile, about what the highway system of America would be like in 1863 and 1963.

Coal is not glamorous, like the atom or waterpower. It is a very humble source of electricity. The coal industry for two generations was called a sick industry. For a long time technical advances in mining and transporting coal at lower cost and of producing electricity from the heat of burning coal advanced hardly at all in an economic sense. In the mysterious way by which changes take place at the most unexpected places, suddenly coal in the last decade has made enormous strides.

I recall the judgment on an atomic energy international ownership proposal, of the distinguished British physicist, Dr. P. M. S. Blackett. Writing in 1948 he said, "America's fuel reserves are only likely to be adequate in the future at steeply rising costs." This proved to be off the beam by 180 degrees. Actually the proven reserves have increased and electric generating costs have declined "steeply."

This is not the place to describe that progress toward lower and lower costs of coal-generated electricity. It is enough to say that improved technology and economics in the mining of coal and its transportation, greater efficiency in the transformation of coal's heat into electricity, and in long-distance power transmission have made coal in many parts of the country—including the Ohio Valley—by all odds the least costly source of energy except for some of the better waterpower sites. The U.S. supply of coal, with the new methods of mining and transportation of coal and of electricity seems at the moment to be more than adequate for decades at least, even in the face of the steeply mounting energy needs of this country.

But is the issue of 1963 whether uranium as a fuel is, or will be, less or more costly than coal by a mill or two per unit of electricity? This appears to be the current justification for expenditure of Government funds for atomic development. But if that is all that is presently at stake, I doubt whether the national interest justifies these expenditures. Certainly, the justification is a far cry from the initial prospectus for this extensive program.

A word about other fuels: gas and oil.

Natural gas prices have been rising, and its future as a boiler fuel is limited because of its higher value for other uses. Fuel oil is a byproduct of the oil industry's production of higher value products and, therefore, offers only limited competition to coal as a fuel for the rapidly expanding production of electric power, except in especially favorable locations.

But it was not only a major economic source of heat and power that those vast expenditures were intended to secure. It was believed that atomic discoveries would produce revolutionary advances not only in basic science but in their application in medicine and in the growing of food and fiber, a revolutionary contribution to the conquest of poverty and disease on a world-wide scale.

Turning now briefly to these other areas of the peaceful atom. The radioactive isotope has indeed been a great boon as a tool of science. Those who in the forties sensed that this might well be the greatest benign use of atomic energy have thus far been proven right. The radioactive isotope has had important, though still limited, applications, in medicine and in a few other areas, such as in chemical engineering. As to industrial applications though a new and realistic note of prudence is emerging. Dow Chemical Co., for example, recently announced its success in using a radioactive substance, cobalt 60, as a catalyst to produce small quantities of the organic compound, ethyl bromide. The headline was of the style of the old exuberant era: "The atom runs a chemical plant." But in the fine print, the company's chemist said, "It's just another type of catalyst, another tool to consider. Ultraviolet light and chemical agents may still be the best, most economical way to produce many chemicals." The atom in chemistry is now seen to be a part of the mainstream of chemistry, not a kind of magic.

There continues to be a very high level of intellectual excitement and progress in physics, following the path cut a generation ago by such giants as the late Niels Bohr and his younger creative counterparts, some of them in the very community where I am speaking to you tonight. The money and brains devoted to nuclear science apart from research and development for atomic power, have, I think, been well spent. I am, however, not the only one by any means who questions whether as large a part of our total resources of brains and money as is devoted to this area of science—the millions on accelerators for example—is justified compared with the opportunities in other fields such as biochemistry.

The problems of securing safe and competitively economic power from the atom have proved to be very considerable. Other sources of power are ample and are diminishing in cost.

If we accept these propositions, we will have a new perspective that can save vast sums of Government funds; a great deal of scientific and technical talent could be more beneficially used in other areas. For this I believe we can be sure: at the time and place the economics of power show need for atomic energy when compared with the costs and safety of power from other sources of energy the manufacturers of equipment and the utility industry, private and public, will supply that need without Government prodding.

Where there is no present or prospective economic need for a product or service, does it make sense for the Government of the United States to continue to spend as much as it does on civilian atomic energy? I strongly doubt this. Military applications, including the nuclear submarine powerplant, stand in a different category, of course.

Does it make sense for some of America's ablest technical men in the AEC, its contractors, and in industry to confront frustration after frustration for no presently foreseeable overriding public purpose, as things now stand? The question deserves an objective analysis, not served by another round of long-range predictions of what we shall need in 2063.

We can well be proud—I certainly am—of our great atomic laboratories in the establishment of several of which I had some direct responsibility. But should we assume they always expand, that they will never be cut back in favor of other kinds of research? A kind of Parkinson's law of research has developed: that research expands as fast as money for that work is made available. Fifteen billions of dollars of Federal funds for research could become 30 billions if we

don't take a hard look at Parkinson's law of research soon.

In our constantly expanding research and development efforts should we not stop to question the effect on the scale of those efforts of the rise of new scientific areas of at least equal, perhaps greater, promise than that of the peaceful atom?

Another question: the Atomic Energy Commission continues to stockpile uranium. By 1966, we are told, there will be a surplus of uranium over needs for weapons and reactors of a value of a billion dollars. Do the prospects for atomic reactors in the coming decade justify such a surplus reserve? If not, can we afford to build a kind of atomic political pork barrel, or a uranium congressional bloc like the silver bloc?

The reasons we continue to do these things in the face of the changed prospects that atomic power will have a profound effect on American life are various.

Some are straight political ones. Some are the natural and justifiable pride of men whose technical careers have been given over to this goal and who have understandable difficulty being wholly objective about the results.

But deeper still, I think, are the remnants of a noble resolve that we must prove that the atom has a present peaceful non-weapons use of very great importance.

As first chairman of AEC and before that as one of those who helped draft a State Department proposal for international control of the atom I had a share in formulating and popularizing that hope of unlimited peaceful potentials. But in the intervening 17 years the hopes are considerably dimmed. The rhetoric and the emotion, however, linger on; the facts should be faced, for they will prevail.

Is the peaceful atom then a goldbrick, a fiasco, a flop? Not at all. Nothing has changed the majesty of the basic discovery of its theoretical potential. The trouble is rather with ourselves for allowing our determination that the atom should have a peaceful use as a source of energy to so grossly inflate our hopes. There are some who would say that what we need is a revised timetable of when these hopes may be realized. But in the meantime—and it may be many years—several other potential sources of energy and the improvement of existing sources may, as a consequence of the imperative of change, relegate atomic energy as a cost-competitive source of power to only specialized and limited applications.

Why were our hopes inflated?

The basic cause, I think, was a conviction, and one that I shared fully, and tried to inculcate in others, that somehow or other the discovery that had produced so terrible a weapon simply had to have an important peaceful use. Such a sentiment is far from ignoble. We are a peace-loving people. Everyone, our leaders and laymen and scientists and military men, wanted to establish that there is a beneficial use of this great discovery. We were grimly determined to prove that this discovery was not just a weapon. This led perhaps to wishful thinking, a wishful elevation of the "sunny side" of the atom. So we did not see atomic energy as just another form of heat, another fuel. We gave it a unique status. We took it out of the stream of life, made for it a place apart.

Now our emotional attitude has swung to the other extreme. We are disenchanted with the peaceful atom as if it were somehow human and had deliberately failed us.

The strong attraction of the peaceful atom as an offset to the terrors of the atom's destructiveness as a weapon have led to some strange results. A few words about them may illuminate the problem we face in getting the peaceful atom into perspective, of returning it to its place as one part of our scientific and technical development.

And it is to seek a new perspective that is the theme of these discussions.

One or two illustrations will do for our purpose. Years ago the Russians announced that, unlike the bloodthirsty Americans who only thought of the atom in terms of destruction, they, the Russians, were developing this explosive for peaceful purposes, such as great excavation for ports and the like. Most knowledgeable people at that time thought this was a characteristic piece of Soviet cold war propaganda, and obvious nonsense. Yet the pressure on us to prove that atomic weapons were not the only product of these great scientific efforts was such that our own atomic energy program has gone in for this kind of thing: projects for blowing out harbors, making explosions underground to produce steam and so on. Without judging the details of these undertakings, the important thing is that it shows how far the desire of scientists and administrators will carry them when we try to establish a nonmilitary use when no substantial one of current importance has been proven.

For example, dramatic pictures of a great hole blasted out in the desert by a peaceful atomic explosion, in July 1962, were released to the press by AEC, for the first time, in November. The release was at a time when the AEC's budget for this kind of spectacular was before the Budget Bureau. Or to take another example: as a buildup for this peaceful use of the atom the amount of earth moved by this explosion in the desert was compared with the earth moved in digging a tunnel under New York's East River, where an atomic explosion would hardly be welcomed. This is just another of the many instances of the way in which public relations techniques—the not-so-hidden persuader—have been used to promote the appropriation of funds for the atom.

Another consequence of this same kind of effort to glamorize the atom is a foreign aid program within the Atomic Energy Commission, part of President Eisenhower's program in 1954 called atoms for peace. An elaborate ritual for providing atomic research and reactor equipment and technology to such countries as Thailand and Guatemala and other similar underdeveloped countries became an expensive showpiece of the AEC program. Much of this was as meaningless and wasteful an operation as could be imagined; for most of these countries had hardly a cadre of scientists, or the necessary facilities to put this exchange of atomic knowledge to any significant use. Even as a propaganda move it was self-defeating and naive. A great many of these countries need and could use doctors and medicine, storage batteries, plows and fertilizers and seed—and good elementary scientific instruction. Only the desire to prove somehow that atoms were for peace could justify the absurdity of a separate program, not in the foreign aid part of the State Department, but in the AEC.

Let me cite another consequence of the "come hither" of the peaceful atom, so that it overshadows other equally promising areas of science. From the very beginning of the AEC, it has always been easier to get Congress to appropriate funds for science and research if somehow the atom can be tacked on to the request. This is not to deprecate the importance of the huge accelerators running into the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been provided for, or the elaborate and even luxurious laboratories that have grown up at Oak Ridge, the Argonne, Brookhaven, and Berkeley. These vast and extensive scientific establishments at public expense are amply justified, even though the results for science would seem rather disappointing when compared with the possibilities and needs of alternative ways of furthering basic science. But there are other

claimants for research funds, such as in medical research, particularly in the field of biology.

I submit that it will not be possible for Congress to allocate appropriately the total resources of the country to be expended on scientific research and development so long as the atom is thought of and dealt with not as one segment of scientific effort to be balanced against other segments, but as a thing apart. Until the atom is brought back fully into the mainstream of the scientific effort of the country, as an element of that mainstream, Congress will continue to be vulnerable to special pleading for funds for atomic research with little opportunity realistically to weigh that field against the needs and opportunities of other parts of science. Science is a single fabric. To separate out the atom may have seemed justified in 1946 or even 1956. One must seriously question whether this is any longer justified in the light of 1963.

Of all our national resources, minds are the most important. Two-thirds of the trained minds available for exploring our scientific and technical frontiers are absorbed by the atomic energy, space and defense activities of our country. Let me underline that: two-thirds.

As a consequence all the rest of America's needs are, relatively, impoverished, neglected and starved.

For the first time the country is beginning to realize that you cannot have a satisfactory economic growth rate we hear so much about but of which we see little, if this two-thirds allocation of our trained brains goes on much longer. President Kennedy's Economic Report to Congress of December 21, 1962, has this comment to make: "We have," he said of this two-thirds absorption of trained minds, "paid a price by sharply limiting the scarce scientific and engineering resources available to the civilian sectors of the American economy."

The civilian sectors is a colorless economist's term for what it is that keeps America going. Cut off the research and technical blood supply to the civilian sectors and the space, defense, and atomic energy programs will have no one left to pay their bills. Cutting back on this drain on scarce brains isn't proposed in the President's economic report. I suggest Congress consider the atomic energy program as one good place to begin to cut back sharply, to make more brains available to some of the presently starved civilian areas of science and technology.

Three propositions then need to be weighed, debated, and conclusions reached if we are to bring up to date our basic premise about the peaceful atom, vintage 1963.

I suggest the 1963 premises should be these:

1. Energy from the atom is not now needed for civilian purposes.

2. At the time and place where it is needed it will be forthcoming without governmental prodding. If there is a real need, it will be met by the utility and manufacturing industries, as it has been with the automobile, the diesel engine, the telephone, and so on, in response to proved economic need.

3. There is now no urgent fuels or power crisis and no prospect of one in the foreseeable future; when such a shortage looms, it will be taken care of by the atom if that is then the best alternative.

In short, then, we should stop trying to force feed atomic energy. Throw away the present discredited timetable. Don't abandon the hope, of course, but deal with it realistically.

The same approach should apply to the atom in basic science, in medicine, and agriculture, and industry; weigh these claims for funds for research and development efforts along with others, not give the atom a place apart.

If we are going to readjust our ideas about the emphasis we ought to place on the peaceful atom then perhaps some revision is in order as to the agency that has responsibility for it. This is said not because the AEC has not done a good job, but the contours of its job should conform to our 1963 picture of the atom, not that of 1946 when it was established.

Why did Congress, in 1946, with the country's general approval set up a wholly separate agency for the atom? This made good sense in 1946 for three chief reasons:

1. At that time, we alone had the bomb. We had committed ourselves to international control. We were sincerely attempting to prove to the world that our intentions were peaceful. Therefore, custody and control and development of this terrible new force were properly placed in the hands of a civilian agency—not the military.

2. Secrecy. Collecting all of the functions relating to the atom in a single huge agency seemed to be the best safeguard possible against the loss of the scientific and technical secrets we and the British together had in our possession.

3. Third, atomic energy was generally expected to transform the face of industrial society within a short space of time, and therefore a special new agency was clearly needed to prepare and plan for such a dynamic change.

These reasons were certainly valid in 1946 and 1947. But what about today? Let's look at them in the light of the facts of 1963.

1. First, the emphasis on a civilian agency. The world is now and has been for some years in an atomic arms race. The hope of international control is dim. Not only does Russia have the bomb, but France will soon, and other nations as well in due course. The military facts of 1963 now have forced us to place large quantities of nuclear arms directly in the hands of our military—in the skies, in missiles, beneath the earth's surface, under the seas.

We still have civilian control in the sense that the President, as always, is responsible, but the role of the AEC as a special civilian custodian and watchdog is, of necessity, a fiction.

The AEC functions chiefly as a designer, developer, maker and tester of atomic weaponry. These are grave technical responsibilities, and have been carried with distinction by able men. But as the reason for a sharp separation between civilian and military roles has faded, so the distinctive role of the AEC has changed. The AEC as weaponeer has in fact become perforce very much a part of the Military Establishment of the Nation, serving the needs and goals of that Military Establishment as defined by the military. The spectrum of weapons and the range of war plans is now very broad indeed, from intercontinental missiles to conventional tools of the infantry or of guerrilla warfare. With so broad a context the AEC, expert in nuclear weaponry alone, can hardly provide an indispensable independent civilian judgment to the Chiefs of Staff. Realistically, isn't the AEC essentially not too different from any major technical contractor to the Defense Department in the area of missiles, say, or other new weapons?

2. As for the second reason, secrecy, the reasons for secrecy diminished in 1949, when Russia tested its first bomb. Atomic secrecy still has some value to us, but since 1949 it has become progressively less crucial. First, because we realized gradually that secrecy in basic science is a myth. Second, because the variety of secrets (that is, of temporary technological advantages) has multiplied—in rocketry, in submarines, etc.—and is very far from being preponderant in the atomic field, as once had been the case. The function of the AEC as a gigantic strongbox for all the major U.S. weapon se-

crets—the picture in 1946—just does not jibe with the facts of 1963.

3. The new world of atomic plenty, as reviewed earlier does not exist. Certainly the peaceful atom occupies a subordinate role in the development of the United States today and will continue thus for years to come.

In sum, the three chief reasons for the establishment of the AEC in 1946 are no longer wholly valid in the world of 1963. This is not to say that the AEC has failed. It certainly has not. But we ought to take a fresh look at the AEC and be sure that it is geared to the realities of today, and not to the exploded premises of 1946.

The reality is that the atom has not justified the separate and unique status which Congress understandably assigned it in 1946. It has not been the ultimate weapon as once was said, not the single necessary weapon. It has not revolutionized industrial society. It has achieved good, heartwarming results, but no revolutionary advance in medicine. The peaceful atom has not ushered in a new world but has rather become a part, a minor part, of the old one. And yet the official sponsor and trustee of the atom in this country, the Atomic Energy Commission, has hardly changed at all.

A revision of the AEC so that its functions conform to the facts of 1963 would seem to be in order. To recommend the details of how such a reemphasis ought to be worked out in terms of transfer of functions and even loppings-off are not a responsibility of mine or any other private citizen. Whether the AEC has one administrator or its present five commissioners, or whether such-and-such a division ought to be reduced from 50 desks to 1 or 2 \* \* \* these matters are of interest to me chiefly as a taxpayer.

What does concern me is that steps are taken to get the atom fully back into the stream of American life, and in a role of proper proportions. I want my government to continue to encourage, through every means, the broad growth of scientific research and development—and that means all of science not as in the past singling out the atom for preferential treatment. I do not want atomic science, because of the euphoria of the past, or present-day lobbying power, to secure more than its justifiable share of our research resources of money and brains. If the most efficient way of insuring a balanced scientific development means transferring from the AEC all of its grants or scholarships, and turning these over, say, to the National Science Foundation, then I would be heartily in favor of such a move. Similarly, I favor continuing technical and financial aid to underdeveloped countries and if in certain instances such aid would be wisely supplemented by an atomic power installation, well and good. But the idea of a separate atomic point 4 program, carried on almost as if the larger and more comprehensive scheme of foreign aid did not exist, makes no sense to me whatsoever.

This artificial apartness of the atom in areas where this is not justified has been and is not only wasteful but harmful. Let me cite but one example of many.

A few years ago almost by accident the public discovered that containers of low-level radioactive waste products were being dumped into the coastal waters of Massachusetts. In that area fishing is an important industry and a source of food for the whole Northeast. In the summer the beaches are used by millions of people for recreation. This dumping was done with the permission of the AEC, but apparently the marine biologists and the State and Federal agencies with responsibility for health did not supervise the dumping. The AEC suffered in prestige by this unfortunate assumption that because radiation was its field, they were also experts on public health. A more serious consequence: by this sense of atomic apartness the State and Federal public

health services were deprived of the opportunity to become fully knowledgeable of the radiation hazards—or absence of hazards—in such wastes and how to protect against them. Today more and more the functions of AEC that involve existing technical agencies are being slowly transferred to those agencies. This is a move in the direction I urge: putting the atom into the mainstream of men's affairs, not artificially keeping it separate and apart.

What I have been trying to do in this discussion is:

To take a look at the peaceful atom and also at the executive establishment concerned with the atom, in the light of the facts of 1963. This has been an effort to see the peaceful atom not as it once was viewed, but as it really is today. On the basis of that examination I have suggested some changes are due, perhaps overdue. What I have said of the peaceful atom is based on the theme of these lectures; namely, that the atom is not something magic and separate and apart, but is an integral part of the whole fabric of life of which change is the basic imperative.

#### FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Honorable Howell Appling, Jr., secretary of state of the State of Oregon, has called to the attention of my colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, and myself the enrolled senate joint memorial 4 which was adopted recently by the 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon.

I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of my colleague and myself, that this memorial, dealing with the importance of obtaining adequate funds for the water pollution control program at Oregon State University, be set forth at this point in my remarks.

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

#### SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 4

To His Excellency, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, is legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas under the 1961 amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Oregon State University at Corvallis has been selected as the site for the Pacific Northwest regional laboratory for the conduct of research, investigation, experiments, field demonstrations, and studies and training relating to the prevention and control of water pollution; and

Whereas the site has been established on the campus and funds have been appropriated for the construction of this facility; and

Whereas there is need for programing and establishing research at an early date prior to the completion of the actual laboratory building scheduled for early 1965, staff must be recruited and research in its initial phases must be undertaken in order that the laboratory can be used to its utmost effectiveness as soon as it is available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to provide support for initiating and carrying out research relating to water pollution problems by introducing in

the fiscal year 1964 budget necessary funds for hiring staff and initiating research for the water pollution control program at Oregon State University.

2. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to each Member of the Oregon congressional delegation, and to each Member of the Washington, Idaho, and Montana delegations.

Adopted by senate March 5, 1963.

DALE A. HENDERSON,  
Secretary of Senate.

BEN MUSA,  
President of Senate.

Adopted by house April 20, 1963.

CLARENCE BARTON,  
Speaker of House.

### CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Nation and the world have been witness in recent days to a spectacle of racial bigotry in the United States that would disgrace a Union of South Africa or a Portuguese Angola.

It is no longer possible for decent citizens to sit in silence, whether they are public officials or not, and tolerate by that silence the massive and oppressive denial of constitutional rights that is occurring in several areas of the United States.

The conflict between peaceful Negro demonstrators and police in the cities of America brings to mind nothing so much as the assaults of the Nazi Party storm troopers against the Jews, and the unleashing of Communist soldiers against peaceful demonstrators in Eastern Europe.

Unless American citizens are willing to stand up and demand an end to these scenes of police brutality and disregard for civil rights, our constitutional guarantees will be no better than those of Hitler's Germany or Communist Russia.

Aside from the merely moral indecency of what has been transpiring, police authorities in certain southern communities are crushing the exercise of rights supposedly guaranteed to every American by nothing less basic than the Constitution.

The heroic Americans who are completing the march for equality begun by William Moore are doing no more than exercising their right to freedom of speech, and their right to petition their government for a redress of grievances. Under the Federal Constitution, they are guaranteed that right by the first article of the Bill of Rights. I would be surprised if they are not also supposed to be guaranteed that right by the constitution of the State which took it from them.

Moreover, they are exercising the right of all Americans to move freely from one State to another, a right recognized by the Supreme Court, and a right that was denied them when they were arrested not upon violation of law but merely upon their entry into one of our States. In my opinion, the local authorities responsible for the travesty should be prosecuted on both grounds.

Let us remember that we are long past the day when citizens were secure in their constitutional right only against the officers and action of the Federal Government. The executive officers of

the Federal Government have the duty to protect Americans in the exercise of their constitutional rights against their infringement by State authority, as well.

I know it is said that the civil rights statutes are relatively weak. But some do exist. I know it is said that in the past the courts have limited their application. But even within those limitations, there is room for the Justice Department to make clear that the Federal Government is not entirely powerless to intervene.

Section 242 of title 18 of the United States Code makes it a punishable offense for anyone "under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, (to) willfully subject any inhabitant of any State, territory, or district to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States."

I can think of the Bill of Rights, with its supposed guarantee of free speech, petition, and peaceful assembly; I can think of the 14th amendment, with its supposed guarantee that no State shall make or enforce any law which abridges the privileges or immunities of American citizens and which also forbids a State to deny any person life, liberty, or equal protection of its laws.

The Supreme Court has indicated that for any local official to be brought to account under this section there must be shown an intent upon his part to deny a Federal right. Surely there is evidence that there was such intent in the case of the memorial marchers.

There is also evidence that there is an intent to deny the right of peaceful assembly and freedom of speech to the demonstrators in Birmingham, Ala. The use of hoses and dogs upon peaceful demonstrators is such evidence, in my opinion.

I hope the Department of Justice will reexamine its legal weapons in these cases. I hope it will recognize that the courts will never tell it when to move in to protect American rights; it is up to the Justice Department to act within the rules already laid down by the courts and proceed to test by action whether or not the courts agree with its interpretation of its powers.

For this enforcement arm of the National Government to do nothing, except to send mediators and await reports from the combat zone, is a shameful commentary on American democracy. If indeed, the Justice Department does act in defense of American rights and is not upheld by the Federal courts, than it should seek whatever new legislation is necessary to empower it to act.

It will never be good enough for this, or any administration of the Federal Government, to wring its hands over the inadequacy of legislation in this field. The test of this administration is whether it is willing to exercise its existing authority to the full, and then seek from Congress whatever additional authority is needed to put an end to the police atrocities which have been occurring.

To the extent that these demonstrations are against segregation of public facilities in Alabama, and the denial of the right to vote in Mississippi, they are

against something already known to be illegal. The demonstrators are asking that the law simply be upheld, but they are not even being accorded that right by the legal authorities of those States.

Aside from the legal side of this issue, there is the even more urgent moral side of it. I can think of no action anywhere in these United States that is a more completely un-American activity than that of the Alabama police in arresting the Moore marchers and in attacking the Birmingham demonstrators. Such spectacles must bring great joy to the hearts of Communists everywhere, as they see American law officers putting down peaceful demonstrations in the same fashion as the Communist police put them down. Arrests, imprisonment, and brutality are the methods of totalitarianism everywhere, in Cuba, East Germany, in Red China, and apparently, in certain parts of the American South.

No conscientious American can continue to remain silent. This is not a matter that can be met with passivity on the part of the majority, and left to the Negroes and whites of the South to fight it out among themselves. What is going on down there today is an infinitely greater threat to American freedom than Cuba, for indeed, if we cannot and do not protect America freedom in southern America, then where can we and where will we protect it?

I made the foregoing remarks because I think they are a deserving and fitting tribute to a magnificent article written by Joel J. Sprayregen, general counsel, Illinois division, American Civil Liberties Union, entitled, "Of Dogs and Freedom—Under the Law." This inspiring article of Joel Sprayregen's is published in the April 26, 1963, Chicago Daily Law Bulletin. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Chicago Daily Law Bulletin, Apr. 26, 1963]

#### OF DOGS AND FREEDOM—UNDER THE LAW (By Joel J. Sprayregen)

Law Day came a little early in front of the Leflore County Courthouse in Greenwood, Miss., last month. The principal celebrant was a giant police dog who left an enduring impression on the leg of a minister and, incidentally, on the minds of millions of people throughout the world.

It is regrettable that the pressure of his official duties will keep this dog from appearing with eminent jurists and leaders of the bar at Law Day observances throughout the Nation. The President's proclamation says that we need a Law Day for "our people to rededicate themselves to ideals of equality and justice in relations with one another." The amount of rededication necessary may be measured by the distance between the upper and lower jaws of the police dog.

As has always been customary in cases where a citizen is oppressed, the dog can plead that he was merely following orders. His master—a policeman sworn himself to follow orders and, if possible to enforce the laws of the land—ordered the dog to bite the leg of a minister who was peacefully demonstrating in the cause of securing the right to vote for his fellow citizens. In Greenwood, apparently, clergymen had better preach only where no one can hear them; as earlier authorities have noted, the Gospel

can be a disturbing thing if only men will open their hearts and minds to hear it.

The President's proclamation tells us that Law Day records "man's advance from savagery to civilization (with) reason and morality displacing brutal force." We may ponder that—although it is not recorded that dogs have an official "Law Day" of their own—the attack on the minister was not something that came naturally to the animal. Only after intensive training—presumably by human beings—is a dog sufficiently "educated" to attack instantly a man who has not threatened to do him wrong. This is certainly a significant accomplishment for higher education in Mississippi. But on Law Day, can we ask for something a little higher? Can we ask for education to ensure the prevalence of reason and morality over brute force?

Greenwood's premature Law Day festivities may remind us of more than the peril of the preacher who ventures into the gray pastures of public morality. As lawyers, it should remind us that when we take the case of the afflicted and oppressed—in Greenwood or Chicago—we act in the noblest of traditions. As a leading contemporary theologian says:

"The concern for justice is delegated to the judges, as if it were a matter for professionals or specialists. But to do justice is what God demands of every man: it is the supreme commandment and one that cannot be fulfilled vicariously. The calling of the prophet may be described as that of an advocate or champion, speaking for those who are too weak to plead their own cause. Indeed, the major activity of the prophets was interference, remonstrating about wrongs inflicted on other people. \* \* \* The prophet is a person who is not tolerant of wrongs done to others."

We are not the first generation of lawyers called on to employ our ingenuity and courage in defense of the rule of law. St. Thomas More lost first his judgeship, and then his life, because he would not swear to an act which he believed was beyond the power of Parliament and the King. Lord Coke lost his judgeship by insisting that even kings are subject to the law. Have any lawyers ever drafted a more persuasive brief in defense of political freedom than the one in which Madison and Jefferson pledged for themselves and their colleagues, "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor"?

In Illinois, Governor Altgeld lost his office because he believed that political passion was no ground on which to keep men in prison. A downstate Illinois lawyer shepherded his countrymen through a fratricidal blood-letting so that our best traditions of self-government "shall not perish from this earth." In 1910, the justices of our State supreme court (prophesying a case that 52 years later was to bring down grossly undeserved wrath on the U.S. Supreme Court) ruled that a Catholic schoolchild could not be compelled to recite from the Protestant Bible. And in Cook County, how many times has Clarence Darrow or the public defender or a member of the Defense of Prisoners Committee stepped to the bar in defense of, among other things, the finest traditions of the profession?

Almost half the world today celebrates a May Day whose heroes are, not lawyers dedicated to a rule of reason, but rather trained assassins and embittered theorists who never knew the responsibility and art of self-government under a rule of law. But our own traditions warn us not to be complacent about our achievements because the supreme commandment of justice "cannot be fulfilled vicariously." To each generation of American lawyers—and laymen—is given the responsibility of preserving freedom under law against the faint-hearted who would trade it for the illusory "security" of increased governmental power over the conscience and conduct of the individual citizen.

The responsibility must be met both inside and outside of courthouses in Mississippi, as well as in the North. It can be met not by quoting dead men, but only by taking risks to protect the liberty of living men.

Is there a despicable defendant who cannot secure a fair trial? Is there a schoolchild segregated because of his race or compelled by the State to recite a prayer in which he does not believe? Is there a policeman who tortures prisoners whom he believes guilty? Is there a judge who thinks contempt of court means any disagreement with him? Is there a mayor who thinks he can break up a peaceful demonstration for civil rights or peace or John Birch? Is there an American citizen who is not allowed to vote because his skin is black? Can a police dog's bark drown out, or his teeth crush, a plea for human dignity under law? Such cases are the crucibles in which are tested daily our faithfulness to the great tradition, and our right to have a Law Day.

Man, having subjected all the other animals on earth to his rule, now stands on the eve of conquering the infinite spaces of the universe. But can man subject himself to the rule of law? If he can, we can excuse police dogs from participation in our ceremonies, and let them have their own day. Man himself will then be worthy to proclaim Law Day throughout the universe.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. WEDNESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, there will be no business considered today.

It is anticipated that on Wednesday next the Senate will consider the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill; the Treasury, Post Office, and Executive offices appropriation bill; and also the unfinished business, S. 537, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment to meet at 11 o'clock on Wednesday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

#### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 537) to amend the Legislative Reorganiza-

tion Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

#### ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF THE 1963 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM AND PROPOSED FEED GRAIN LEGISLATION FOR 1964-65

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last year when the administration's proposal for a mandatory feed grain bill—a bill which would have provided for a mandatory limitation on feed grain production—came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I opposed it and I offered an amendment to knock out the mandatory provision. My amendment succeeded in the committee by one vote. I opposed the mandatory provision again on the floor, but it passed the Senate by a very close vote. But it failed in the House, and was never enacted into law.

Now, the administration has had second thoughts on the kind of feed grain bill it feels would be best for the country. I commend the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States for recognizing that a mandatory program would not be desirable. I feel that it would not work, that it is not a practical approach. I think it would be most unfortunate for our agricultural economy.

Preliminary reports indicate that 25.8 million feed grain base acres will be diverted under the 1963 program as compared with a diversion of 28.6 million in 1962 and 25.2 million acres in 1961. For the entire United States feed grain acres intended for diversion in 1963 are only 90 percent of those diverted in 1962.

The central Corn Belt States of Iowa, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio all reported fewer than 90 percent as many feed grain acres intended for diversion in 1963 as in 1962. Iowa, Illinois, and Ohio, for example, will divert only 80 percent as many acres as in 1962. Indiana, Missouri, and Michigan will divert only 85 percent as many acres as in 1962. Other States which reported a greater than national average decline in acres intended for diversion in 1963 were Arizona, Delaware, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, North Dakota, and Texas.

There were 20 States, however, mostly in the Northeast, West, and South which reported more feed-grain acres intended for diversion in 1963 than in 1962. They are: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Washington, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Montana, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Georgia.

The number of farms participating in the 1963 program is slightly higher than in 1962 and about 10 percent higher than in 1961. Only nine States have fewer farms enrolled in the 1963 than in the 1961 program. The nine States are: Arizona, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, Nebraska, and Ohio.

Small farms appear to be participating in larger numbers in 1963 and some large farms may have dropped out. In

spite of the 10-percent increase in the number of farms participating in the program, the percentage of the total feed-grain acreage on farms participating in the 1963 program is lower than it was in 1961; and is only slightly higher than in 1962. In 1961, 59 percent of the base acreage of feed grains was on farms which participated in the program. In 1962 barley was also included in the program and the percentage of the total feed-grain acreage on the farms participating in the program dropped to 55.3. Preliminary estimates indicate that 56.7 of the feed grain base acreage is on the farms which are participating in the 1963 program.

The smaller acreage of corn, grain sorghum and barley intended for diversion in 1963 as compared with 1962 is the result of a higher proportion of small farms participating in 1963 and of less diversion per farm cooperating. The portion of the base diverted for payment on participating farms dropped from an average of 39.6 percent in 1961 and 42 percent in 1962 to 34.4 percent intended for 1963. In Iowa and Illinois the percentage diversion on the participating farms dropped from 34.7 percent in 1962 to 27 percent in 1963—a reduction of almost 20 percent in the proportion of the bases diverted on the participating farms. This is in line with the changed economic incentives in the 1963 program which provides less incentive for diverting more than 20 percent of the base acreage than was provided in the 1961 and 1962 programs.

One of the reasons why I opposed the program last year was that I thought the taxpayer would not get as much for his money, inasmuch as the incentive for the farmers to cut down on production was reduced, while the payments were increased.

#### COST COMPARISONS

Acreage diversion payments in 1961 were \$782 million; in 1962, \$842 million; and acreage diversion plus price support payments for the 1963 program are now estimated at \$872 million, which will be the highest to date. In addition to the payments to producers in 1961 and 1962 the Government took over 500 to 600 million bushels of corn at \$1.20 per bushel and substantial amounts of other feed grains at comparable loan values after selling certificated grain at \$1 to \$1.08 per bushel. Its losses on these feed grains probably amounted to \$100 to \$150 million each year. Under the 1963 program with the loan value of \$1.07 per bushel for corn—and other loan values in proportion—and a prohibition against selling certificated grain at less than the loan values, little if any 1963 feed grains are expected to be delivered to the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price-support program.

Taking into account both the payments for diversion and the CCC losses on the new grains acquired under the 1961 and 1962 loans, it appears that the cost per acre diverted in 1963 will be about the same as the total cost per acre diverted in 1961 but 5 to 10 percent higher than in 1962.

As compared with the 1961 and 1962 programs, in 1963 the Secretary of Agri-

culture reduced acreage diversion payments from 50 to 20 percent of the value of the crop grown, raised the price-support level from \$1.20 to \$1.25 per bushel for corn, and made similar increases in the price-support level for the other feed grains. These changes were made to keep the total cost of the 1963 program in line with the cost of the 1961 and 1962 programs in view of the change in the legislation requiring compensatory price-support payments of 18 cents per bushel for corn, and for other feed grains in proportion.

Although the Government costs per acre diverted for the 1963 program will probably be 5 to 10 percent higher than total costs per diverted acre for the 1962 program, the market price of corn will be stabilized at a level 5 to 10 percent higher than in 1961 and 1962. The legislative authorization for the 1963 feed grains program provides that no certificated grains can be sold at less than the loan value, \$1.07 per bushel for corn, plus carrying charges. For this reason the market prices for the 1963 feed grain crops is expected to average higher than the equivalent of \$1.07 per bushel for corn. Most of the certificated grains from the 1961 program were sold on the basis of about \$1.02 per bushel for corn and most of those from the 1962 program have been sold for about \$1.07 per bushel for corn and market prices approximated these levels.

#### SOME UNCERTAINTIES

On the basis of the sharp reduction in feed grain carryover stocks achieved during 1961-62 and 1962-63, there has been widespread expectation that carryover stocks would be reduced to desired levels of about 45 million tons at the close of the 1963 feed grain marketing year, October 1, 1964. Even though farmers intend to plant 2.6 million acres more feed grains in 1963 than in 1962, if acre yields are lower as a result of less favorable weather, the desired reduction in stocks may be achieved. If, however, an upward trend in yields continues as in recent years, feed grain production in 1963, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture technicians, may be 8.5 million tons larger than in 1962. This is equivalent to over three-fourths the reduction in carryover stocks expected in 1962-63. In other words, it may take one or two more years of diversion programs similar to the 1963 program before stocks are reduced to desired levels.

If 1963 feed grain production is 8.5 million tons larger than in 1962, as now projected by USDA, it is improbable that the Commodity Credit Corporation will be able to sell all of its certified grain at the equivalent of \$1.07 per bushel plus carrying charges for corn. The Commodity Credit Corporation will have between 800 and 900 million bushels of grain covered by 1963 certificates to sell; yet, if 1963 feed grain production is as high as now projected, much less than this would be needed from CCC stocks to supplement current production in the 1963-64 marketing year. Under such conditions it is doubtful that market prices would be high enough to permit CCC to dispose of all its grains covered by certificates.

#### PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR 1964 AND 1965

This background indicates one of the reasons why I support the feed grain bill, now having hearings before our Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. We expect to report it this week, and take it up next week—and I refer to H.R. 4997—as passed by the House of Representatives. It provides for the continuation of a voluntary feed grains program for the 2 crop years 1964 and 1965. In this bill the Secretary of Agriculture is given sufficient authority to carry on programs combining the best features of the 1961, 1962, and 1963 programs. He also is given authority to grant bases to new feed grain producers and to allow county committees to take into account factors in addition to 1959-60 feed grain acreage history in setting individual farm bases.

This proposal has been criticized by some persons, including myself, as providing too much discretion for the Secretary of Agriculture. I do think, however, in view of the background I have just discussed and the fact that no one can predict what kind of weather we are going to have, it is well to have considerable flexibility of action in the Secretary of Agriculture, so he can make payments in accordance with the crops which will develop and the weather which we will have.

Criticism of H.R. 4997, as amended, centers on two points. It is alleged, first, that it gives too much discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture, and second, if enacted and the wheat marketing quota referendum carries, wheat producers will be permitted to produce wheat on feed grain base acres to the disadvantage of established feed grain producers.

It is true that substantial discretion would be granted the Secretary of Agriculture. If it were desired, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry might provide additional legislative history guidelines, without opening the bill for amendments, either in their committee report or in debate on the floor of the Senate. Generally acceptable guidelines might be to the effect that the Secretary should offer a program each year which would be expected to maintain or increase producers incomes, cost no more per acre of feed grains diverted than the average of the 1961, 1962, and 1963 programs, and make as rapid progress as possible in reducing feed grain stocks to desired levels. The desired level might be specified at 40 to 45 million tons if desired.

The criticism that passage of H.R. 4997 would result in the production of wheat on feed grain base acres overlooks the fact that, if wheat is grown on feed grain base acres, the producer first must have diverted a part of his feed grain base acres to conservation uses, as specified by the Secretary of Agriculture. Also, the wheat grown on feed grain base acres, on the average, will produce no more feed than if the land were planted to a feed grain. The adverse effects on feed grain and livestock producers of the wheat-feed grain substitution clause in the 1962 Agricultural Act appear to be less than the probable adverse effects resulting from a defeat of wheat marketing quotas.

Another criticism of the passage of feed grain legislation at this time is the belief that it would be inadequate or ineffective if the wheat marketing quota referendum for the 1964 crop were defeated on May 21. Under H.R. 4997, as amended, the Secretary of Agriculture could offer feed grain producers a program in 1964 which would assure all co-operators the announced price support level for their feed grains produced in 1964 at no greater total cost or cost per acre diverted than the average of the 1961-63 programs.

If the wheat marketing quota referendum is defeated, however, 200 million or more bushels of wheat may be produced in 1964 in excess of amounts that can be marketed through usual channels at home and abroad. This wheat in effect would be added to feed grain supplies and might result in little or no reduction in total grain stocks, even though 25 million feed grain acres or more were diverted to conservation uses under a 1964 feed grain program.

To sum up, I favor the proposal because, in the first place, it is voluntary. I think it is extremely important that it be a voluntary feed grain bill. I recognize that there may be too much discretion allowed the Secretary of Agriculture, and for that reason I would favor guidelines in the committee report so that there will be some restraint on the Secretary of Agriculture, particularly as to the payments he makes. In the second place, I think this bill contains provisions, in effect in 1961, 1962, and this year, which will provide for higher farm income. Finally, I think the bill will provide lower costs for the taxpayers.

I think any fair, dispassionate, and objective analysis will show that this program has cost about \$1 billion annually for the past 3 years. If we had not had provisions in the program for reducing production and if we had tried to maintain farm income anywhere near where it is, the cost would have been a great deal higher than it was, and would be higher in the future, than it will be if we pass this bill.

I am happy, as one who opposed the mandatory feed grain program proposed last year, to favor this bill. I am glad that compulsory proposal is out of the way this year and we can know what to expect in the coming 2 years, if this bill is passed.

#### SURE RISE IN INTEREST RATES DESTROYS ARGUMENT FOR TAX CUTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently the distinguished financial commentator, Sylvia Porter, discussed the inevitable fact that interest rates are going to rise continually, and probably very sharply, during this year and next year. Her analysis is as cogent and concise as any I have seen. She gives not one reason, but six for her statement: The economy is perking up. The Treasury is financing a huge deficit, and therefore is going to borrow larger sums of money. The Federal Treasury and the Federal Reserve is determined to finance the effort without inflation

which means to them with higher interest rates. The administration and the Federal Reserve System also feel that we must increase our interest rates, at least on Government operations, to keep money from flowing out of the country. Also the proposed tax cut is likely to put even more pressure on interest rates and drive them even higher.

I think this analysis is excellent. I happen to disagree with Sylvia Porter on the necessity for higher interest rates. I think a fair appraisal will show that we should make every effort to stop any rise in present interest rates. Also, this analysis establishes the fact that in addition to its other unfortunate consequences, a tax cut will shove interest rates up, faster and farther. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### INTEREST RATE RISE MAY BE ON WAY (By Sylvia Porter)

Every important financial-economic force in this country is now working to push interest rates up gradually in 1963-64.

This will mean that borrowers will pay a higher price for cash. The increases may be measured only in fractions, but on large sums borrowed for prolonged periods even a rise of one-fourth percent can run into big money.

This will mean that an investor in new bonds or mortgages will get a higher price for the cash he lends. Again, the increases may be measured only in fractions, but fractions can make an impressive difference in what you earn over a long period of time.

The chances that interest rates will go down in the months ahead are next to zero. At best they'll hold within this year's range. The greater probability is that they'll climb gradually from today's levels because:

1. The economy is perking up and this indicates a rising demand from private and public sources for funds to finance business expansion and modernization, homebuilding and home buying, installment purchases and a vast variety of other projects. There's plenty of credit available in our commercial banking system and in savings institutions now to meet foreseeable demands. There's no doubt that credit will be available for legitimate projects. But as the demand for money climbs to meet the supply, the pressure will be for a rise in the price of money. This always has been the pattern.

2. The Treasury will have to finance a huge deficit in the Federal budget in coming months. Just in July-December 1963, it will have to borrow between \$11 and \$13 billion. As the Treasury taps the market with its borrowings, it obviously will absorb an immense amount of money and this factor will help tilt interest rates upward.

3. While the Federal Reserve System will continue to supply funds to the banking system in order to avoid braking the economic advance, it will not "oversupply" the system. Flooding the money market with funds in a cycle of expanding business could lay the base for another inflationary spurt and this the Central Bank will fight.

4. Both the administration and the Federal Reserve System agree the deficits of this period should be financed in the least inflationary way possible—which means borrowing as much of the money as is feasible outside the banking system. To appeal to nonbank investors, the Treasury well may have to pay gradually higher rates on the securities it offers. It already is paying close to 3 percent for 90-day loans, over 4 percent on its long-term I.O.U.'s. It is a distinct possibility that in the future it will increase

the rate it pays on its savings bonds from today's maximum of 3½ percent to, say, 4 percent, in order to attract more funds from little investors.

5. The administration and the Federal Reserve System also agree that our interest rate level is a crucial weapon in trying to curb the outflow of gold. Because for years we have been spending so much more abroad than we have been earning abroad, our foreign creditors have built up tremendous short-term balances here which they can send abroad at will and turn into gold. To keep our creditors willing to maintain their balances in short-term U.S. securities, the interest rates on those securities must be high enough to appeal to our creditors, and Washington recognizes this.

6. Assuming substantial tax cuts are voted and these add new vigor to our economy, the Federal Reserve System will have much more freedom to act to control the money supply in order to combat inflationary tendencies and to nudge interest rates toward levels deemed desirable to protect our gold supply and dollar.

But not one force is operating now to push interest rates down. Rather, all appear to be moving in the opposite direction.

#### PAYOFF AID TO TITO: YUGOSLAVIA AND RUMANIA TO BUILD DAM TOGETHER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it has been announced in the past few days that Yugoslavia and Rumania are going to build a huge dam, at enormous cost, for the benefit of both economies; and that construction will start this year.

This is another indication of the fact that Yugoslavia is moving closer and closer to the Communist bloc, moving closer and closer to Moscow orientation, and is adapting its economy to fit into the economy of other Iron Curtain countries.

In the article by Hans Benedict, of the Associated Press, I came across the following statement:

Details of the financing have not been disclosed. The Soviet Union may be a silent partner in the project. Russian ships transport 37 percent of tonnage in the Romanian-Yugoslav section of the Danube.

Mr. President, there have been debates in the past, and there will be again, over whether we should continue to give the large amount of foreign aid to Yugoslavia in the future that we have given to it in the past. We have given Yugoslavia more than \$2 billion in foreign aid. I understand we have given more aid to this country than to any other so-called neutral country in the world.

On the basis of the recent record of Yugoslavia, it is not a neutral country. It is a Communist country. Tito says so. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Yugoslavia, Rumania To Build Dam Together" be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

#### YUGOSLAVIA, RUMANIA TO BUILD DAM TOGETHER

(By Hans Benedict)

VIENNA, AUSTRIA.—A gorge of torrential Danube waters between Yugoslavia and Rumania will be turned into a giant lake to help shipping and give the two countries the second biggest powerplant in Europe.

Under an agreement expected to be concluded next month, Yugoslav and Rumanian experts will start a joint \$300 million project in the Iron Gate Strait within 7 years. It calls for a dam and power station with an annual output of 10.7 billion kilowatt-hours, nearly as much as Russia's Volga River plant.

The dam will raise the level of the Danube upstream for about 75 miles, flooding the Rumanian town of Orsova and a dozen villages on both sides of the border. The population of 25,000 will be resettled.

The Danube, blue in the Johann Strauss waltz, is gray to most beholders. It rises in Germany and runs 1,750 miles, touching the capital cities of Vienna, Budapest, and Belgrade.

At the Iron Gate the river foams into whitecaps as it whirls over jagged rocks between cliffs 120 yards apart. Parts of old shipwrecks are still in the rocks.

The artificial lake is to hold more than 35 billion cubic feet of water. While the hydroelectric plant is to be financed by the two governments, another \$100 million will be contributed by other Danubian countries for a system of locks. The entire project is to be completed by 1972.

The feud between Yugoslavia and the Soviet bloc in the Stalinist era stalled co-operation. In early 1956, when Moscow-Belgrade relations were thawing again, Rumanian-Yugoslav talks began. The Hungarian revolution interrupted the talks again. They were eventually resumed in 1960.

Details of the financing have not been disclosed. The Soviet Union may be a silent partner in the project. Russian ships transport 37 percent of tonnage in the Rumanian-Yugoslav section of the Danube.

The raising of the water level will make Belgrade accessible to ships of up to 5,000 tons. The dam, 1,300 yards long and 160 feet high, also will serve as a road and railway bridge, cutting the distance between Belgrade and Bucharest.

Two other international Danube power projects have been shelved due to financial difficulties. One was a joint Austrian-Czechoslovak dam across the river between Wolfsthal and Bratislava. A Czechoslovak-Hungarian project of four dams also has been waiting since 1956 to be realized.

#### BIRMINGHAM CIVIL RIGHTS SITUATION

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the unhappy events of the last few days in Birmingham should shake the conscience and sense of justice of the American people. And when I speak of the American people, I do so not to isolate the people of Alabama for, although their officials may be supported by many of their people, I am sure that there are many Alabamians who do not support their extreme action.

The use of dogs against human beings—fellow citizens not charged with any serious crime against the government or their fellow man, but simply seeking their constitutional rights as citizens, and desiring equal treatment under the law as human beings—is reprehensible. Today the administration is seeking a truce, and a truce is needed to avoid further injury to life. But the sad point is that the administration must seek a truce, and cannot fully enforce the substantive rights for which Negro citizens are marching and demonstrating, because the administration has failed to seek legislative action which would give it the statutory authority

and means to support and enforce the rights that the Negroes claim and to which they are entitled.

These fellow citizens claim the equal right of voting guaranteed by the 15th amendment to the Constitution; they claim the right for their children to attend desegregated schools, held by the Supreme Court of the United States almost 10 years ago in the case of Brown against Board of Education of Topeka to be their right under the 14th amendment; they claim the equal right to use public facilities, whether in control of the Federal, State, or local government, and to the use of facilities in all forms of interstate commerce, all of which rights have been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. They claim also the right to equal use of public businesses, licensed by the State and held out by their owners as available for public use.

We know that every municipality has the authority to prescribe limitations on parades and demonstrations, and it may be true that the Negroes who have been parading are in violation of these municipal ordinances. But it can hardly be argued that the purpose of these ordinances is to prevent fellow citizens from asking for their fundamental constitutional rights. And even though a truce may be secured, we cannot believe that these demonstrations will be ended until these constitutional rights are recognized.

This administration has at its disposal a voting rights law enacted under the administration of President Eisenhower. But the Civil Rights Commission has reported that the provision which enables referees to enroll Negro voters has been very little used.

Although President Eisenhower and Attorney General Brownell asked for authority to enable the Attorney General to intervene in the name of the United States in school desegregation cases to secure a speedier acceptance of the Brown case, this administration has not and apparently will not ask for this power. Such legislation would lift the unbearable financial burden of prosecuting suits from the backs of individuals and transfer it to the United States, where it belongs.

The right of access to private businesses has not yet been clarified. The issue is in the courts and in justice, I must say that I understand the administration supports this right. Nevertheless, the administration has taken no action in the Congress, as I believe it could, to secure the enactment of legislation holding—as Justice Harlan did in his dissenting opinion in the civil rights cases many years ago—that these businesses, being licensed by the States, come within the purview of the 14th amendment.

In that great civil rights case in 1883, Justice Harlan, the grandfather of the present Justice, wrote a dissenting opinion in which he advanced the position that, because the State licensed businesses that held themselves out for use by the public, they fell within the purview of the 14th amendment. I believe legislation to this effect would be constitutional. I believe that the Su-

preme Court, when it again comes to this issue, will support the position taken by Justice Harlan.

The net result of the failure of the administration to seek statutory authority is that it is today prevented from taking timely and positive action, within the framework of law, to secure the rights for which these citizens strive.

The need for the Federal Government to have statutory authority to deal with this type situation can be applied to the progress of school desegregation in individual school districts. If the administration had statutory authority, and if there were a refusal to obey the mandate of the Court to desegregate, our Government would intervene. If the administration would seek, as President Eisenhower sought, authority for the Attorney General to intervene in school desegregation cases, it would be acting before the fact—instead of after the fact, as it is compelled to do today.

I apply this reasoning also to the use of public businesses. Today, because Negroes are insisting upon their right—as they believe it to be—to use public businesses, and because there is a local ordinance against parading, the Federal Government finds itself sitting on the outside and must ask for a truce. If there had been a finding by the Supreme Court—or if legislation had been enacted by Congress that the States come under the 14th amendment with respect to businesses licensed for public use—then today the Federal Government would be acting in support of the right of access of these individuals, instead of being forced to seek a truce with the Alabama officials who are using force and coercion, water hoses and dogs against human beings.

I realize that enforcement of the law is difficult when it is opposed by many citizens of a community, for consent is an element in our system of law. But consent will not come easily unless there is enforcement of the law by the Federal Government, against officials as well as private citizens. This administration has rendered itself unable to intercede fully and effectively in the enforcement of the law because it has not sought statutory authority from Congress in school desegregation and public business cases.

I must say that this indictment lies not only against the administration but also against the Congress. While many civil rights bills have been introduced in Congress, the effort has not been made on the part of Members of either the House or Senate—and I include myself as one of them—to at least bring up for consideration those bills and take whatever time is necessary for their perfection and passage.

The two great parties, with the exception of some leaders, are paying lip service to the cause of civil rights. Under the administration of President Eisenhower, two civil rights bills were passed—and they were passed because his administration and the Republican leadership of the Congress, aided by Democrats deeply interested in civil rights, did not weaken in their efforts to secure their passage.

I dislike doing so, but I am sorry to say that I believe the purpose of the

Republican Party in the field of civil rights has deteriorated since President Eisenhower's administration. If there is any party which should be united on civil rights, it is the Republican Party. We are not split sectionally, and it cannot be charged of our party as it can of the Democratic Party, that it does not want to offend its southern wing. Yet, whether it is for the hope by candidates of gaining votes in a convention, or for the hope of electoral votes from the South in 1964, we are compromising the issue which brought the Republican Party into being.

Some in our party, in spite of such outrages as have occurred in Birmingham, and in other places in the country even outside the South, still maintain that the issues of civil rights are local ones to be resolved by the States. Such an argument would lead one to believe that Lincoln never argued that human rights and human dignity were national issues; that he never fought the same argument of Douglas that these issues could be determined locally—and on this argument made the Republican Party a national party, a party which moved the conscience of the country and the world.

I believe the South will have a two-party system, and a growing Republican Party, because its people know that will be best for their section and for the country. If our party uses the expedient argument of States' rights with respect to constitutional and human rights—in an effort to secure convention or electoral votes—it is possible we might win a few Southern States in 1964. But in the long run, such a position will destroy the Republican Party, and worse, it will do a great wrong because it will be supporting the denial of the constitutional and human rights of our citizens.

Mr. President, there are many civil rights bills before the Senate which could be acted upon. In what I have said, I do not wish to draw attention to any bills which I have introduced or intend to introduce. But I do intend to implement what I have said today by the introduction of proposed legislation which will meet some of the specific issues which I believe have played a part in the great drive of our fellow citizens to secure their constitutional and human rights.

#### ARBOR DAY COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, one of the most important events on the spring calendar in Nebraska each year is the observance of Arbor Day at the home of J. Sterling Morton, the holiday's founder.

This year's observance on April 21 was no exception. The speaker was John Rees, a Lithuanian refugee who has become widely known for his fight against communism.

Reflecting on the decades throughout which Arbor Day has been marked at Nebraska City's beautiful Arbor Lodge, Mr. Morton's home which has for many years been a State park, I recalled the efforts in 1932 to obtain a commemorative stamp to mark the 60th anniversary

of Arbor Day and the 100th anniversary of the birth of J. Sterling Morton, one of the most distinguished Secretaries of Agriculture in our history.

Mr. Frank A. Bartling, longtime postmaster at Nebraska City, and one of the most ardent supporters of Arbor Day, conceived the idea for the stamp. He has favored me with his account of Nebraska City's efforts to obtain the commemorative stamp and the results thereof.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Bartling's history of the Arbor Day commemorative stamp printed in the RECORD.

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

ARBOR DAY COMMEMORATIVE 2-CENT POSTAGE STAMP ISSUE, NEBRASKA CITY, NEBR., APRIL 22, 1932

(History by Frank A. Bartling, postmaster, 1932)

New Year's Day, 1932, as I was finishing some routine postal work at my office and thinking of the postal business for the past year which revealed a falling off in business in this city, thoughts came to mind as to stimulating interest in Nebraska City. My thoughts drifted to the dilemma of the chamber of commerce committee on Arbor Day in finding some new ideas on celebrating the 100th anniversary of the birth of J. Sterling Morton and the 60th anniversary of the founding of Arbor Day. The idea flashed to my mind that this town should secure a commemorative postage stamp issue for Arbor Day. On the spur of the moment, I hastily typed a brief note to Mr. J. H. Sweet, editor of the News-Press, suggesting that if his paper and the chamber of commerce would back the idea, this city could have a stamp issue for Arbor Day, April 22, 1932. I delivered the note with other news items of the post office that morning and received no response immediately. However, I had conveyed my ideas to Mr. M. R. Thorp, assistant postmaster, who at that time was chairman of the chamber of commerce and soon a small news item appeared in the News-Press mentioning the idea.

However, several prominent Nebraska Citizens, Mr. J. W. Steinhart and Mr. N. C. Abbott, became enthusiastic over the plan and letters were written by the chamber of commerce and other citizens to the Post Office Department and the U.S. Senator R.B. Howell and Congressman John H. Morehead asking that this anniversary be given a commemorative stamp issue.

The Postmaster General replied that owing to other commemorative issues in 1932, especially the Washington Bicentennial, no Arbor Day 2-cent stamp could be issued. (This exchange of correspondence is in the files.)

Not willing to be defeated in such a historic cause, the chamber of commerce enlisted the support of Lincoln and Omaha chambers, in presenting strong pressure to bear on the Post Office Department, and on Senator Howell, Congressman Morehead and Baldrige to get the issue. Several businessmen and myself sent letters to our Nebraska representatives. Senator Howell partially declined to assist because he had applied for a "Buffalo Bill" W. F. Cody commemorative stamp for North Platte, Nebr. On the other hand, Congressman Morehead became very interested in the issue and worked hard and with perseverance. He was given valuable help by Congressman Malcolm Baldrige, of Omaha. (Letters from Mr. Morehead from the files give evidence of his efforts.) After the first efforts from Nebraska City, Omaha, and Lincoln, the

status of the stamp issue remained quiet and dormant for about 4 weeks. I became restless and uneasy, so on Friday, March 11, I telegraphed Mr. Morehead advising him that Nebraska City was urging progress and asked him to report status of the matter. The next morning, I received a reply by telegraph stating that the stamp issue was approved by the Postmaster General. (This correspondence is also in files.)

Then detailed instructions from the Third Assistant Postmaster General, Division of Stamps Office, began to be received at our office. Preparations were made at the local office for a heavy business. I had very much to do and worked hard for 6 weeks previous to the holiday and for several weeks following it, in order that the handling of such a large volume of business at our office would be taken care of with the least possible errors. Incoming letters inclosing coins, checks, drafts, and thousands of money orders, accompanied with letters of instructions accumulated. I soon realized that our regular force could not do the work alone and after exchange of correspondence with Post Office Department officials in Washington, I was assured that they would give us help and ample expense money to carry out the task.

Department officials had experience handling other commemorative stamp issues, so their letters gave me plain instructions how to proceed. Also experienced supervisors to help us were sent here from Washington, April 11. Mrs. Myrtle C. Shaughnessy (widow of former Second Assistant Postmaster General) and Charles Anderson, traveling mechanic of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General Office, arrived. Mr. Anderson brought a special canceling machine equipped with a cast-die, worded "Nebraska City, Nebr., April 22, 1932." Within a few days after the arrival of these two officials, came Mrs. L. P. Shawen from the office of M. L. Eideness, Jr., Chief, Division of Stamps. Mr. Eideness, Jr., was to be here for the holiday but was unable to attend and so sent his representative, Richard Breaden, for that day. The last week before the holiday was an exceedingly busy one. Temporary postal workrooms were set up in three rooms on the second floor of the post office building, April 12, 10 days prior to the holiday. Then the entire Arbor Day stamp business was handled upstairs. Incoming mail was sorted downstairs and all Arbor mail taken upstairs. Mrs. Shaughnessy had charge of issuing stamps to extra clerks and had supervision of sales and cash. She bought stamps from the wholesale stock downstairs, sorted and reissued the stock to clerks engaged in affixing them to envelopes. Mr. Anderson took charge of the canceling machine and the dispatching and Mrs. Shawen handled correspondence and special business. Three hundred thousand Arbor Day 2-cent commemorative stamps were in the first shipment received here from Washington.

All during the Arbor Day stamp business, I worked long hours, including Sundays and was very tired out at the close. Extra clerks received 65 cents per hour and their pay for the time during this rush of business was from \$35 to \$101, and regular clerks received overtime pay. Assistant Postmaster Thorp and myself received no extra pay for our overtime and even the large increase in receipts failed to give us an increase in annual pay.

Stamp affixing to first day covers was not confined to post office or entirely to post office employees. Individuals had advertised in stamp magazines that orders would be taken for souvenir envelopes and mailing thereof, so several types of souvenirs were on sale. Some local dealers booked large orders and early on Arbor Day were at the stamp window when I opened the window at 5 o'clock in the morning on April 22, 1932, Arbor Day.

A number of stamp dealers came to the city and others in the East has engaged people in Nebraska City to take their orders to buy stamps here and affix them to souvenir envelopes which they shipped here for cancellation as first day covers.

The commemorative issue was authorized by Postmaster General Walter F. Brown on March 12, 1932, and Arbor Day came on Friday, April 22. Orders for stamps enclosing first day covers were first received in Nebraska City on March 20, and continued to come until April 22; the peak of the load was about April 14.

As temporary employees for this stamp issue, 22 persons were employed as extra help, the total payroll for these employees was \$1,499. First day sales in Nebraska City, 540,000 2-cent stamps; 279,409 pieces of mail matter went through the special canceling machine; 1,151 pieces special delivery mail; 51,000 airmail letters, and 610 pieces registered mail. All this required 59 pouches, these being dispatched on the holiday, April 22. Total money orders paid, 8,150, in amounts from 2 cents up. Our money order accounts were not completed until May 30. The total number of Arbor Day 2-cent commemorative stamps printed was 66,182,900, being sold over the United States the day after the issue in Nebraska City.

The Arbor Day stamp bears the picture of Ruth and Alvin Hall, Jr., children of Alvin Hall, employed in the U.S. Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Washington, D.C. When it was necessary to furnish subject matter for the Arbor Day stamp, Hall's children consented to pose for it. It portrays the children planting a Japanese cherry tree in front of their Washington home. The engraver slightly altered the original photograph in order to make the picture suitable for stamp engraving.

On the day of the celebration, members of the Morton family came to Nebraska City as the honored guests. First guest to call at the post office, of the Morton family, were Mrs. Carl Morton, city, and her daughter, Mrs. Martha Morton Lattner, and daughter, Dubuque, Iowa. Mr. and Mrs. Joy Morton, his son, J. Sterling Morton and his son, Joy Morton 2d, and Betty Morton, granddaughter, all from Chicago, came to the office later in the morning. I escorted all the guests through the post office and explained to them the handling of mail. Mr. Joy Morton displayed a keen interest in the affair and he and his son asked questions and commented on the large amount of foreign mail. The party spent about an hour around the office and on leaving, Mr. Joy Morton complimented me on the success of the event.

Weather conditions were very favorable on the holiday. A large crowd came to the city and attended the tree planting ceremonies at Arbor Lodge and visited scenes of interest in the city. Many visitors from over the State were here.

The day closed with a banquet at Memorial Building attended by about 500 people.

The Morton family being guests of honor and naturally the center of interest, with Mr. T. W. McCullough, editor of the Omaha Bee-News, as speaker of the evening. His address was long, of the formal type, so a little tiresome to some listeners.

The interesting talk of the evening was by Mr. Joy Morton, who spoke reminiscently of the family during their residence here and some events of his boyhood days here. His son, J. Sterling Morton 2d, followed with a brief address.

#### ALBUMS OF RECORDS MADE BY FOUR U.S. MILITARY BANDS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the May 1963 issue of *Footlight*, the National Cultural Center's newsletter,

attention is drawn to the record albums recently made by the four U.S. military bands. The proceeds from the sale of these records will go to benefit the National Cultural Center.

As Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Board of the Cultural Center, pointed out in *Footlight*, the pressing of these records represents unique cooperation among widely diverse groups, including the RCA Victor Record Division of the Radio Corp. of America, the Department of Defense, the American Federation of Musicians, the American Federation of Television Artists, leading music composers, arrangers and publishers, the personnel of the military bands, and the people associated with the Cultural Center.

The selections included in the albums represent the standard songs which have become integral parts of our American musical heritage. The records will be a worthwhile addition to any music lover's collection, and the sale of the records will give every American the opportunity to make his or her contribution toward making the National Cultural Center a reality.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* an excerpt from the May 1963 edition of *Footlight*, including the remarks of President Kennedy, recipient of the first pressings of the albums.

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

#### SERVICE BAND RECORDINGS

On May 1, recordings made by the four U.S. military bands—Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force—went on sale to the public. This is the first time such recordings have been commercially available. On April 23, the first pressings of the albums were presented to President Kennedy in his office at the White House. Making the presentation were George R. Marek, vice president of RCA Victor Records, Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the Board of Trustees, National Cultural Center, and the four conductors; Lt. Col. Hugh Curry, U.S. Army; Lt. Col. Albert Schoepper, U.S. Marine Corps; Lt. Anthony Mitchell, U.S. Navy; and Capt. Harry H. Meuser, U.S. Air Force, for Col. George S. Howard, who was ill.

In accepting the records, the President said, "I want to express my appreciation to RCA for having made these recordings which, I understand, are unusually well done. I understand that the National Cultural Center will receive 95 cents on each album, and it will be a great help to the Center.

"In addition, I am very grateful to the Musicians' Union, which has waived all its interests and rights in this matter. This is the first time that the American military bands have gone into this area, and it has been done because of the strong feeling by the industry and by the union that the Cultural Center will serve the country as well as the performing arts.

"Most of all we are grateful to our country's military bands—the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force—for recording the albums. I hope that everyone buys them. It will give people a chance to hear great band music and to make a contribution to the development of the Cultural Center, which belongs to Washington, which is part of the Nation. I will enjoy playing the records myself."

#### DESIGN AND PROGRAM OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, imagine the following situation:

Robert S. McNamara points his pencil at the man across the desk. "What does the program definition study indicate?" he asks. "The project is certain to succeed, Mr. McNamara," the man replies. "We have been studying it for 5 years. The design studies show that all phases of the program are within the state of the art. Cost effectiveness has been thoroughly analyzed. The computer studies show that we should meet the target date with no significant cost overruns. There is no question that this project meets all the required specifications. We recommend we go ahead with this one and that the alternative projects be canceled."

"Splendid," says Mr. McNamara. "Cancel all the other cars; we'll just build the Edsel."

That conversation, of course, never took place. But it is used as the lead of a thoughtful editorial in the April 29 issue of *Missiles and Rockets* to make the point that as the president of the Ford Motor Co., Mr. McNamara would never have committed that company to a single design, no matter how well studied.

Yet, as William J. Coughlin points out in the editorial aptly titled, "The Fallible Man," as Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara seems to have no qualms about committing this Nation's future to a single design concept.

The editorial asks the question of what would have happened in World War II "if we had canceled the B-17 and built only the B-24; if we had canceled the P-51 and built only the P-47."

Mr. Coughlin writes:

We will always have with us the fallible man. The man who might cancel the F-86 in favor of the F-84 and never find out about his mistake until the Russian MiGs swept down across the Yalu.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* the editorial entitled "The Fallible Man," published in the April 29, 1963, issue of *Missiles and Rockets*.

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

#### THE FALLIBLE MAN

Robert S. McNamara pointed his pencil at the man across the desk. "What does the program definition study indicate?" he asked. "The project is certain to succeed, Mr. McNamara," the man replied. "We have been studying it for 5 years. The design studies show that all phases of the program are within the state of the art. Cost effectiveness has been thoroughly analyzed. The computer studies show that we should meet the target date with no significant cost overruns. There is no question that this project meets all the required specifications. We recommend we go ahead with this one and that the alternative projects be canceled."

"Splendid," said McNamara. "Cancel all the other cars; we'll just build the Edsel."

Secretary of Defense McNamara will be the first to assure you that no such conversation ever took place. If it had, the Ford Motor Co. today would be a financial shambles. Edsel was a dismal failure. Yet the project had been thoroughly analyzed by

some of the finest minds in the automotive business and given the go-ahead by the management of one of the most successful firms in the industry. These experienced businessmen, operating in a familiar environment, were whipped by the unknowns.

Why do we bring up the Edsel?

Because we are certain that Mr. McNamara, if he had been Ford president at that time, never would have committed his company's future to a single design, no matter how well studied.

Yet, as Secretary of Defense, he apparently has no qualms about committing his Nation's future to a single design concept.

As we study the philosophy of Defense Research and Engineering, we find men of high intelligence taking a highly unintelligent approach to the weapon systems which this Nation will need in the future. They seem convinced that until it can be proven absolutely that a total system will work, until all question-marks are answered, until all risks are eliminated, no go-ahead should be given for development of a given project. Once committed to that philosophy of certainty, it is only a brief step to the belief that you need only one design. If you are so certain the first will work, why build two?

Show paper proposals to a scientist and he can assure you, after study, that one is more likely to succeed than another. Show them to an engineer and he'll tell you that the best way to find out is to build both of them and test them.

The dangers in our defense organization today lie in the fact that the heavily scientific organization of Defense Research and Engineering is making decisions that more practical engineers would decline to make without testing of hardware.

Today, as we have pointed out before, three-fourths of the new projects under study by the Joint Chiefs of Staff come down from D.D.R. & E.—a complete reversal of previous years when proposals flowed largely from the more practical minds of men in the military and industry.

We are told that the new single-design approach is necessary because weapon systems today are so costly that we cannot afford to embark on two parallel projects. We say the reverse is true; we cannot afford to abandon dual approaches—due to the simple fact that once wholly committed to the wrong road it becomes impossible to turn back because of the sheer size of the financial outlay already made. The cost of today's projects makes it imperative that dual approaches be explored before commitment to the entire weapons system.

Why not explore both Gemini and Dynasoar technology? Why not explore two TFX prototypes? No one can say now that one approach or another will be the successful one—paper studies just won't do the job.

There would be no problem, of course, if we had an infallible man as Secretary of Defense, one who could count on his advisers always to give him the correct advice and one who could always make the right decision.

Let's turn back the pages of recent aviation history and muse on what a single design approach might have done for the Nation's well-being.

Turn back to the days just before World War II. Paper proposals for two fighter planes are being studied by Defense Research and Engineering.

"It is quite apparent," says a high Defense official, "that we don't need both these fighter aircraft. One will do. Cancel the P-38. We'll build only the P-39."

A few weeks later, more proposals are laid on his desk.

"Why should we go into two costly bomber programs?" he asks. "Cancel the B-17. We'll build only the B-24."

Months pass.

"Cancel the P-51," he says. "We'll build only the P-47."

We leave to those with more imagination the ruminations on what course World War II might have taken if we had been forced to fight it without the P-38, P-51, and B-17. The Nation certainly might have saved a great deal of money and won the war quite handily, of course, if we had possessed a high Defense official who unerringly could have selected the P-38, P-51, and B-17 and canceled the less successful alternatives. No such man existed then and none exists today.

We always will have with us the fallible man. The man who might cancel the F-86 in favor of the F-84 and never find out about his mistake until the Russian Migs swept down across the Yalu.

When it comes to military weapons, this Nation cannot afford to guess. We must explore all alternative approaches to the furthest point in hardware that we possibly can afford. We must not let fallible man make irrevocable decisions.

We hope Mr. McNamara remembers the Edsel.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the pending business before the Senate, S. 537, will provide for a more effective evaluation of budget requirements of executive agencies of the Federal Government.

Both historically and legally, one of the major functions of Congress—if not our most important single one—is that of controlling Federal spending and taxing, and the financial policies of the Government.

Yet I do not believe we are performing that function adequately today. In passing on Federal appropriations, we proceed primarily on the basis of the proposals made to us by the President, rather than creating our own policy guides. The initiative is left with the President, although theoretically Congress has the power to control. Furthermore, even when it comes to passing on the details of appropriations for each program and bureau, we rely largely on the analysis and data presented to us by the agency itself and by the administration's Budget Bureau, rather than developing our own material.

The bill S. 537, which would establish a joint congressional committee on the Budget, is intended to repair that situation by providing us with the means for doing our own analysis of requested appropriations, of preparing our own material on the budget, and developing our own policies to control Federal financial policies. The proposed joint committee would have a small staff to carry on the kind of study and analysis to which reference is made. As I envisage it, this joint committee would operate in a manner similar to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which provides expert technical assistance to both the Senate Finance and the House Ways and Means Committees.

It is recognized that at present both the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees have highly efficient staffs, but in practice the men on those staffs must necessarily devote full time to the processing of the particular appropriation bills to which they are assigned. The staff of the proposed new joint

committee would have time to carry on studies of longer range and broader scope, including those which cut across individual appropriation bills.

Creation of this new joint committee would not be a radical departure from the kind of arrangement Congress has already created with respect to other matters. Furthermore, it would not infringe on the prerogatives of either House, since the joint committee and its staff would remain firmly under the control of members of the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses.

Spending has skyrocketed in the last few years. For fiscal year 1962, President Eisenhower requested new obligatory authority of about \$81 billion. For fiscal year 1964, we have been asked to approve new obligatory authority amounting to \$108 billion. This is an increase of \$27 billion or 33½ percent in the short span of 2 calendar years.

I submit that Congress is obligated to improve its machinery for coping with administration requests for appropriations, if we are seriously to claim that we control the purse strings of the Government. Enactment of Senate bill 537 will be an effective step for improvement in this regard.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I should like to join in the comments made by the senior Senator from Nebraska concerning Senate bill 537. I wish to associate myself with his views, and to make a comment on that subject.

Mr. President, the cosponsorships of Senate bill 537 by 77 Members of the Senate indicates that the merits of this bill are generally recognized. A long discussion of it by a new cosponsor is, therefore, unnecessary. Nevertheless, I wish to take the occasion to comment on the chief sponsor of the bill and to make a brief observation on the proposition before us.

I am persuaded that the Senate and the Nation owe the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] a vote of deep appreciation for his constant and consistent support of the cause of an effective Congress. His efforts since 1950 to secure the enactment of this particular bill typify his determination to accomplish that which he believes is right and necessary.

Mr. President, regardless of whether our colleagues at the south end of the Capitol see fit to pass this measure this year or in a subsequent year, we have a clear obligation again to make an expression on this matter.

On the bill itself, I should like to make one point which in my judgment justifies enactment of the bill: If Congress is to remain a constructive, effective, and coequal branch of our National Government, Congress must exercise an informed and independent judgment concerning the volume, the direction, and the priority of our national efforts. The most effective participation this branch possesses is in connection with its ability and its duty to control the flow of money to the administrative agencies. Our best intentions will not be satisfied, nor will the Nation's interests be served, if we cannot assure proper utilization of the

vast financial resources which we siphon from the pocketbooks of the citizens and redirect through Government programs.

I have heard it said that the best way to learn one's way around a strange city is to drive a taxicab. In similar manner, I suggest the best way to learn one's way around Government is to try to trace what happens to the tax dollars. There is no better way to know and to understand the Government than to know where its money comes from and where it is spent.

All Members of this body have a sincere desire to act from an informed position upon the many issues which confront us. As I seek to understand the budget, I must say that the one-way streets and dead end streets, the detours, and the stop lights make the task far from easy. The budget document, while neatly assembled, is not always a helpful roadmap. I am sure the frustration I have experienced in this area is shared by many of my colleagues.

This condition—the size and the complexity of our Government and the size and complexity of our national budget—is worthy of our serious attention.

I would hope that as a result of the work of the proposed joint committee, we would have available data compiled independently of that furnished by witnesses and administering agencies. Often we are in the position of having to judge an issue based upon the evidence and the case submitted only by the proponents. Honorable as their intentions may be, we should not be compelled to rely upon only such evidence.

I would anticipate frequent evaluations of continuing programs. Very frequently we direct our analysis to programs which are new or call for increased funds, whereas programs with fairly constant fiscal demands are not as carefully scrutinized for value received or for their need to exist at all.

Certainly we need more realistic projections of the future cost of new programs. We are in the habit of starting a new program of nominal cost, only to find that the first appropriation is just "seed" money. These programs later return to us, and demand more support. We should know what we are getting into, and we should be in a position to provide to the administration guidance regarding our future intentions. This can be done by having available to the Congress and to the administration detailed projections, as part of our legislative record.

We should have available a realistic view of authorized spending. Each year we authorize vast programs. It may be that these authorizations are easily passed because it is understood that the actual appropriation of money is not involved. We assume that the appropriations process will protect the taxpayers. We need to have a better understanding of what we are committed to and of how real these obligations are.

Mr. President, in my opinion, these are a few of the very real needs which a joint committee on the budget and a competent staff will satisfy.

#### U.S. POLICY TOWARD AFRICA AND THE EMERGING NATIONS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful analyses of the shortcomings of our current policy toward Africa and the emerging nations is contained in a recent article written by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

In the blunt terms which are characteristic of the Senator, he maintains that "as things now stand, we are not helping the African masses very much, and we are not helping ourselves at all."

No one can quarrel with that statement. Clearly, as Senator GOLDWATER suggests, now is the time for a fresh approach to the problem, and a rethinking, and perhaps discarding, of some of our outmoded notions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senator GOLDWATER'S "How Do You Stand, Sir?" column, distributed by the Los Angeles Times Syndicate for April 11.

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

##### HOW DO YOU STAND, SIR?

(By U.S. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER)

Our entire African foreign policy needs a careful reexamination. For, as things now stand, we are not helping the African masses very much, and we are not helping ourselves at all.

The United States opposes colonialism in Africa. Unquestionably, this is right in theory. But in practice, some unpleasant developments have arisen.

Since 1956, 27 new African countries have been admitted to the United Nations. Most of these are in economic trouble, despite aid from the European countries which formerly ruled them. Almost without exception, the economic situation in the new states has deteriorated. Moreover, the trend toward dictatorship and personal rule is marked, as the personal extravagance and inflationary policies of many of the rulers and their entourage have been.

Equally disturbing is the nationalism and extremism in most of the new states. Anti-European sentiment is strong and seems to be rising all over Africa.

Kenya, the British colony, is not yet free, but already the white farmers are leaving. The chances are heavy that their property will be expropriated.

Freedom for the Belgian Congo was followed by outbreaks of violence which resulted in atrocities and murders and destruction of property. The exodus of the Europeans which followed that declaration of independence is one reason for the sorry state in which the Congo finds itself today.

There is such a thing as freedom too soon. This is exemplified in the Belgian Congo and in some other states as well. The Belgians claim we put pressure on them to get out of the Congo, and now it is fully apparent that the Congo was not ready to run its own affairs. Informed leaders claim the chaos there is likely to continue for a number of years.

Meanwhile, the United States has committed itself to back the Congo Government. Already we have put many millions of dollars into the country, one way or another. The total sum in 1962 was over \$200 million. We will, of course, give the Congo much more before we are through.

Cyrille Adoula, Premier of the Congo, is openly supporting a movement to drive the Portuguese out of the nearby Province of Angola. He has donated land for a camp which is training troops for an invasion of Angola. The men are being supplied with arms by Ben Bella, the Algerian leader who pledged his support to Castro right after he visited the United States to engage in foreign aid talks.

If we permit Adoula to carry out his plans, it will amount to our assisting an attack on the Portuguese, since we are Adoula's principal backer. And because Angola is no more ready for self-government than was the Congo, the eviction of the Portuguese from that Province will simply give us one more country to support.

Many of the new African States are too small to be viable. Others lack the necessary resources. Experts say there are only about five states with the area and resources required to permit them to take care of themselves. These are Nigeria, the Congo, Ghana, Tanganyika, and the Sudan. But these sorely need the technical and administrative skills of the whites, as do the other new African nations.

Today, the drive against colonialism in Africa continues unabated. As it moves into South Africa, it encounters increasing resistance. The problems multiply and increase in size.

So, I suggest, the time has come for us to take stock of our policies. Perhaps the time has come to try out some basis for cooperation between whites and natives before we insist that the whites abdicate entirely, for it has become obvious that a satisfactory working relationship between the races is necessary for any real African progress. Our present policy is not providing such a relationship.

How do you stand, sir?

#### THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in these days when big government seems to be steadily growing bigger, many of us are concerned to know just how the role of government in our life is to be defined. There would appear to be no better definition than that given by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON in his speech before the "Forum of the Future," at Charleston, W. Va., on Thursday, April 25, 1963.

Taking his cue from the West Virginia State motto, "Mountaineers Are Always Free," the Vice President described government as mankind's most powerful—and most fallible—creation. As developed by freemen, it is and must always remain a servant of the people. Better government, he pointed out, not simply more government, is our aim. The success of our Union is due, Vice President JOHNSON said, to the fact that it has never attempted to exert any power other than that granted to it freely at the polls.

Reviewing the jealous guarding of freedom in the Mountain State's first 100 years, the Vice President boldly envisioned the role of government in the next 100 years as a four-pronged instrument for achieving social progress by means of education, exploration of space, expansion of our economy, and conservation of natural resources.

Because the role of government is such an important question in all of our minds

today, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

(By LYNDON B. JOHNSON)

One hundred years ago—on June 20, 1863—the State of West Virginia was admitted to the Union. In that year, the soil of our land ran with tragic blood as American fought American as an outgrowth of their differences over what the role of government should be.

The topic assigned to me for this "Forum of the Future" has been—and continues to be—the most controversial, the most divisive, and the most nearly continuous issue of our national life from the Continental Congress to the present.

Whether we speak of the Nation, of an individual State, or of any of the local areas served by the 91,000 constituted governments of our land, we cannot look into the future and say with confidence what the role of government will be 100 years, 10 years or even 1 year hence. This question is answered anew each time the people vote. This process is one of the great sources of strength of our system—and of our freedoms.

Government is mankind's most powerful invention. It is also among the least perfect and most fallible of his works. Many more governments have failed than have succeeded. Our own—still less than 200 years old—has outlived virtually every government which existed at the time of its formation, largely because of the constant scrutiny it received—at all levels—by people jealous of their liberties.

This spirit has a long history in West Virginia. Inhabitants of these mountains petitioned the British Crown for self-government long before the Colonies declared their independence. West Virginians have given more than lip service to the slogan, "Mountaineers Are Always Free."

The American view toward government was well expressed more than 100 years ago in a story related by the writer and philosopher, Henry Thoreau. In his Journal, Thoreau related this personal experience: "I went to the store the other day to buy a bolt for our front door, for as I told the storekeeper, the Governor was coming here. 'Aye,' said he, 'And the legislature, too.' 'Then, I will take two bolts,' said I. He said that there had been a steady demand for bolts and locks of late, for our protectors were coming."

(Of course, I trust the Governor and the members of the legislature who are present will bear in mind that Thoreau did not have the privilege of living in West Virginia.)

I believe the point is made. When we consider the question of the role of government, we consider the question which has provoked the strongest feelings of Americans through the years—and we establish the one fact which underlies our discussion here. That is the fact that for the next 100 years, the role of government in West Virginia—and in the Nation—will be determined by the will of the people themselves.

As Governor of the State of New York, a very great American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, said more than 30 years ago: "The duty of the state toward its citizens is the duty of the servant to its master."

Our present debates on the role of government are obsessed with issues of size and cost. Some regard big government as an end in itself. Others believe big government is an evil in itself. The many details of these debates are unlikely soon to be settled. If we have settled on any national consensus about the role of government,

however, it is upon the concept of government as servant—rather than as master.

Government is not made benevolent or tyrannical by its smallness or its bigness. The decisive test is performance. Government is good—or it is not good—in proportion as it performs what the people need it to perform: neither less nor more, neither too little nor too much.

In the earlier years of this century, Samuel Gompers, when asked what labor wanted, answered with a single word: "More." If many Americans today were asked what they wanted of government, their instinct might be to answer: "Less."

But big government is a fact of our national life. In 1929, the transactions of government—Federal, State, and local—represented less than 10 percent of our gross national product. At the start of this decade, such transactions accounted for nearly 30 percent. We cannot dismiss this size, the rate of growth, or the broad implications of the relationship of governmental policies to our whole economy and society. But we can insist—we must insist—that the very dimensions of government's present role be accompanied by better performance as our servant.

In the century of West Virginia's statehood, we have evolved the concept that if government is to be the faithful and effective servant of the people, its first—and foremost—service must be to the people's future. A responsible concern for the future has been a distinguishing characteristic of government in America. This concern has been expressed in four principal areas of activity: exploration, expansion, education, and conservation.

From the expedition of Lewis and Clark to the orbital flight of John Glenn, American government has been distinguished by an intelligent willingness to support and encourage exploration and discovery.

From the Homestead Act of 1862 to the incentives of the Revenue Act of 1962, American Government has concerned itself with stimulating expansion for both individuals and businesses. As early as 1787, when John Adams and Thomas Jefferson set aside 1 lot in every 10 in the Northwest Territory for the support of education, American Government has honored a commitment to the future through a commitment to the education of our young.

Since the earliest years of this century, American Government—both Federal and State—has prudently assumed responsibility for conservation of our endowment of natural resources—and, in this prudent tradition, Government has undertaken a parallel responsibility to conserve and utilize more fully our human resources.

While we cannot prophesy far into the future what future generations will want the role of Government to be, I believe we can expect—and predict—continuation of these principal directions of public policy and governmental responsibility.

What will be the meaning for West Virginia?

The Mountain State, 100 years ago, elected to cast its lot with the Union. That decision then is symbolic for today. The future of West Virginia is inseparable from the future of the Union as a whole. Yet, in saying this, I realize that West Virginians may justifiably ask if this is so of the future, why has it not been so of the present and the immediate past.

In times of virtually universal American prosperity and growth, West Virginia has not shared equally in the national advance. The number of jobs has dwindled. Farm income has declined for your 43,000 farms. The number of businesses has decreased to 25,000.

Income per capita has fallen to less than 80 percent of the national average.

In this regard, I was interested to find—to my surprise—that despite these trends, there are twice as many persons in West Virginia owning and holding stocks on the New York Stock Exchange than in my own State of Texas.

The experiences of recent years might justify West Virginians adopting the philosophy of Mr. Dooley, who said: "Anyhow, there is always one ray of light ahead—we're sure to have hard times."

While such a philosophy might seem justified, at this start of West Virginia's centennial observance, we neither accept such an attitude nor believe it. On the contrary, we view the future from an exactly opposite perspective. As a nation, we accept as our responsibility the proposition that Americans of every State must be sure of good times ahead.

The fate which has befallen West Virginia in recent years was not determined within the borders of your State. It was determined by events and forces in other States, in the entire Nation, and even in the world.

Developments in our own Southwest and the distant Middle East—developments as near as the coal markets of the mid-Atlantic and as far as the Common Market of Europe—had their consequences and effect upon the enterprise, the jobs, the homes and, finally, even the food on the plates of West Virginians.

The people of the United States have, through the policies of their Government, made a commitment to the individual and his well being. In the lesson of West Virginia, we have learned that Government cannot meet this commitment merely by being ready to write a check. Government must perform more than the role of an automated charity.

In this interdependent world, good times for the individual American can only be assured as individual human beings throughout the world enjoy better times for themselves.

West Virginia's per capita income is, as I have mentioned, below the average of all States. But at the level of about \$1,800 annually, the income of West Virginians compares as the wealth of millionaires to the income of most of the earth's population.

In only six nations, including our own, is the income level over \$1,000 a year. In only a few others does it exceed \$500 a year. Most of the world's population lives for a year on no more than a single weekly paycheck of an American industrial worker.

We have learned in this 20th century that we could not isolate ourselves from military aggressors of the world. Today, we are learning—or ought to be learning—that we cannot isolate ourselves or the domestic economy from the aggressors of poverty or privation in the world. Either the living standards of the world must rise toward ours or our own standards will fall toward those of the world.

One of the lessons we have learned in West Virginia applies also to the world. We have learned that America cannot assure better times for the world merely through the use of our checkbook.

Vastly more is required of responsible government than that it be a checkwriting machine. The standards of government—whether its relative size be large or small—demand able and courageous performance in the four realms I have mentioned: exploration, expansion, education and conservation.

In the next 100 years, government's role in these areas will be active and important. The objective of all that is done will be to

improve life for the individual here on earth.

We explore space. Our objective is far more than to reach the moon. Our space effort will require the fullest use of our resources, bringing new and higher uses for the natural wealth of West Virginia, creating better jobs and higher paying jobs for your people and the people of all the States. But the fruits of our space technology will open opportunity worldwide.

We seek to foster expansion—expansion of industry, the building of plants, the expansion of research and distribution. But even more, we seek expansion of the good life for all our people—the building of better homes, increasing profitability of farms, opening new doors of opportunity to all people regardless of race, religion or national origin.

We seek to foster conservation. We must continue the prudent preservation of our natural resources and achieve the fuller development of our inland rivers, our water power, our timberlands and our soil. We must keep the air we breathe and the water we drink clean and healthful. But we must also conserve the great wealth of our human resources—eliminating the scrapping of human talents because of age or illness or mental retardation or lack of skills.

Above all, we must continue the American commitment to education. What we are as a nation, and what we have been able to achieve as a people, is the dividend of our investment in the minds of our youth. Our leadership in the world—the fate of freedom itself—will be determined by how we honor our commitment to education. But even more, the kind of life our people know will flow from our investment in education the next 10 years and the next 100 years.

In the first years after World War II, we in America permitted and even encouraged our government—at all levels—to limit its role to the service of the present. The consequences have been many. West Virginia is case example No. 1. We know now—better than we have known before—that government must fill the role of serving the future or else its burden becomes oppressive and the opportunities of the people decline.

In these next 100 years, government must assume a much more vigorous role in the level-headed pursuit of peace.

Government must open wider the door of choice for individuals.

Government must help the people to marshal to the fullest their resources of earth and spirit.

The role of government must in this next century be more than ever the role of faithful servant faithfully serving the future. We must measure its performance less by its costs than by its accomplishments in supporting the greater liberty of all the people.

The traditional American view that government requires constant scrutiny remains a healthy view and we must not lose sight of one thing.

The tyranny of communism has not been able to extend its reach beyond the march of its foot soldiers. Yet, the idea born on these shores—the idea of servant government serving the people—has leaped oceans, swept continents, inspired millions to seek independence and has been the great moving force of this century.

We are creators and possessors of an instrument of infinite good in the role of government we have conceived in America. While we remain vigilant against its abuses, exacting in our standards for its performance, we should, at the same time, respect it and work with it, realizing that its success alone will be our salvation. The fundamental role of our Government these next 100 years—in West Virginia, in the Nation, and in the world, must be to achieve progress for all the people, greater prosperity for all humankind, and, finally, to achieve peace among men forevermore.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. WEDNESDAY, MAY 8

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. Wednesday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Wednesday, May 8, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 6, 1963:

### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

Edmond T. Daly, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions for the term of 10 years vice Randolph C. Richardson, deceased.

### DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, U.S. Air Force, to be reappointed as Chief of Staff of the Air Force for a term of 1 year.

### DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Adm. David Lamar McDonald, U.S. Navy, to be appointed as Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy for a term of 2 years.

### IN THE MARINE CORPS

I nominate Lt. Gen. Robert B. Luckey, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with the provisions of title 10, U.S. Code, section 5233.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. James P. Berkeley, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

### IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

#### To be major, Medical Corps

Fichtner, John Z., XXXXXX

#### To be captain

Abene, Gasper V., XXXXXX

Abrahams, Edwin G., XXXXXX

Abramoski, Leo B., XXXXXX

Abt, Irwin E., XXXXXX

Adams, George B., XXXXXX

Adams, Jack E., XXXXXX

Adams, James E., XXXXXX

Adcock, Thomas G., XXXXXX

Addicott, Charles W., XXXXXX

Aicken, Larry B., XXXXXX

Ainsworth, Robert L., XXXXXX

Akin, George H., XXXXXX

Akiyama, Frank M., XXXXXX

Albright, Anthony F., XXXXXX

Alexander, Joseph E., Jr., XXXXXX

Alford, John R., XXXXXX

Allen, Boyd W., Jr., XXXXXX

Allen, Robert C., XXXXXX

Allison, Robert H., XXXXXX

Alshelmer, Robert H., XXXXXX

Alston, Pontha D., XXXXXX

Alton, Gary O., XXXXXX

Amerson, Hinton S., XXXXXX

Amos, Julian E., XXXXXX

Anderson, Curtis E., Jr., XXXXXX

Anderson, David P., XXXXXX

Anderson, Joseph L., XXXXXX

Andreacchio, Nicholas A., XXXXXX

Apperson, Jack A., XXXXX

Archer, James H., XXXXXX

Areheart, Henry W., Jr., XXXXXX

Argo, James W., XXXXXX

Armstrong, Hart R., XXXXXX

Armstrong, James S., Jr., XXXXXX

Arnold, John M., XXXXXX

Arnold, Robert W., XXXXXX

Aschettino, Richard F., XXXXXX

Bachmann, Robert R., XXXXXX

Baeb, David E., XXXXXX

Bagnaschi, Albert L., Jr., XXXXXX

Bailey, Clarence A., XXXXXX

Bailey, George W., 3d, XXXXXX

Baird, Richard J., XXXXXX

Bakeman, Charles D., XXXXXX

Baker, Robert M., Sr., XXXXXX

Baldwin, Richard B., XXXXXX

Baldwin, Robert C., XXXXXX

Balint, Barry T. J., XXXXXX

Bane, Wista F., Jr., XXXXXX

Banks, James C., XXXXXX

Banner, Thomas A., XXXXXX

Barbazette, John H., XXXXXX

Barber, James J., XXXXXX

Barborak, Franklin D., XXXXXX

Barisano, Louis, XXXXXX

Barker, Harold S., Jr., XXXXXX

Barker, Rex N., XXXXXX

Barlow, Donald J., XXXXXX

Barnard, Roy S., XXXXXX

Barnum, Robert C., XXXXXX

Barrett, Jonathan R., 3d, XXXXXX

Barrett, William T., XXXXXX

Barry, Arthur A., XXXXXX

Bartlett, Gerald T., XXXXXX

Bassett, Gordon C., XXXXXX

Baumeister, Harold J., XXXXXX

Baun, Richard A., XXXXXX

Bayruns, Paul C., XXXXXX

Beasley, Benjamin E., XXXXXX

Beaulieu, Gary P., XXXXXX

Beaver, Joseph M., XXXXXX

Beavers, Guy M., XXXXXX

Beben, Joseph A., XXXXXX

Beck, Frederick S., XXXXXX

Beckwith, Robert E., XXXXXX

Beckwith, Robert B., XXXXXX

Beltz, Charles A., Jr., XXXXXX

Bell, Raymond E., Jr., XXXXXX

Bell, William E., XXXXXX

Bennett, Ferrell R., XXXXXX

Bennett, Lester E., XXXXXX

Berg, George A., XXXXXX

Bergson, Richard W., XXXXXX

Berner, John J., XXXXXX

Berry, William W., XXXXXX

Bethke, Gerald H., XXXXXX

Bezemek, Ludwig A., XXXXXX

Biberstein, Billy J., XXXXXX

Bickley, James B., XXXXXX

Bierl, Leon D., XXXXXX

Billey, John J., XXXXXX

Binder, Fremont E., XXXXXX

Bingham, Ellis D., XXXXXX

Bird, Max R., XXXXXX

Bishop, Donald E., XXXXXX

Bishop, Joseph A., XXXXXX

Bisping, Jack F., XXXXXX

Bizzell, Word G., XXXXXX

Blakeley, David C., XXXXXX

Blaker, William J., XXXXXX

Blanc, John E., XXXXXX

Blank, James N., XXXXXX

Blank, Lyle E., XXXXXX

Blascak, Donald W., XXXXXX

Bledsoe, Edward P., XXXXXX

Bloomfield, John E., XXXXXX

Boiani, Peter J., XXXXXX

Boivin, Arcade G., XXXXXX

Bokovoy, Jon E., XXXXXX

Boll, Albert F., XXXXXX

Boit, Richard R., XXXXXX

Bomar, Hobby J., Jr., XXXXXX

Bone, Aubra N., XXXXXX

Bonilla-Acevedo, Tomas, XXXXXX

Bonner, Benjamin J., 3d, XXXXXX

Bonta, Stanley G., XXXXXX

Booth, John P., 3d, XXXXXX

Borer, Robert S., XXXXXX

Borgstrom, Richard O., XXXXXX

Bostancic, James F., XXXXXX  
 Boswell, Leonard LeR., XXXXXX  
 Bourland, James M., XXXXXX  
 Bowden, John J., XXXXXX  
 Bowen, Cecil R., XXXXXX  
 Bower, George L., XXXXXX  
 Bowman, Donald C., XXXXXX  
 Boyanowski, John G., XXXXXX  
 Boyle, Ernest W., XXXXXX  
 Boyle, James A., XXXXXX  
 Braas, Emery W., XXXXXX  
 Bradley, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Brann, Travis L., XXXXXX  
 Brannen, Barney L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Breckheimer, Donald G., XXXXXX  
 Breitenberg, Edward P., XXXXXX  
 Brickhouse, Willie T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Briggs, Charles F., XXXXXX  
 Briggs, Thomas J., XXXXXX  
 Brill, James H., XXXXXX  
 Brister, Delano R., XXXXXX  
 Britt, Albert S., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Brittain, Richard T., XXXXXX  
 Britton, James H., XXXXXX  
 Britton, John A., XXXXXX  
 Brock, Jeffrey D., XXXXXX  
 Brockway, Lawrence N., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Bronson, Richard M., XXXXXX  
 Broome, James R., XXXX  
 Brown, Fred D., XXXXXX  
 Brown, Lee D., XXXXXX  
 Brown, Leonard T., XXXXXX  
 Brown, Richard W., XXXXXX  
 Brown, Robert M., XXXXXX  
 Brown, Roy A., XXXXXX  
 Brown, Terry W., XXXXXX  
 Brudvig, Dale K., XXXXXX  
 Bruner, Robert J., XXXXXX  
 Bruskiwicz, Glenn L., XXXXXX  
 Bryan, Richard L., XXXXXX  
 Bryant, James W., XXXXXX  
 Bryant, Thomas E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Bryant, William L., XXXXXX  
 Bryden, John M., XXXXXX  
 Brylla, Charles W., XXXXXX  
 Buchan, Alan B., XXXXXX  
 Buck, Champlin F., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Buckner, David L., XXXXXX  
 Buckner, Donald A., XXXXXX  
 Budd, Alexander S., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Buddo, James S., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Bue, Paul A. J., XXXXXX  
 Buel, Charles J., XXXXXX  
 Burbery, John W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Burgdorf, Carl F., 2d, XXXXXX  
 Burke, Francis J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Burke, Richard A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Burke, Sib H., XXXXXX  
 Burke, William M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Burt, John C., XXXXXX  
 Burton, Dawson L., XXXXXX  
 Burton, Donald L., XXXXXX  
 Bush, Emory W., XXXXXX  
 Bushyhead, Edward R., XXXXXX  
 Buswell, Arthur T., XXXXXX  
 Buttermore, Charles W., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Buxton, John L., XXXXXX  
 Byers, Robert D., XXXXXX  
 Bynam, Holland E., XXXXXX  
 Byrd, Doxey, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Caldwell, Richard G., XXXXXX  
 Calhoun, Charles C., XXXXXX  
 Calhoun, Creighton L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Calvert, George H., XXXXXX  
 Camp, Dave E., XXXXXX  
 Campbell, Charles B., XXXXXX  
 Campbell, Donald A., XXXXXX  
 Campbell, Joseph R., XXXXXX  
 Campbell, Richard E., XXXXXX  
 Campbell, William R., XXXXXX  
 Campion, William W., XXXXXX  
 Cann, Donald C., XXXXXX  
 Cannefax, Robert W., XXXXXX  
 Carmody, Robert W., XXXXXX  
 Carrier, Billy C., XXXXXX  
 Carroll, William F., XXXXXX  
 Carruth, George A., XXXXXX  
 Carson, Martin B., XXXXXX  
 Carter, Harold M., XXXXXX  
 Carucci, Raymond A., XXXXXX  
 Caruso, Michael L., XXXXXX

Casey, Franklin J., XXXXXX  
 Cass, Stanley D., XXXXXX  
 Castelli, Joseph G., XXXXXX  
 Castle, Edward R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Cawley, John H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Cel, Peter G., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Cento, Dahl J., XXXXXX  
 Chandler, Richard L., XXXXXX  
 Chaney, Arlen L., XXXXXX  
 Chaney, Bobby J., XXXXXX  
 Chapman, Paul P., XXXXXX  
 Charles, George H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Chase, Edward L., XXXXXX  
 Chase, Gerald W., XXXXXX  
 Chenoweth, Robert T., XXXXXX  
 Chernault, James A., XXXXXX  
 Chesley, Arthur P., XXXXXX  
 Chittick, Peter J., XXXXXX  
 Christensen, Eric M., XXXXXX  
 Christenson, Willard M., XXXXXX  
 Christy, Bobby G., XXXXXX  
 Circeo, Louis J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Clark, Davis, XXXXXX  
 Clark, Donald P., XXXXXX  
 Clark, Gary L., XXXXXX  
 Clark, Jon M., XXXXXX  
 Clark, Joseph E., XXXXXX  
 Clarke, Charles C., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Clarke, Edward F., XXXXXX  
 Clay, Clifford D., XXXXXX  
 Cleaver, George A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Clelan, Joseph R., XXXXXX  
 Cline, Donald H., XXXXXX  
 Clites, James E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Clowe, John F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Coates, Charles H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Cochran, James O., XXXXXX  
 Cockrell, William F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Codd, Nicholas J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Coffee, Edwin F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Coffman, Richard L., XXXXXX  
 Cofoni, Peter J., XXXXXX  
 Colket, Charles H., XXXXXX  
 Collier, William T., XXXXXX  
 Collings, J. Elmer, XXXXXX  
 Collins, David G., XXXXXX  
 Comeau, Robert F., XXXXXX  
 Conklin, Willard D., XXXXXX  
 Conley, James A., XXXXXX  
 Conrad, Hawkins M., XXXXXX  
 Conroy, Arthur T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Conroy, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Conway, James B., XXXXXX  
 Cook, James H., XXXXXX  
 Cook, John J., XXXXXX  
 Coon, Robert L., XXXXXX  
 Cooper, Albert C., XXXXXX  
 Cooper, Charles H., XXXXXX  
 Cooper, Jack B., XXXXXX  
 Cooper, Robert A., XXXXXX  
 Cooper, Robert T., XXXXXX  
 Cooper, Willis M., XXXXXX  
 Cordell, Ralph D., XXXXXX  
 Correll, Ralph T., XXXXXX  
 Cortez, James J., XXXXXX  
 Cothran, Paul E., XXXXXX  
 Cotter, Paul L., XXXXXX  
 Coughlin, James L., XXXXXX  
 Cover, John P., XXXXXX  
 Cowles, Phillip R., XXXXXX  
 Cox, Randall S., XXXXXX  
 Cox, Sammy T., XXXXXX  
 Craddock, Nicholas J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Crater, John F., XXXXXX  
 Crawford, Jack F., XXXXXX  
 Crider, Terence A., XXXXXX  
 Crittenden, Robert N., XXXXXX  
 Crofford, Clifford D., XXXXXX  
 Croft, John A., XXXXXX  
 Cross, Freeman G., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Crowl, Gilbert W., XXXXXX  
 Culbertson, Jerome B., XXXXXX  
 Cullins, Robert B., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Cummins, William, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Cunliff, Roy A., XXXXXX  
 Cunningham, Cleve, XXXXXX  
 Cunningham, James G., XXXXXX  
 Curran, Francis R., XXXXXX  
 Curran, Jan D., XXXXXX  
 Currier, Roger M., 4th, XXXXXX  
 Custer, Philip E., XXXXXX  
 Cutler, Edward J., XXXXXX

Cyr, Charles W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Dahl, John F., XXXXXX  
 Daluga, Richard B., XXXXXX  
 Damme, Richard J., XXXXXX  
 Daugherty, John M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Davenport, Charles L., XXXXXX  
 Davenport, Theodore G., XXXXXX  
 Davies, Peter G., XXXXXX  
 Davies, William A., XXXXXX  
 Davis, Harold M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Dawes, Robert C., XXXXXX  
 Dawson, Jon C., XXXXXX  
 Day, Herman E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 DeGraw, Allen C., XXXXXX  
 DeLany, Daniel J., XXXXXX  
 DeSimone, Frank P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 DeWitt, Calvin, 3d, XXXXXX  
 Dean, Richard C., XXXXXX  
 Dearden, Sheldon W., XXXXXX  
 Deel, Arlin, XXXXXX  
 DelVecchio, William P., XXXXXX  
 Delandro, Donald J., XXXXXX  
 Denmark, Sumner J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Dennison, Gary V., XXXXXX  
 Deshler, Robert C., XXXXXX  
 Devereaux, Raymond A., XXXXXX  
 DiValentino, Leo E., XXXXXX  
 Dick, William W., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Dickson, Rodney, XXXXXX  
 Dillon, Gregory P., XXXXXX  
 Dilyard, Rex E., XXXXXX  
 Dion, George J., XXXXXX  
 Doar, James M., XXXXXX  
 Dodge, Rodney E., XXXXXX  
 Dodson, John P., XXXXXX  
 Doneski, Bernard J., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Donker, Leo M., XXXXXX  
 Dooling, Stephen V., XXXXXX  
 Doolittle, Lloyd W., XXXXXX  
 Dorrough, Aaron G., XXXXXX  
 Dorward, Neil L., XXXXXX  
 Dougherty, James E., XXXXXX  
 Dougherty, Maurice F., XXXXXX  
 Dow, Richard A., XXXXXX  
 Dowds, James B., XXXXXX  
 Dross, Allen E., XXXXXX  
 Dross, David D., XXXXXX  
 Drudik, Robert L., XXXXXX  
 Druit, Clifford A., XXXXXX  
 Drummond, Louis A., XXXXXX  
 DuBois, Donald A., XXXXXX  
 Dubbelde, John B., XXXXXX  
 Dubose, Perryman F., XXXXXX  
 Dudzik, Joseph A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Duhon, Ben E., XXXXXX  
 Duncan, Wayne M., XXXXXX  
 Duncan, William A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Dunn, James E., XXXXXX  
 Dunn, James W., XXXXXX  
 Durbin, William B., XXXXXX  
 Durr, Donald D., XXXXXX  
 Dvorak, Philip J., XXXXXX  
 Dwyer, William M., XXXXXX  
 Dyer, Howard B., XXXXXX  
 Dyke, Charles W., XXXXXX  
 Dyson, Harold B., XXXXXX  
 East, Kenneth E., XXXXXX  
 Easterling, Ned H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Easterwood, John L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Easton, Donald G., XXXXXX  
 Eastwood, Clifford A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Echevarria, William, XXXXXX  
 Edgar, James S. V., XXXXXX  
 Edwards, Emmet D., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Edwards, Richard I., XXXXXX  
 Elder, John F., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Ellis, Gary L., XXXXXX  
 Ellis, William R., XXXXXX  
 Ely, Sumner R., XXXXXX  
 Emery, Richard F., XXXXXX  
 Emrick, Charles W., XXXXXX  
 Engle, Phillip D., XXXXXX  
 English, Don C., XXXXXX  
 Ensign, Allyn B., XXXXXX  
 Eperon, Thomas A., XXXXXX  
 Erickson, Darold J., XXXXXX  
 Erminger, Lee E., XXXXXX  
 Eure, Samuel L., XXXXXX  
 Evans, Walter C., XXXXXX  
 Everett, James W., XXXXXX  
 Ewanus, Milton D., XXXXXX

Fadel, Richard A., XXXXXX  
 Fader, Jerome H., XXXXXX  
 Fairchild, Robert L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Fancher, Louis C., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Faulkender, Robert W., XXXXXX  
 Feaster, Lewis L., XXXXXX  
 Feeney, Richard L., XXXXXX  
 Fekete, Alexander J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Felber, Theodore D., XXXXXX  
 Feld, Philip, XXXXXX  
 Fennell, George R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Fenton, Donald F., XXXXXX  
 Fentress, Harry B., XXXXXX  
 Finch, Arthur L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Finch, Kenneth W., XXXXXX  
 Fingles, Douglas O., XXXXXX  
 Finlay, John C., XXXXXX  
 Fiorentino, William J., XXXXXX  
 Fisher, Paul D., XXXXXX  
 Fiske, John R., XXXXXX  
 Fiske, William S., XXXXXX  
 Flanagan, Carl P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Flanders, Norwood S., XXXXXX  
 Fleming, Jerry L., XXXXXX  
 Focer, Samuel W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Follansbee, John N., XXXXXX  
 Fong, Joseph Y. K., XXXXXX  
 Fontanella, David A., XXXXXX  
 Ford, Wilbur E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Forgy, Jack O., XXXXXX  
 Foster, Andrew R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Foster, Robert G., XXXXXX  
 Fournier, Joseph J., XXXXXX  
 Fox, Barry P., XXXXXX  
 Fraker, John R., XXXXXX  
 Franklin, Bobby G., XXXXXX  
 Freeman, Carl F., XXXXXX  
 Freitas, Louis H., XXXXXX  
 Freyder, James G., XXXXXX  
 Friedman, Fred L., XXXXXX  
 Friend, William N., XXXXXX  
 Frisbie, James G., XXXXXX  
 Fritz, Richard L., XXXXXX  
 Froebel, Martin C., XXXXXX  
 Frost, Henry R., XXXXXX  
 Fugitt, Billy W., XXXXXX  
 Fulton, Lawrence P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Gagliardone, John L., XXXXXX  
 Gaines, Merrel E., XXXXXX  
 Gale, Edward W., XXXXXX  
 Gallagher, Joseph P., XXXXXX  
 Galloway, Gerald E., XXXXXX  
 Gann, Charles E., XXXXXX  
 Garigan, Thomas P., XXXXXX  
 Garner, John J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Gaspard, Glaudis P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Gasper, John M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Gately, Michael P., XXXXXX  
 Gates, Kermit H., Jr., XXXX  
 Gaustad, Peter J., XXXXXX  
 Gaw, Stephen T., XXXXXX  
 Gayler, Earl D., XXXXXX  
 Gebhardt, William A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Gecky, George, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Gentry, Paul E., XXXXXX  
 Gentry, Roy C., XXXXXX  
 George, Dannie E., XXXXXX  
 George, Edward H., III, XXXXXX  
 Giles, George E., XXXXXX  
 Gilmore, Joseph R., XXXXXX  
 Ginter, Duane L., XXXXXX  
 Glasgow, William L., XXXXXX  
 Glasker, Samuel J., XXXXXX  
 Glen, George W. B., XXXXXX  
 Glover, Richard R., XXXXXX  
 Goetz, George W., XXXXXX  
 Goetz, John A., XXXXXX  
 Goldberg, William, XXXXXX  
 Golden, William L., XXXXXX  
 Gomon, Charles W., XXXXXX  
 Gonzalez, Alvaro E., XXXXXX  
 Goode, David E., XXXXXX  
 Gooding, Ronald S., XXXXXX  
 Goodson, Harry C., XXXXXX  
 Gordon, Charles L., XXXXXX  
 Gordon, Dudley J., XXXXXX  
 Gordon, Walter C., XXXXXX  
 Govatos, John N., XXXXXX  
 Graham, Joseph E., XXXXXX  
 Grant, Michael E., XXXXXX  
 Gray, Frank M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Gray, Joseph M., XXXXXX  
 Green, James L., XXXXXX  
 Green, Robert E., Jr., XXXX  
 Green, Thomas E., XXXXXX  
 Greene, Earl M., XXXXXX  
 Greenwood, John R., XXXXXX  
 Greenwood, Walter A., XXXX  
 Grim, Charles D., XXXXXX  
 Grimes, Dan S., XXXXXX  
 Griswold, Edward C., XXXXXX  
 Groetken, David L., XXXXXX  
 Gross, Franklyn W., XXXXXX  
 Gross, Woolf P., XXXXXX  
 Groves, John E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Grubbs, William F., 2d, XXXXXX  
 Gruber, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Gruhn, Thomas S., XXXXXX  
 Guba, Howard J., XXXXXX  
 Guillory, Larry G., XXXXXX  
 Guildner, Francis J., XXXXXX  
 Gullen, John P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hagyard, Warren A., XXXXXX  
 Haldane, Douglas W., XXXXXX  
 Hale, Charles A., XXXXXX  
 Hall, Clarence E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hall, Francis W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hall, George W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hall, William E., XXXX  
 Hallinan, James M., Jr., XXXX  
 Hallmark, Billy J., XXXXXX  
 Hallock, Donald V., XXXXXX  
 Halloway, Kenneth E., Jr., XXXX  
 Halpern, Wayne J., XXXXXX  
 Hammond, Leroy D., XXXXXX  
 Hammond, Robert D., XXXXXX  
 Hamner, Richard S., XXXXXX  
 Hampton, Emery W., XXXXXX  
 Hanawald, Len M., XXXXXX  
 Hancock, James H., XXXXXX  
 Handback, Henry C., XXXXXX  
 Handley, Charles B., XXXXXX  
 Hanigan, Francis L., XXXXXX  
 Hanlin, Richard W., XXXXXX  
 Hannen, William M., XXXXXX  
 Hannon, Murray W., XXXXXX  
 Harbuck, Eugene L., XXXXXX  
 Hardegree, Bobby L., O/T/11  
 Hardy, Robert M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Harring, Anthony U., XXXXXX  
 Harris, Bruce R., XXXXXX  
 Harris, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Harris, Robert W., XXXXXX  
 Harris, Thomas L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Harrison, Henry L., XXXXXX  
 Harrison, William H., XXXXXX  
 Hartmann, Frederick D., XXXXXX  
 Harvard, Thomas P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Harwig, Donald H., XXXXXX  
 Harwood, Michael S., XXXXXX  
 Hatch, Henry J., XXXXXX  
 Hatch, John F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hatch, Vernon L., XXXXXX  
 Hatcher, Robert T., XXXXXX  
 Hawkins, Richard S., XXXXXX  
 Hawley, Gerald S., XXXXXX  
 Hays, Paul A., XXXXXX  
 Hearne, William D., XXXXXX  
 Hedcock, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Heggen, Larry E., XXXXXX  
 Heidecker, Duane E., XXXXXX  
 Henry, Ronald W., XXXXXX  
 Henson, Hugh E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Herbert, Anthony B., XXXXXX  
 Herbst, William R., XXXXXX  
 Herring, Bernard M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hertz, Sanford G., XXXXXX  
 Hess, Carl E., XXXXXX  
 Hettinger, John R., XXXXXX  
 Heverly, Charles S., XXXXXX  
 Hickerson, Arville L., XXXXXX  
 Hickey, Edward I., XXXXXX  
 Hicklin, Thomas R., XXXXXX  
 Hickman, Jere L., XXXXXX  
 Hicks, Frederick G., XXXXXX  
 Hicks, Gerald F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Higgins, James M., XXXXXX  
 Higgins, Michael S., XXXXXX  
 High, Charles S., XXXXXX  
 Higman, James H., XXXXXX  
 Hildreth, Edward E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hill, James L. E., XXXXXX  
 Hill, John L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hill, Robert G., XXXXXX  
 Hill, Theron H., XXXXXX  
 Hilmo, Orin R., XXXXXX  
 Hinds, William L., XXXXXX  
 Hines, Joseph E., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Hinspeter, William L., XXXXXX  
 Hoagland, Merton B., XXXXXX  
 Hobin, Raymond M., XXXXXX  
 Hocker, John R., XXXXXX  
 Hodges, Charles E., XXXXXX  
 Hoff, Rodger L., XXXXXX  
 Hoffman, Robert F., XXXXXX  
 Hogan, Thomas J., XXXXXX  
 Holladay, Van D., XXXXXX  
 Hollenbeck, Elmer W., XXXXXX  
 Holmes, David R., XXXXXX  
 Holmes, James R., XXXXXX  
 Holmes, Jasper F., XXXXXX  
 Holmstrom, Ronald J., XXXXXX  
 Holt, Bill V., XXXXXX  
 Honsinger, Larry E., XXXXXX  
 Hood, George E., XXXXXX  
 Hopkins, James E., XXXXXX  
 Horn, Robert C., XXXXXX  
 Hornstein, Edmund H., XXXXXX  
 Horton, Floyd W., XXXXXX  
 Houllis, Harry S., XXXXXX  
 House, Joseph W., XXXXXX  
 Houser, George M., XXXXXX  
 Houser, Houston P., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Howard, James W., XXXXXX  
 Howe, Robert H., XXXXXX  
 Howerton, William B., XXXXXX  
 Howes, Richard H., XXXXXX  
 Hoyt, Richard E., XXXXXX  
 Huddle, Charles E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Huff, Donald W., XXXXXX  
 Hughes, Jimmie T., XXXXXX  
 Hull, Michael H., XXXXXX  
 Hummel, Richard H., XXXXXX  
 Humphrey, Paul W., XXXXXX  
 Humphrey, Raymond F., XXXXXX  
 Humphreys, George D., XXXXXX  
 Hunt, Byron W., XXXXXX  
 Hunt, Gordon M., XXXXXX  
 Hunt, Wallace G., XXXXXX  
 Hunter, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Hybert, Samuel L., XXXXXX  
 Isemann, Michael J., XXXXXX  
 Ingman, John F., XXXXXX  
 Irwin, Carl H., Junior, XXXXXX  
 Irwin, James T., XXXXXX  
 Isbell, James C., XXXXXX  
 Isham, James A., XXXXXX  
 Israel, Glenn A., XXXXXX  
 Iverson, George D., 5th, XXXXXX  
 Izatt, James, XXXXXX  
 Jackson, James W., XXXXXX  
 Jacobs, Irwin M., XXXXXX  
 Jacobs, Marvin, XXXXXX  
 James, Jesse H., XXXXXX  
 James, William N., XXXXXX  
 Jameson, James J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Janert, Alfred C., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Jenis, Donald S., XXXXXX  
 Jenkins, James R., XXXXXX  
 Jenks, George V., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Jennings, Curtis A., XXXXXX  
 Jeter, Munford S., XXXXXX  
 Jewett, Richard E., XXXXXX  
 Johanknecht, George P., XXXXXX  
 Johns, Robert N., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, Andrew C., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, Arthur D., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, Chester F., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, Clifton R., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, Donald K., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, Ernest D., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, James C., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, Stanley T., XXXXXX  
 Johnstone, Homer J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Joiner, Carey P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Jones, Gilbert E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Jones, Luther E., XXXXXX  
 Jones, Ronald A., XXXXXX  
 Jones, Walter R., XXXXXX  
 Jordan, Howell H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Judson, Alan L., XXXXXX  
 Judy, Jerry E., XXXXXX  
 Kao, Peter K., XXXXXX

Kaiser, James B., XXXXXX  
 Kaiser, Philip E., XXXXXX  
 Karalekas, Charles J., XXXXXX  
 Karr, Don E., XXXXXX  
 Kastner, George D., XXXXXX  
 Katz, Charles M., XXXXXX  
 Kaufman, Raymond, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Kawabata, Kazuto, XXXXXX  
 Keefe, John L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Keefe, Victor F., XXXXXX  
 Keel, Frank W., XXXXXX  
 Kegelman, Theodore J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Kehoe, Thomas P., XXXXXX  
 Keith, Donald M., XXXXXX  
 Kelley, James F., XXXXXX  
 Kelley, John W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Kelly, Edward V., XXXXXX  
 Kelly, Ted W., XXXXXX  
 Kelly, Thomas A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Kelly, Thomas W., XXXXXX  
 Keneipp, George E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Kennedy, Irvin D., XXXXXX  
 Kennett, Walter H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Kenster, Jesse W., XXXXXX  
 Kenyon, Richard D., XXXXXX  
 Keogh, John J., XXXXXX  
 Kerver, Thomas J., XXXXXX  
 Kessinger, John M., XXXXXX  
 Kester, William R., XXXXXX  
 Ketchum, Raymond E. V., 2d, XXXXXX  
 Keville, Clarence H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Keys, Robert W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Kielkopf, Edward C., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Kilpe, Gunars, XXXXXX  
 Kimura, Kay S., XXXXXX  
 King, Charles M., XXXXXX  
 King, Donald P., XXXXXX  
 King, William T., XXXXXX  
 King, William T., XXXXXX  
 Kirk, John G., XXXXXX  
 Kirk, Louis D., XXXXXX  
 Kirkwood, John H., XXXXXX  
 Kirshman, Norman H., XXXXXX  
 Kite, John C., XXXXXX  
 Kleypas, Kenneth A., XXXXXX  
 Knakal, Joseph C., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Knapper, Aubrey L., XXXXXX  
 Knieriem, Matthew E., XXXXXX  
 Knipp, James D., XXXXXX  
 Koehnke, Joseph A., XXXXXX  
 Kovel, Maxim I., XXXXXX  
 Koford, Joel L., XXXXXX  
 Kolb, Carter M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Kramer, Bryce R., XXXXXX  
 Krapf, Albert H., 2d, XXXXXX  
 Kretzner, John C., XXXXXX  
 Krome, Alan, XXXXXX  
 Kubas, Michael J., XXXXXX  
 Kunard, Donald D., XXXXXX  
 Kuykendall, George B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Kysar, Alverado F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 LaPorte, Justin G., XXXXXX  
 Lackey, Lyman A., XXXXXX  
 Ladd, John P., XXXXXX  
 Lain, John C., XXXXXX  
 Lakies, Robert J., XXXXXX  
 Lane, Ralph B., XXXXXX  
 Langer, Joseph A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Langworthy, Robert A., XXXXXX  
 Lanham, Michael C., XXXXXX  
 Laningham, William O., XXXXXX  
 Lanzillo, Eugene R., XXXXXX  
 Large, Darrell R., XXXXXX  
 Larimer, Charles L., XXXXXX  
 Laseau, Joseph N., XXXXXX  
 Latturner, George J., XXXXXX  
 Laughon, Richard W., XXXXXX  
 Lawson, Robert A., XXXXXX  
 Lawton, Johnnie, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Lea, Charles E., XXXXXX  
 Leach, Robert A., XXXXXX  
 Leard, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Leckinger, Paul A., XXXXXX  
 Lecrone, Donald, XXXXXX  
 Lee, James R., XXXXXX  
 Lee, Walter T., XXXXXX  
 Lee, William E., XXXXXX  
 Leger, Jean C., XXXXXX  
 Lehner, Scott J., XXXXXX  
 Lehner, William J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Leitzky, John D., XXXXXX  
 Lemes, Ralph V., XXXXXX  
 Lenderman, William R., XXXXXX  
 Lenoci, Joseph V., XXXXXX  
 Lesko, Charles J., XXXXXX  
 Lespasio, Neal A., XXXXXX  
 Leuer, Kenneth C., XXXXXX  
 Lewers, Sam, XXXXXX  
 Lewis, John C., XXXXXX  
 Lewis, Robert C., XXXXXX  
 Ley, Donald R., XXXXXX  
 Liakos, William G., XXXXXX  
 Ligon, Claude M., XXXXXX  
 Ligon, Robert E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Liles, Michael S., XXXXXX  
 Lindholm, Tom L., XXXXXX  
 Lindsey, Jerry N., XXXXXX  
 Lingaitis, Francis V., XXXXXX  
 Link, Elbert W., XXXXXX  
 Lippe, Lawrence., XXXXXX  
 Little, John A., XXXXXX  
 Little, Ronald E., XXXXXX  
 Littlejohn, Thomas W., XXXXXX  
 Loberg, John C., XXXXXX  
 Lockaby, Jesse S., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Lockwood, Willard E., XXXXXX  
 Loeffke, Bernardo, XXXXXX  
 Lofton, Marvin, XXXXXX  
 Logan, Laddie B., XXXXXX  
 Logan, Rodney W., XXXXXX  
 Lollis, James A., XXXXXX  
 Lomax, Rhoss C., Jr., XXXXXX  
 London, William G., XXXXXX  
 Long, John E., XXXXXX  
 Long, Kenneth D., XXXXXX  
 Loomis, Robert W., XXXXXX  
 Loop, James W., XXXXXX  
 Lopes, Francis J., XXXXXX  
 Lorms, John L., XXXXXX  
 Losk, Robert C., XXXXXX  
 Lott, Kirby J., XXXXXX  
 Loudermilk, Roy L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Love, Harold M., XXXXXX  
 Lucas, Dale A., XXXXXX  
 Lucas, Ronald M., XXXXXX  
 Luck, Bennie E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Luke, Dawson B., XXXXXX  
 Luke, John B., XXXXXX  
 Luna, Raymundo R., XXXXXX  
 Lusk, James A., XXXXXX  
 Lustig, Jacob E., XXXXXX  
 Luther, Ralph A., XXXXXX  
 Luther, William H., XXXXXX  
 Lyle, John A., XXXXXX  
 Lyons, Calvin G., XXXXXX  
 MacGill, James F., XXXXXX  
 MacHatton, Joseph G., XXXXXX  
 MacKusick, Arthur L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Machen, Bobby, XXXXXX  
 Madsen, Arlyn R., XXXXXX  
 Maffett, Fletcher H., XXXXXX  
 Maguire, James E., XXXXXX  
 Malone, K. H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Maloney, James E., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Manahan, Richard R., XXXXXX  
 Mangum, Robin, XXXXXX  
 Manner, Eugene L., XXXXXX  
 Manning, Albert E., XXXXXX  
 Mapes, John B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Marmaras, Ernest, XXXXXX  
 Marmor, John W., XXXXXX  
 Marrella, Leonard S., XXXXXX  
 Marsh, Elgin R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Marsh, Robert, XXXXXX  
 Martin, Alfred L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Martin, Ernest H., XXXXXX  
 Martin, Mason E., XXXXXX  
 Martin, Yancey F., XXXXXX  
 Martinez, Howard M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Mascia, Donald J., XXXXXX  
 Mason, Arther W., XXXXXX  
 Mason, John, XXXXXX  
 Massey, Oran A., XXXXXX  
 Mastro, Franklin D., XXXXXX  
 Matheson, Edgar M., XXXXXX  
 Mathis, Milton H., XXXXXX  
 Matsuo, Herbert T., XXXXXX  
 Matthews, Church M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Mattison, Charles H., XXXXXX  
 May, Elmer C., XXXXXX  
 May, Francis B., XXXXXX  
 May, Richard L., XXXXXX  
 McAfee, Floyd H., XXXXXX  
 McBride, Eugene R., XXXXXX  
 McBride, Morris R., XXXXXX  
 McCall, Gerald T., XXXXXX  
 McCarthy, Edward W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 McCarthy, Fox, XXXXXX  
 McCarthy, John M., XXXXXX  
 McClain, Charles S., XXXXXX  
 McClain, Terrence W., XXXXXX  
 McCleave, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 McConkey, Rodney F., XXXXXX  
 McConnell, Bruce D., XXXXXX  
 McConnell, Rodney D., XXXXXX  
 McCoy, George V., XXXXXX  
 McCrary, Thomas D., XXXXXX  
 McCullom, Cornell, Jr., XXXXXX  
 McDonald, John M., XXXXXX  
 McDonald, Thomas B., 3d, XXXXXX  
 McDonough, Bruce B., XXXXXX  
 McDowell, Richard L., XXXXXX  
 McGivern, Parlan L., XXXXXX  
 McGovern, George W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 McGowan, Paul A., XXXXXX  
 McGowan, Richard M., XXXXXX  
 McHugh, Thomas P., XXXXXX  
 McKay, Michael J., XXXXXX  
 McKie, Robert H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 McKinley, Martin E., XXXXXX  
 McKinney, Horatio W., XXXXXX  
 McKinstry, Thomas I., XXXXXX  
 McLaughlin, James J., XXXXXX  
 McLaughlin, John O., XXXXXX  
 McNulty, William B., XXXXXX  
 McWhirter, Julian H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Mead, Dana G., XXXXXX  
 Mead, Warne D., XXXXXX  
 Meaney, Edward J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Medford, Dillard E., XXXXXX  
 Meehan, John J. P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Menefee, William P., XXXXXX  
 Meredith, James M., XXXXXX  
 Merrick, Robert L., XXXXXX  
 Merritt, Hubert D., XXXXXX  
 Metalios, James Z., XXXXXX  
 Mettam, Richard E., XXXXXX  
 Meyer, Conan G., XXXXXX  
 Michel, Thomas E., XXXXXX  
 Mielke, Kari A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Miklinski, Anthony R., XXXXXX  
 Mikuta, Joel J., XXXXXX  
 Miller, Edward H., XXXXXX  
 Miles, Ralph E., XXXXXX  
 Miller, Austin E., XXXXXX  
 Miller, Donald L., XXXXXX  
 Miller, Robert F., XXXXXX  
 Miller, Roger E., XXXXXX  
 Miller, Royce D., XXXXXX  
 Miller, Spencer R., XXXXXX  
 Milliron, Joseph F., XXXXXX  
 Mills, Charles S., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Mills, Lawrence L., XXXXXX  
 Mills, Robert R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Mitchell, John H., XXXXXX  
 Mitchell, John S., XXXXXX  
 Mittelstaedt, Robert N., XXXXXX  
 Mixer, Wilbur R., XXXXXX  
 Modica, Giac P., XXXXXX  
 Molinelli, Robert F., XXXXXX  
 Monaco, Nicholas, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Monahan, Edward J., XXXXXX  
 Montalvo, Martin T., XXXXXX  
 Montgomery, James D., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Montgomery, Ross D., XXXXXX  
 Moore, Marshall L., XXXXXX  
 Moore, Robert D., XXXXXX  
 Moran, Hugh F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Morey, William S., XXXXXX  
 Morgan, Jack E., XXXXXX  
 Morrison, Kenneth L., XXXXXX  
 Morrow, Cecil R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Mortensen, Theodore J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Morton, Richard H., XXXXXX  
 Mosco, Richard A., XXXXXX  
 Moser, William R., XXXXXX  
 Moses, Charles C., XXXXXX  
 Moses, Laurence G., XXXXXX  
 Moxley, Thomas T., XXXXXX  
 Mudd, William C., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Mudgett, John S., XXXXXX  
 Muenter, William T., XXXXXX  
 Mullen, David A., XXXXXX

Mullins, Donald G., XXXXXX  
 Mungovan, Robert W., XXXXXX  
 Murchison, John T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Murphy, Clifton M., XXXXXX  
 Murphy, John A., XXXXXX  
 Murphy, John E., XXXXXX  
 Murphy, William E., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Murray, Jackson S., XXXXXX  
 Musial, Walter F., XXXXXX  
 Myers, John T., XXXXXX  
 Nack, John M., XXXXXX  
 Nader, Walter E., XXXXXX  
 Nagel, Joseph L., XXXXXX  
 Nash, Harold F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Nash, John N., XXXXXX  
 Nash, Tom P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Naumann, Ralph E., XXXXXX  
 Negaard, Carman D., XXXXXX  
 Nelson, Clifford R., XXXXXX  
 Nelson, Maynard L., XXXXXX  
 Nelson, Theodore R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Nelson, William J., XXXXXX  
 Nemeth, Philip K., XXXXXX  
 Neukamm, Bruno J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Newlin, Edgar C., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Newman, Erman M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Newman, Joe B., XXXXXX  
 Newman, Robert C., XXXXXX  
 Newsom, Samuel J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Newton, George F., XXXXXX  
 Nicholas, Talbot J., XXXXXX  
 Nicks, John G., XXXXXX  
 Nicoll, Wayne B., XXXXXX  
 Niemczyk, Theodore T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Nilles, Gary W., XXXXXX  
 Noakes, Edmund D., XXXXXX  
 Nobriga, Gordon H., XXXXXX  
 Nock, Carleton C., XXXXXX  
 Nock, Jean A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Norris, James B., XXXXXX  
 Nottingham, Jonathan D., XXXXXX  
 Oakes, Leslie C., XXXXXX  
 Oaks, Clarence B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 O'Brien, Robert A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 O'Connor, John H., XXXXXX  
 Offan, Kenneth J., XXXXXX  
 Ogden, Leigh M., XXXXXX  
 O'Grady, George L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Okita, Harold K., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Olmsmith, Edwin S., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Olson, Hardin L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Olson, Martin G., XXXXXX  
 Olson, Thomas E., XXXXXX  
 Onellion, Willard M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Oneto, John B., XXXXXX  
 O'Rourke, Lewis C., XXXXXX  
 Otto, Robert W., XXXXXX  
 Owen, Thomas D., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Owens, Sherrill, XXXXXX  
 Paas, Alfred O., XXXXXX  
 Pack, Kenneth L., XXXXXX  
 Padgett, Lary W., XXXXXX  
 Padilla, Ramon, XXXXXX  
 Pagel, John A., XXXXXX  
 Palmer, Arthur N., XXXXXX  
 Palmer, William T., XXXXXX  
 Palmertree, Tommy R., XXXXXX  
 Palmieri, Guy J., XXXXXX  
 Paradiso, Richard A., XXXXXX  
 Pare, Harold J., XXXXXX  
 Parham, Byron A. P., XXXXXX  
 Parke, Walter M., XXXXXX  
 Parker, Murry E., XXXXXX  
 Parker, Richard G., XXXXXX  
 Parks, Donald, XXXXXX  
 Parr, Ivan W., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Parrack, Jim M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Passamaneck, David J., XXXXXX  
 Pastore, Richard M., XXXXXX  
 Pataro, Rudolph N., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Patrick, Burton D., XXXXXX  
 Patte, Chris, XXXXXX  
 Patterson, Jerry K., XXXXXX  
 Patterson, John T., XXXXXX  
 Patterson, Raydean H., XXXXXX  
 Patterson, Willard L., XXXXXX  
 Peach, James G., XXXXXX  
 Pearlman, James T., XXXXXX  
 Pearson, Theodore J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Peckham, John H., XXXXXX  
 Peden, Ronald L., XXXXXX  
 Penrose, Newton B., XXXXXX  
 Penzler, Harry D., XXXXXX  
 Perrine, David P., XXXXXX  
 Perry, James R., XXXXXX  
 Perry, Mervin E., XXXXXX  
 Person, John L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Peterson, Harlan F., XXXXXX  
 Peterson, Walter R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Pettersen, Clifford D., XXXXXX  
 Pfeil, Henry, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Philipp, Ronald E., XXXXXX  
 Philpott, Lawrence D., XXXXXX  
 Phipps, Donald E., XXXXXX  
 Plianka, Thomas A., XXXXXX  
 Pickens, Homer C., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Pierce, Isaiah B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Piner, James, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Pinkston, William R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Pipes, Jack R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Pipkin, John R., XXXXXX  
 Place, Berwyn L., XXXXXX  
 Pockock, James A., XXXXXX  
 Polczynski, Albert E., XXXXXX  
 Pope, Donald R., XXXXXX  
 Porter, Bobby B., XXXXXX  
 Porter, Royce L., XXXXXX  
 Porter, Thomas A., XXXXXX  
 Portier, Gerald C., XXXXXX  
 Potamos, Christ F., XXXXXX  
 Powe, Carl M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Powell, James D., XXXXXX  
 Powell, Raymond G., XXXXXX  
 Powell, Richard E., XXXXXX  
 Powell, Walter W., 2d, XXXXXX  
 Powell, William S., XXXXXX  
 Powers, Max L., XXXXXX  
 Press, Donald E., XXXXXX  
 Prewitt, Herbert F., XXXXXX  
 Price, George W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Price, Roger J., XXXXXX  
 Price, Roy C., XXXXXX  
 Pritchard, Donald H., XXXXXX  
 Pritchard, Walter L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Proctor, Marvin P., XXXXXX  
 Prossor, John E., XXXXXX  
 Proulx, Clovis B., XXXXXX  
 Provine, Carl R., XXXXXX  
 Puett, Joseph F., XXXX  
 Pugh, John W., XXXXXX  
 Pullin, James R., XXXXXX  
 Puttkammer, Paul D., XXXXXX  
 Quatannens, Louis S., XXXXXX  
 Quintard, Jerry L., XXXXXX  
 Radcliff, William A., XXXXXX  
 Radler, Charles M., XXXXXX  
 Rafferty, James E., XXXXXX  
 Rahn, William E., XXXXXX  
 Raines, Fred B., XXXXXX  
 Rakowitz, James A., XXXXXX  
 Ramsden, John J., XXXXXX  
 Ramsden, Russell W., XXXXXX  
 Randolph, William M., XXXXXX  
 Rawls, Paul L., XXXXXX  
 Rawls, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Ray, James W., XXXXXX  
 Ray, Robert L., XXXXXX  
 Raymond, Charles L., XXXXXX  
 Raynes, Troyce L., XXXXXX  
 Reagan, Jerry E., XXXXXX  
 Reedy, Henry J., XXXXXX  
 Reel, Ralph E., XXXXXX  
 Reeves, Donald W., XXXXXX  
 Reget, Gene R., XXXXXX  
 Reichel, James E., XXXXXX  
 Reichelt, Eric F., XXXXXX  
 Reid, Wilbur E., XXXXXX  
 Reidy, William D., XXXXXX  
 Remington, Allen K., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Reue, David N., XXXXXX  
 Reynolds, George P., XXXXXX  
 Reynolds, Robert M., XXXXXX  
 Rhichard, Clinton P., XXXXXX  
 Rhodes, Glen L., XXXXXX  
 Rhodes, Howard E., XXXXXX  
 Rich, Arthur L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Richardson, George L., XXXXXX  
 Richardson, James O., XXXXXX  
 Riedl, William H., XXXXXX  
 Riley, John G., XXXXXX  
 Ring, Taft C., XXXXXX  
 Rink, James H., XXXXXX  
 Riolo, Jose A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Ritchey, John P., XXXXXX  
 Riviere, Francis, XXXX  
 Robbins, Grant C., XXXXXX  
 Roberts, Charles W., XXXXXX  
 Roberts, Donald A., XXXXXX  
 Roberts, Donald M., XXXXXX  
 Roberts, Norman L., XXXXXX  
 Roberts, Roy A., XXXXX  
 Robinson, Bobby C., XXXXXX  
 Robinson, Charles W., XXXXXX  
 Robinson, James B., XXXXXX  
 Robinson, Nicholas J., XXXXXX  
 Robinson, Thonius, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Rock, Thomas L., XXXXXX  
 Roddy, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Rodenmayer, John P., XXXXXX  
 Rodgers, Robert J., XXXXXX  
 Rodriguez, Cesar A., XXXXXX  
 Roebuck, Thomas W., XXXXXX  
 Rogers, George V., XXXXXX  
 Rogers, Gordon B., Jr., XXXX  
 Rogers, William H., XXXXXX  
 Rogers, William R., XXXXXX  
 Roller, Robin J., XXXX  
 Roman, Theodore, XXXXXX  
 Rose, Barnes W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Rose, Buel T., XXXXXX  
 Roth, Morton F., XXXXXX  
 Roth, Thomas J., XXXXXX  
 Rowinski, Thomas H., XXXXXX  
 Rowlands, David L., XXXXXX  
 Rubin, David B., XXXXXX  
 Rudrow, Robert G., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Runyan, Thomas E., XXXX  
 Rupp, James E., XXXXXX  
 Ruppe, Jake M., XXXXXX  
 Russell, Beryl D., XXXXXX  
 Russell, George G., XXXXXX  
 Russo, Joseph S., XXXXXX  
 Rutter, Leo F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Ryan, James T., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Sadler, Clyde D., XXXXXX  
 Salmonsens, Peter C., XXXXXX  
 Salzman, James D., XXXXXX  
 Sanches, Manuel L., XXXXXX  
 Sanchez, James, XXXXXX  
 Sanders, Reuben L., XXXXXX  
 Sanford, Thomas H., XXXXXX  
 Santa Barbara, Joseph R., XXXXXX  
 Santilli, Joseph F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Sapp, Clarence D., XXXXXX  
 Saunders, Don M., XXXXXX  
 Saunders, Donald S., XXXXXX  
 Schaefer, John E., XXXXXX  
 Scheff, Richard P., XXXXXX  
 Schessler, Donald E., XXXXXX  
 Schiefer, Henry J., XXXXXX  
 Schiesser, Charles W., XXXXXX  
 Schmidt, Guy L., XXXXXX  
 Schneble, Elmer J., XXXXXX  
 Schneeman, Douglas, XXXXXX  
 Schober, Frank J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Schofield, David G., XXXXXX  
 Scholtes, Richard A., XXXXXX  
 Schorr, David E., XXXXXX  
 Schroeder, Eldon K., XXXXXX  
 Schubert, John E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Schuler, James D., XXXXXX  
 Schulze, Howard D., XXXXXX  
 Schumacher, Henry J., XXXXXX  
 Schwoppe, Edwin G., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Scott, Jerry C., XXXXXX  
 Scott, John R., XXXXXX  
 Scudder, Charles P., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Sedgwick, Clyde N., XXXXXX  
 Seely, William B., XXXXXX  
 Seitz, Donald E., XXXXXX  
 Serna, Albert I., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Serrico, Frank L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Serrin, Phillip A., 2d, XXXXXX  
 Sexton, Herman L., XXXXXX  
 Seybold, Lawrence C., XXXXXX  
 Shaddock, Carroll W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Shannon, Douglas, XXXXXX  
 Sharp, Charles W., XXXXXX  
 Shaw, Robert L., XXXXXX  
 Shellabarger, Harold L., XXXXXX  
 Shimek, E. Joe, 2d, XXXXXX  
 Shoptaugh, Leland D., XXXXXX  
 Shuman, John N., XXXXXX

Shumway, James D., XXXXX  
 Slegel, James L., XXXXX  
 Silnes, Sigvart E., XXXXX  
 Simila, Kenneth B., XXXXX  
 Simmons, Cecil K., XXXXX  
 Simons, Robert J., XXXXX  
 Simons, Simon I., XXXXX  
 Simpson, Robert B., XXXXX  
 Simpson, William, XXXXX  
 Sims, Charles O., 3d, XXXXX  
 Sims, John C., Jr., XXXXX  
 Sims, Wesley N., XXXXX  
 Sindoni, Samuel S., XXXXX  
 Skahan, Michael N., XXXXX  
 Skelton, Robert C., XXXXX  
 Skinner, Gary N., Sr., XXXXX  
 Sloan, Charles W., XXXXX  
 Smith, Albert J., XXXXX  
 Smith, David L., XXXXX  
 Smith, Derald H., XXXXX  
 Smith, Donald R., XXXXX  
 Smith, George O., XXXXX  
 Smith, James D., XXXXX  
 Smith, Jimmy W., XXXXX  
 Smith, John D., XXXX  
 Smith, Raymond G., XXXXX  
 Smith, Samuel E., XXXX  
 Smith, Walter D., XXXXX  
 Smith, William L., XXXXX  
 Smolenyak, George C., XXXXX  
 Snyder, Harold B., Jr., XXXXX  
 Snyder, James E., XXXXX  
 Snyder, Ronald E., XXXXX  
 Sobraske, John E., XXXX  
 Solberg, Anthony M., XXXXX  
 Solley, Charles W., XXXXX  
 Solomon, Jack M., XXXXX  
 Somerville, Paul F., XXXXX  
 Sones, Vernon B., XXXXX  
 Sowers, William R., Jr., XXXXX 3  
 Soyster, Harry E., XXXXX  
 Spears, Joseph M., Jr., XXXXX  
 Spector, Joseph H., XXXXX  
 Spence, Ray L., XXXXX  
 Speth, Gerald L., XXXXX  
 Spodobalski, Anthony C., XXXXX  
 Sprague, Charles R., XXXXX  
 Sprague, James D., XXXXX  
 Spurgers, Roy K., XXXXX  
 Squires, Myron E., XXXXX  
 Staggs, Leon D., XXXXX  
 Stamps, John R., XXXXX  
 Stasky, Gall V., XXXXX  
 Stearns, Peter D., XXXXX  
 Steed, Dale C., XXXXX  
 Steel, Richard E., XXXXX  
 Steffen, Albert J., XXXXX  
 Steffen, William E., XXXXX  
 Steger, George F., XXXXX  
 Steimle, Carl R., XXXXX  
 Stein, Edward J., Jr., XXXXX  
 Stein, Michael K., XXXXX  
 Stemley, Gary A., XXXXX  
 Stephenson, Richard E., XXXX  
 Stern, Allan R., XXXXX  
 Stevens, Francis R., Jr., XXXXX  
 Stevens, Ronald B., XXXXX  
 Stewart, John P., XXXXX  
 Stewart, Kelly E., XXXXX  
 Stewart, Robert C., XXXXX  
 Stewart, Ronald B., XXXXX  
 Stewart, William R., XXXXX  
 Stinson, Kenneth B., XXXX  
 Stipe, Aquila E., XXXXX  
 Stipe, John W. M., Jr., XXXX  
 Stockhammer, Gordon F., XXXXX  
 Stockhausen, William T., XXXXX  
 Stoddard, Timothy D., XXXXX  
 Stokes, John H., 3d, XXXXX  
 Stone, Charles B., 4th, XXXXX  
 Stone, Gordon L., XXXXX  
 Storms, Robert N., Jr., XXXXX  
 Stotser, George R., XXXXX  
 Stout, Bruce F., XXXXX  
 Stout, Thomas E., XXXXX  
 Stuart, James R., XXXXX  
 Stycos, John S., XXXX  
 Summers, Wallen M., XXXXX  
 Swann, Roscoe A., Jr., XXXXX  
 Swayne, Charles J., XXXXX  
 Swenson, James A., XXXXX  
 Swindler, Murray G., XXXXX  
 Szendrey, Charles P., XXXXX  
 Szvetcz, Edward, XXXXX  
 Takenaka, Harold H., XXXXX  
 Talbot, George T., Jr., XXXXX  
 Tamminen, David L., XXXXX  
 Taylor, Billy H., XXXXX  
 Taylor, Harry S., XXXXX  
 Taylor, Henry S., 3d, XXXXX  
 Taylor, James V., XXXXX  
 Teale, Willis E., Jr., XXXXX  
 Teasley, Harry N., Jr., XXXXX  
 Tedeschi, Joseph R., XXXXX  
 Tener, Robert K., XXXXX  
 Tengan, James T., XXXXX  
 Tengler, John A., XXXXX  
 Terrana, Vincent, XXXXX  
 Terry, Clifford F., XXXXX  
 Tettelbach, Donald C., XXXXX  
 Theroux, Gilbert L., XXXXX  
 Thomas, Harry L., XXXXX  
 Thomas, Robert W., XXXXX  
 Thompson, Chadwick C., XXXXX  
 Thompson, Ross E. G., Jr., XXXXX  
 Thompson, Thomas G., XXXXX  
 Thompson, William R., XXXXX  
 Thomson, Robert W., XXXXX  
 Tiekens, Richard V., XXXXX  
 Tilly, Clyde C., Jr., XXXXX  
 Tilton, Robert C., XXXXX  
 Timlin, Jerome P., XXXXX  
 Timmons, Robert W., XXXXX  
 Tindall, Asa W., Jr., XXXXX  
 Todd, Carmen D., XXXXX  
 Tomaka, Karl S., XXXXX  
 Toole, Jay C., XXXXX  
 Toolson, John M., Jr., XXXXX  
 Torf, Arthur S., XXXXX  
 Townsend, Merton L., XXXXX  
 Townsend, Robert F., XXXXX  
 Traficante, Anthony J., XXXXX  
 Trdla, Joseph R., XXXXX  
 Treat, Robert B., Jr., XXXXX  
 Trece, Ausby J., XXXXX  
 Tribe, Donald S., XXXXX  
 Tucker, Andrew L., XXXXX  
 Tucker, James M., XXXXX  
 Tucker, Lee W., XXXXX  
 Tullington, Bernard J., Jr., XXXXX  
 Turk, Roy M., XXXXX  
 Turnbull, Robert B., XXXXX  
 Turner, Donald E., XXXXX  
 Turner, Thomas E., 3d, XXXXX  
 Tussing, James T., XXXXX  
 Tweddell, Johnny B., XXXXX  
 Undercoffer, John T., XXXXX  
 Vall, Robert B., XXXXX  
 Valle, John D., XXXXX  
 Van Buskirk, Kenneth C., Jr., XXXXX  
 Van Cleave, Henry D., Jr., XXXXX  
 Van Herpe, William H., XXXXX  
 Van Houten, Peter F., XXXXX  
 Van Winkle, Daniel G., XXXXX  
 Vandergrift, Kennard S., Jr., XXXXX  
 Vardamis, Alexander A., Jr., XXXXX  
 Vargo, John J., Jr., XXXXX  
 Varner, VeLoy J., XXXXX  
 Vaughn, Norman M., Jr., XXXXX  
 Ventzek, Robert E., XXXXX  
 Vermillion, Robert V., XXXXX  
 Vickers, John H., XXXXX  
 Vicknair, Darrell H., XXXXX  
 Vockery, William L., XXXXX  
 Voorhees, Theodore E., XXXXX  
 Vossen, Francis C., XXXXX  
 Vuono, Carl E., XXXXX  
 Wade, Merle L., XXXXX  
 Wadhams, Bruce M., XXXXX  
 Wagner, Stanley G., XXXXX  
 Waite, Richard D., XXXXX  
 Wakefield, Donald Y., XXXXX  
 Walker, Harry D., XXXXX  
 Walker, Jack E., XXXXX  
 Walker, Orien J., Jr., XXXXX  
 Walker, Peter H., XXXXX  
 Walker, Prosper N., XXXXX  
 Walker, Robert E., Jr., XXXXX  
 Wall, Walter F., XXXXX  
 Walters, Charles O., XXXXX  
 Ward, Jerry E., XXXXX  
 Ward, William A., XXXXX  
 Waring, Mowton LeC., Jr., XXXXX  
 Waters, John L., XXXXX  
 Watke, Frederic W., XXXXX  
 Watkins, Edward A., Jr., XXXXX  
 Watson, Gerald G., XXXXX  
 Watson, James H., XXXXX  
 Wattleet, Ronald R., XXXX  
 Watts, Ronald L., XXXXX  
 Weber, Andrew M., Jr., XXXXX  
 Webster, Howard E., Jr., XXXXX  
 Weeks, Jimmy D., XXXXX  
 Weeks, Leon R., XXXXX  
 Weeks, Richard G., XXXXX  
 Weinert, Phillip D., XXXXX  
 Welch, Charles W., XXXXX  
 Welch, Larry L., XXXX  
 Wells, David K., XXXXX  
 Wells, Donald G., XXXXX  
 West, Louis, XXXXX  
 Westerfeldt, Robert C., XXXXX  
 Westhoff, William J., XXXXX  
 Weston, Ray D., XXXXX  
 Wetherington, Bernard J., XXXX  
 Whalen, Donald P., XXXXX  
 Wharton, Walter N., XXXXX  
 Whatley, Howard G., XXXXX  
 Whiddon, Orren R., XXXXX  
 White, Billy T., XXXXX  
 White, Jewel G., XXXXX  
 White, Stanley Z., XXXXX  
 Whitmire, James D., XXXXX  
 Whitt, Lawrence H., XXXXX  
 Whittle, William E., XXXXX  
 Wiersema, Kenneth E., XXXXX  
 Wilder, Allen S., Jr., XXXXX  
 Wiley, Chester J., XXXXX  
 Wilhelm, Edmund A., XXXXX  
 Wilkinson, John C., XXXXX  
 Willett, Frank W., XXXXX  
 Willey, John L., XXXXX  
 Williams, Charles L., 3d, XXXXX  
 Williams, Donald E., Jr., XXXXX  
 Williams, Edward H., XXXXX  
 Williams, Graybill E., XXXXX  
 Williams, Jerry A., XXXXX  
 Williams, Jerry R., XXXXX  
 Williams, Richard E., Jr., XXXXX  
 Williams, Ross S., XXXXX  
 Williams, William J., Jr., XXXXX  
 Williams, William S., XXXXX  
 Williamson, James C., XXXXX  
 Willies, Edward J., XXXX  
 Wilson, Albert H., 3d, XXXXX  
 Wilson, Daniel M., XXXXX  
 Wilson, Gordon E., XXXXX  
 Wilson, Nicholas E., XXXXX  
 Windsor, James A., XXXX  
 Winkler, Carl G., XXXXX  
 Winne, Ross W., Jr., XXXXX  
 Winters, Donald L., XXXXX  
 Winters, Robert E., XXXXX  
 Wise, Harry L., Jr., XXXXX  
 Wise, Joseph R., XXXXX  
 Wisner, Robert M., XXXXX  
 Wishart, Leonard P., 3d, XXXXX  
 Witbrodt, Donald J., XXXXX  
 Witt, Everett L., XXXXX  
 Witt, Jerry V., XXXXX  
 Wittman, Clarence E., XXXXX  
 Wold, Pedar C., XXXXX  
 Wolfe, Robert A., XXXXX  
 Wolfe, William D., XXXXX  
 Wolfe, William M., XXXXX  
 Wood, Billy B., XXXXX  
 Wood, Peter W., XXXXX  
 Woods, Robert D., XXXXX  
 Woods, Robert P., XXXXX  
 Woods, Roger B., XXXXX  
 Woolnough, James P., XXXXX  
 Wray, Donald E., XXXXX  
 Wright, Stuart E., XXXXX  
 Wright, William K., XXXXX  
 Yates, William E., XXXXX  
 Yearly, Ira W., XXXXX  
 Yoos, Robert E., XXXXX  
 Young, Charles D., XXXXX  
 Young, Lawrence B. H., Jr., XXXXX  
 Yuhn, John T., XXXXX  
 Yuill, Stuart J., XXXXX  
 Zabriske, Cedric J., XXXXX  
 Zachgo, Durl D., XXXXX

Zarch, Alan R., XXXXXX  
 Zickel, Raymond E., XXXXXX  
 Zirkle, Michael N., XXXXXX  
 Zitz, Joseph S., XXXXXX  
 Zoeller, Robert J., XXXXXX  
 Zychowski, Edward F., XXXXXX

*To be captain, chaplain*

Beaver, Reinard W., XXXXXX  
 Clark, Donald D., XXXXXX  
 Day, Roland F., XXXXXX  
 Hilton, Gerald K., XXXXXX  
 Howerton, Robert B., XXXXXX  
 Jett, Mace T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Kieschnick, Alton R., XXXXXX  
 Lindenauer, Jon M., XXXXXX  
 Matthias, Charles B., XXXXXX  
 Moore, Willard P., XXXXXX

*To be captain, Women's Army Corps*

Caldwell, Doris L., XXXX  
 Clifford, Margaret, XXXX  
 Cooper, Alice E., XXXX  
 Hallman, Jane I., XXXX  
 Herms, Frances K., XXXX  
 Hess, Anne M., XXXX  
 Homeyer, Anne W., XXXX  
 Mastropool, Gladys N., XXXX  
 Raines, Ruth D., XXXX  
 Shelton, Ellen J., XXXX  
 Sylvester, Suzanne E., XXXX

*To be captain, Medical Corps*

Agee, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Allen, Bohn D., XXXXXX  
 Allen, Harold J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Annable, Charles R., XXXXXX  
 Arthur, James D., XXXXXX  
 Bean, Stuart K., XXXXXX  
 Becker, Arthur A., XXXXXX  
 Bolick, Larry E., XXXXXX  
 Bourgeois, Curtis H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Brainard, William C., XXXXXX  
 Brougher, Robert H., XXXXXX  
 Browning, Donald G., XXXXXX  
 Burton, Thomas H., XXXXXX  
 Cason, William P., XXXXXX  
 Cocke, Joseph G., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Cohen, Richard J., XXXXXX  
 Cooper, Edgar L., XXXXXX  
 Cornell, Paul J., XXXXXX  
 Dickerson, Alfred G., XXXXXX  
 Edmonds, Paul B., XXXXXX  
 Ellison, Norig, XXXXXX  
 Evans, Richard, 3d, XXXXXX  
 Felger, Charles E., XXXXXX  
 Fuqua, William B., XXXXXX  
 Gates, Francis K., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Gerhard, Clyde, XXXXXX  
 Guiton, Carl R., XXXXXX  
 Hano, Jessie E., XXXXXX  
 Harris, Charles H., XXXXXX  
 Haymond, David R., XXXXXX  
 Helmus, Wilbert F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hemingway, Dennis L., XXXXXX  
 Heymann, Robert L., XXXXXX  
 Hughes, Robert P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hutchison, William A., XXXXXX  
 Jensen, Walter L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Jones, Charles B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Ladner, Calvin N., XXXXXX  
 Lawrence, Donald J., XXXXXX  
 Leary, John B., XXXXXX  
 Lett, Charles R., XXXXXX  
 Levy, Morris S., XXXXXX  
 Madison, David S., XXXXXX  
 Magoline, Alfred J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Martin, Jerry R., XXXXXX  
 McLean, Robert B., XXXXXX  
 Miller, Donald F., XXXXXX  
 Monzingo, George F., XXXXXX  
 O'Rourke, George W., XXXXXX  
 Painter, Milford E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Perito, John E., XXXXXX  
 Pitkethly, David T., XXXXXX  
 Quarantilo, Edward P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Rainville, Thomas J., XXXXXX  
 Sauer, Gerald F., XXXXXX  
 Sheaffer, Harold C., XXXXXX  
 Shown, Thomas E., XXXXXX  
 Soha, Albert J., XXXXXX  
 Sprengelmeyer, James T., XXXXXX

Strickland, Alva L., XXXXXX  
 Terrell, Dudley J., XXXXXX  
 Thuss, Charles J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Veatch, William M., XXXXXX  
 Wagner, Clyde W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Washburn, Kenneth B., XXXXXX

*To be captain, Dental Corps*

Balaban, Bernard, XXXXXX  
 Bohanan, Jack R., XXXXXX  
 Cheney, Daniel K., XXXXXX  
 DuPont, Albert A., XXXXXX  
 Hirsch, Edward H., XXXXXX  
 Huget, Eugene F., XXXXXX  
 Morgan, James K., XXXXXX  
 Nelson, Robert N., XXXXXX  
 Rodenburg, Carl E., XXXXXX  
 Schwartz, Roy S., XXXXXX

*To be captain, Veterinary Corps*

Bucci, Thomas J., XXXXXX  
 Edwards, George C., XXXXXX  
 Farris, Richard D., XXXXXX  
 Ferrell, John F., XXXXXX  
 Hunt, Ronald D., XXXXXX  
 Jorgensen, Robert R., XXXXXX  
 Spertzel, Richard O., XXXXXX  
 Voelker, Richard W., Jr., XXXXXX

*To be captain, Medical Service Corps*

Allgood, Gerald D., XXXXXX  
 Amidon, Charles D., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Barber, Leroy M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Bayne, Calvin, XXXXXX  
 Bissell, Donald F., XXXXXX  
 Bowes, Donald J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Broadfoot, Bobby E., XXXXXX  
 Brown, George L., XXXXXX  
 Browning, Robert D., XXXXXX  
 Bryant, Robert J., XXXXXX  
 Bunce, George E., XXXXXX  
 Burris, Norman L., XXXXXX  
 Casasanta, John J., XXXXXX  
 Cedola, Vincent J., XXXXXX  
 Charlton, John L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Clark, Harry H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Clegg, George J., XXXXXX  
 Cooper, James D., XXXXXX  
 Cornwall, Ralph W., XXXXXX  
 Crawford, John C., XXXXXX  
 Crenshaw, William A., XXXXXX  
 Crosley, John K., XXXXXX  
 Dacus, Lester H., XXXXXX  
 Danielson, John J., XXXXXX  
 Darnauer, Paul F., XXXXXX  
 Dawson, William J., XXXXXX  
 Eberwine, James A., XXXXXX  
 Eldridge, Bruce F., XXXXXX  
 Fisher, George A., XXXXXX  
 Geringer, Gerald G., XXXXXX  
 Gossage, Donald R., XXXXXX  
 Gourley, John H., XXXXXX  
 Gulevich, Vladimir, XXXXXX  
 Harding, Clarence E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Harris, Davis P., XXXXXX  
 Haswell, Edward A., XXXXXX  
 Heldmyer, Harry F., XXXXXX  
 Heriot, Richard M., XXXXXX  
 Herndon, Joseph E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hickey, George J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hill, William D., XXXXXX  
 Hudson, James F., XXXXXX  
 Hull, Donald R., XXXXXX  
 Inge, Bobby M., XXXXXX  
 Jordan, France F., XXXXXX  
 La Luzerne, Ronald J., XXXXXX  
 Levy, Louis B., XXXXXX  
 Liedtka, Frederick A., XXXXXX  
 Linder, William W., XXXXXX  
 Lupien, Earle E., XXXXXX  
 Maeder, Donald F., XXXXXX  
 McGinnis, John W., XXXXXX  
 McKain, Jerry L., XXXXXX  
 Mealey, John J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Mills, Freddie J., XXXXXX  
 Moran, Homer B., XXXXXX  
 Muglia, Joseph R., XXXXXX  
 Murphy, John W., XXXXXX  
 Murray, Ernest C., XXXXXX  
 Murrell, Dan S., XXXXXX  
 Naylor, Donald L., XXXXXX  
 Neitzel, Richard F., XXXXXX

Oswalt, Harris G., XXXXXX  
 Otterstedt, Charles C., Junior, XXXXXX  
 Pantalone, Julius D., XXXXXX  
 Phillips, Finos J., XXXXXX  
 Piercy, John P., XXXXXX  
 PITCHFORD, Thomas L., XXXXXX  
 Pitts, William P., XXXXXX  
 Powell, Harold W., XXXXXX  
 Pulcini, Dino J., XXXXXX  
 Romero, Daniel J., XXXXXX  
 Sande, Sigvart, XXXXXX  
 Santori, Luis A., XXXXXX  
 Seeley, Sam T., XXXXXX  
 Shaw, Dale L., XXXXXX  
 Snell, John T., XXXXXX  
 Steinberg, Marshall C., XXXXXX  
 Stevenson, Wilbert, XXXXXX  
 Stowe, Charles L., XXXXXX  
 Stubblefield, James B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Sutton, Mark R., XXXXXX  
 Thornburg, Lamonte F., XXXXXX  
 Timmens, James M., XXXXXX  
 Turner, James G., XXXXXX  
 Upham, Robert W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Van Nus, Frederick, XXXXXX  
 Van Straten, James G., XXXXXX  
 Van Wyck, William E., XXXXXX  
 Villanueva, Teodoro, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Vining, John F., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Walls, Neal H., XXXXXX  
 Wangemann, Robert T., XXXXXX  
 Wilburn, James H., XXXXXX  
 Wilson, Robert G., XXXXXX  
 Wood, Malcolm H., Jr., XXXXXX

*To be captain, Army Nurse Corps*

Anderson, Helen G., XXXXX  
 Farrell, Joanne T., XXXXX  
 Garmon, Betty L., XXXXX  
 Gilbrech, Carmen E., XXXXX  
 Gregory, Barbara A., XXXXX  
 Hanson, Carol L., XXXXX  
 Jaskoski, Margaret L., XXXXX  
 Johnson, Hazel W., XXXXX  
 O'Rourke, Gwendolyn L., XXXXX  
 Sandness, Elizabeth A., XXXXX  
 Sullivan, Elenore F., XXXXX  
 Tauscher, Etta R., XXXXX  
 Yoder, Ann E., XXXXX

*To be captain, Army Medical Specialist Corps*

Brown, Eloise A., XXXX  
 Dobbs, Eunice R., XXXX  
 Fritsch, Ann D., XXXX  
 Hyde, Patricia L., XXXX  
 McDowell, Joyce, XXXX  
 Pause, Barbara E., XXXX  
 Thompson, Margaret B., XXXX  
 Yeakel, Mary H., XXXX

The following named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

*To be first lieutenant*

Adair, Robert B., XXXXXX  
 Adams, Frank S., XXXXXX  
 Adams, Glen T., XXXXXX  
 Adams, Ralph E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Adams, Robert T., XXXXXX  
 Adams, Wilsie H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Adderley, David L., XXXXXX  
 Aikman, Larry P., XXXXXX  
 Alban, John H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Aldridge, Jesse C., XXXXXX  
 Alexander, Don R., XXXXXX  
 Alexander, Joseph D., XXXXXX  
 Algure, Robert T., XXXXXX  
 Allen, Alex L., XXXXXX  
 Allen, Donald K., XXXXXX  
 Allen, Lee, XXXXXX  
 Amiraout, Robert J., XXXXXX  
 Ammerman, Robert H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Anchors, Donald A., XXXXXX  
 Anderson, Powell R., XXXXXX  
 Anderson, Robert A., XXXXXX  
 Anderson, Warren H., XXXXXX  
 Andrews, Raymond S., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Andrews, William C., XXXXXX  
 Appell, Michael N., XXXXXX  
 Applegarth, Donald L., XXXXXX  
 Arthur, Warren A., XXXXXX

Ash, Hughes L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Ax, George R., XXXXXX  
 Bailey, William N., Jr., XXXX  
 Baker, Anthony D., XXXXXX  
 Baker, Charles R., XXXXXX  
 Baldwin, Edward E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Baldwin, Richard A., XXXXXX  
 Balfanz, William F., XXXXXX  
 Bara, Thaddeus J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Bare, George P., XXXX  
 Barone, Ercole M., XXXX  
 Barr, Allyn J., XXXXXX  
 Barrell, Donald H., XXXXXX  
 Barrows, Raymond R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Bartelt, Roger L., XXXXXX  
 Bauer, David W., XXXXXX  
 Baur, James F., XXXXXX  
 Baxter, George J., XXXXXX  
 Beaudin, Lawrence A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Beavers, Leslie E., XXXXXX  
 Beck, William F., XXXXXX  
 Belan, Charles G., XXXXXX  
 Belanger, David P., XXXXXX  
 Bellis, Philip R., XXXXXX  
 Bellis, Edward A., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Beltz, Ronald A., XXXXXX  
 Bennett, James L., XXXXXX  
 Bennett, Thomas R., XXXXXX  
 Berstein, Joel E., XXXXXX  
 Berry, John A., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Bertl, John R., XXXXXX  
 Bertocci, David I., XXXXXX  
 Bibb, Randolph T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Bidgood, Ferdinand C., XXXXXX  
 Bierly, Robert N., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Bingham, James W., XXXXXX  
 Blondi, Richard M., XXXXXX  
 Bireley, Judson L., XXXXXX  
 Blackstone, Anthony H., XXXXXX  
 Blake, Phillip L., XXXXXX  
 Blanton, John R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Blewett, John H., XXXXXX  
 Blitch, William T., XXXXXX  
 Bloch, Arthur LeR., XXXXXX  
 Bochnowski, Frank J., XXXXXX  
 Bogart, William V., XXXXXX  
 Bohn, Joseph P., XXXXXX  
 Bomersheim, Phil K., XXXXXX  
 Bonifay, Issaac F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Booker, James A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Borg, Charles T., XXXXXX  
 Boucher, Arthur G., XXXXXX  
 Bowden, John T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Bowden, Kenneth C., XXXXXX  
 Bowers, Joseph M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Bowersox, Wilbur G., XXXXXX  
 Boyd, Richard K., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Boyd, William L., XXXXXX  
 Boyles, Harry W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Bradford, Larry N., XXXXXX  
 Bradley, Robert N., XXXXXX  
 Bradley, William A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Brady, Edward J., XXXXXX  
 Brand, Harold J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Bratz, Gordon T., XXXXXX  
 Brennan, Ambrose W., XXXXXX  
 Brett, William W., XXXXXX  
 Brickey, William E., XXXXXX  
 Brindley, Peter, XXXXXX  
 Brisach, Eugene M., XXXXXX  
 Britz, Ronald J., XXXXXX  
 Brown, Charles C., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Brown, James H., XXXXXX  
 Brown, Jay S., XXXXXX  
 Brownfield, Harold A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Brugh, Larry D., XXXX  
 Brumblay, Robert H., XXXXXX  
 Brux, Gary H., XXXXXX  
 Bryant, Robert L., XXXXXX  
 Buchanan, Frank B., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Bullock, Thomas L., XXXXXX  
 Bumgardner, William H., XXXXXX  
 Bunten, Ralph T., Jr., XXXX  
 Bunting, Bertram A., XXXXXX  
 Burden, John R., XXXXXX  
 Burnell, Robert W., XXXXXX  
 Burns, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Burns, Timothy F., XXXXXX  
 Bury, Robert H., XXXX  
 Busch, John M., XXXXXX  
 Butler, David H., XXXXXX  
 Byrnes, David F., XXXXXX  
 Cabaniss, William J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Cafky, James W., XXXXXX  
 Caldwell, Joseph G., XXXXXX  
 Caldwell, Ora O., XXXXXX  
 Caldwell, Robert C., XXXXXX  
 Caldwell, Robert W., XXXXXX  
 Callahan, Joseph C., XXXXXX  
 Calverase, Francis J., XXXXXX  
 Calvin, Harry C., XXXXXX  
 Campbell, Charles L., XXXXXX  
 Campbell, Dan H., XXXXXX  
 Campbell, Jack A., XXXXXX  
 Campbell, Richard J., XXXX  
 Canant, Raymond G., XXXXXX  
 Cannon, Joe M., XXXXXX  
 Caraballo, Julian T., XXXXXX  
 Carey, Arthur T., XXXXXX  
 Carlile, Donald E., XXXXXX  
 Carlton, Terry M., XXXXXX  
 Carmean, Clayton H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Carnaghi, Richard A., XXXXXX  
 Carpenter, William S., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Carr, John M., XXXXXX  
 Carter, Kevin R., XXXXXX  
 Carville, Louis A., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Cary, John B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Cary, Martin W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Casey, John L., XXXXXX  
 Castleman, Robert J., Jr., XXXX  
 Cato, Richard W., XXXXXX  
 Cavender, Jerry W., XXXXXX  
 Celichowski, Richard J., XXXXXX  
 Cerjan, Paul G., XXXXXX  
 Chabot, Brion V., XXXXXX  
 Chader, Gordon H., XXXXXX  
 Chaffin, Harry J., XXXXXX  
 Chamberlain, William F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Champ, Alan D., XXXXXX  
 Chapman, Don C., XXXXXX  
 Chapman, Gerald, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Chappell, Phillip E., XXXXXX  
 Chase, William C., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Chitren, Vincent R., XXXXXX  
 Choplick, James R., XXXXXX  
 Clancy, Robert F., XXXXXX  
 Clark, Claude L., XXXXXX  
 Clark, Daniel E., XXXXXX  
 Clark, Herbert N., XXXXXX  
 Clark, Jack L., XXXXXX  
 Clay, Wayne, XXXXXX  
 Cleale, Conrad S., XXXXXX  
 Cleaver, Donald E., XXXXXX  
 Clement, Gregory C., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Click, David L., XXXXXX  
 Coffey, Lawrence E., Jr., XXXX  
 Cole, Robert H., XXXXXX  
 Cole, Theodore E., XXXXXX  
 Collins, Charles D., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Comfort, Gary L., XXXXXX  
 Cook, Clyde L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Cooper, Milton E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Coose, Alonzo, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Copeland, Clinso, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Costa, Joseph, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Costa, Louis P., XXXXXX  
 Cote, Joseph R., XXXXXX  
 Court, Reginald D., XXXXXX  
 Covan, James E., XXXXXX  
 Covell, Stilman D., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Cox, Richard L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Creighton, William S., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Cremer, Frank N., XXXXXX  
 Cressall, William F., XXXXXX  
 Croel, Philip M., XXXXXX  
 Croll, Gerald F., XXXXXX  
 Crosby, George T., XXXXXX  
 Crossley, Ross W., XXXXXX  
 Crowley, Edward M., XXXXXX  
 Crum, Edward W., XXXXXX  
 Crump, John C., XXXXXX  
 Crutchfield, Ralph LeR., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Cruz-Casado, Hector, XXXXXX  
 Cullins, Ross H., XXXXXX  
 Cully, William J., XXXXXX  
 Culp, Richard B., XXXXXX  
 Cummings, Edward H., XXXXXX  
 Cummings, Patrick W., XXXX  
 Cushman, James McR., XXXXXX  
 Danforth, William W., XXXXXX  
 Daniel, James P., XXXXXX  
 Daniel, Richard A., XXXXXX  
 Danielsen, Theodore S., XXXX  
 Darden, Harold W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Darling, Dean H., XXXXXX  
 Darling, Merlin D., XXXXXX  
 Dascanio, John L., XXXXXX  
 Daum, Richard S., XXXXXX  
 Davidson, Robert B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Davis, Joal LeR., XXXXXX  
 Davis, Lynn E., XXXXXX  
 Day, Richard J., XXXXXX  
 Dawdy, William F., XXXXXX  
 Deagle, Edwin A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Dean, Arthur J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Dearing, David P., XXXXXX  
 Deaton, Jones T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 DeBolt, Harold F., XXXXXX  
 Decker, Roger B., XXXXXX  
 Decko, Charles C., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Del Favero, Robert V., XXXX  
 DeLoach, Javan M., XXXXXX  
 DelPonti, John D., XXXXXX  
 Denton, John R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 DePew, John C., XXXXXX  
 Desgroseillers, Ronald P., XXXXXX  
 DeWitt, John L., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Dice, Denis C., XXXXXX  
 Dice, Jack W., XXXXXX  
 Diebold, Jerome A., XXXXXX  
 Dieker, Lawrence L., XXXXXX  
 Dinsmore, Paul F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Dlugopolski, Donald J., XXXXXX  
 Donahue, Daniel J., XXXXXX  
 Donahue, Thomas J., XXXXXX  
 Donaldson, Benjamin L., XXXXXX  
 Dorf, Daniel J., XXXXXX  
 Dorsey, Ira, XXXXXX  
 Douglas, James A., XXXXXX  
 Downey, John T., XXXXXX  
 Doyle, William J., XXXXXX  
 Drake, Earle A., XXXXXX  
 Drake, Edmond H., XXXXXX  
 Dreibelbis, Harold N., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Drewfs, Henry F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Drisko, Richard W., XXXXXX  
 Driver, Lewis F., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Drollinger, William O., XXXXXX  
 Drumbeller, Ronald E., XXXXXX  
 Dubov, Bruce J., XXXXXX  
 Duncan, Wallace H., XXXXXX  
 Dunham, Rockwood S., XXXXXX  
 Dunlap, Albert J., XXXXXX  
 DuPont, Arnold R., XXXXXX  
 Durham, John W., XXXXXX  
 Duryea, Lyman C., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Dwyre, Charles M., XXXXXX  
 Dyer, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Dynes, John H., XXXXXX  
 Eckert, Robert D., XXXXXX  
 Eckmann, Michael E., XXXXXX  
 Edelstein, Rand, XXXXXX  
 Edgette, Charles W., XXXXXX  
 Edwards, Robert H., XXXXXX  
 Elder, Cecil W., XXXXXX  
 Elder, Jack E., XXXXXX  
 Ellis, David E., XXXXXX  
 Endicott, James A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Endy, Clarence E., Jr., XXXX  
 Epley, Gerald G., Jr., XXXX  
 Erickson, William C., XXXXXX  
 Estes, Robert F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Eubanks, Earl W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Eubanks, Herman T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Evans, Benjamin F., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Everbach, Otto G., XXXXXX  
 Eynon, Thomas F., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Faery, Henry F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Fairchild, James B., XXXXXX  
 Fairweather, Robert S., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Fanning, John J., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Fanning, John P., XXXXXX  
 Farrell, Francis W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Fasching, George H., XXXXXX  
 Fay, William P., XXXXXX  
 Fecht, Jack A., XXXXXX  
 Federico, Robert J., XXXXXX  
 Fedynak, Raymond E., XXXXXX  
 Fegan, Charles B., XXXXXX  
 Felber, Joseph G., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Fenton, Roland D., XXXXXX  
 Ferguson, George A., Jr., XXXXXX

Ferguson, Jack H., XXXXXX  
 Ferguson, Michael L., XXXXXX  
 Fero, James P., XXXXXX  
 Ferrence, Paul F., XXXXXX  
 Field, Michael F., XXXXXX  
 Fields, Harold T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Fields, James C., XXXXXX  
 Fiero, Robert S., XXXXXX  
 Finley, George A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Finn, Frank D., XXXXXX  
 Floravanti, Domenic A., XXXXXX  
 Flaenery, Eugene P., XXXXXX  
 Flanagan, Thomas P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Flint, Walker H., XXXXXX  
 Florence, William E., XXXXXX  
 Floyd, Howard J., XXXXXX  
 Flynn, Dennis J., XXXXXX  
 Forbes, Jere K., XXXXXX  
 Forster, Franz J., XXXXXX  
 Fortier, Joseph E., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Fourson, George R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Fowler, Donald E., XXXXXX  
 Fox, Nathaniel S., XXXXXX  
 Foye, Robert, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Francis, Robert G., XXXXXX  
 Frank, John J., XXXXXX  
 Frankenberger, Charles E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Franche, Louis D. F., XXXXXX  
 Fraser, Howard D., XXXXXX  
 Freitag, William W., XXXXXX  
 French, William C., XXXXXX  
 Frigard, George C., XXXXXX  
 Fritts, Courtney R., XXXXXX  
 Fritts, William D., XXXXXX  
 Fritz, James E., XXXXXX  
 Frost, Dean R., XXXXXX  
 Furey, Bartley W., XXXXXX  
 Fyfe, John C., XXXXXX  
 Gabrysiak, Walter J., XXXXXX  
 Gagliano, Ross A., XXXXXX  
 Gallo, Charles L., XXXXXX  
 Gannett, Robert W., XXXXXX  
 Garcia, Jose, XXXXXX  
 Garcia, Miguel A., XXXXXX  
 Garner, George K., XXXXXX  
 Garrity, John J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Garton, Edward R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Garvey, James G., XXXXXX  
 Gates, Richard H., XXXXXX  
 Geehr, Richard S., XXXXXX  
 Geiger, John F., XXXXXX  
 Geisinger, John L., XXXXXX  
 German, Abraham L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Germann, Anthony C., XXXXXX  
 Getgood, John H., XXXXXX  
 Giacoppe, George N., XXXXXX  
 Gianelloni, Sabin J., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Gibbs, Homer J., XXXXXX  
 Gibbs, John J., XXXXXX  
 Gibbs, John S., XXXXXX  
 Gick, George P., XXXXXX  
 Giese, Arthur M., XXXXXX  
 Giglicos, Chris G., XXXXXX  
 Gilliland, Jerrold L., XXXXXX  
 Gill, Terrance M., XXXXXX  
 Gillespie, Richard H., XXXXXX  
 Gillespie, Wayne G., XXXXXX  
 Gilmartin, Michael W., XXXXXX  
 Glaser, Kenneth R., XXXXXX  
 Gledhill, David W., XXXXXX  
 Godwin, James S., XXXXXX  
 Good, Walter R., XXXXXX  
 Goodman, Michael L., XXXXXX  
 Goto, Arthur K., XXXXXX  
 Graham, Leonard T., XXXXXX  
 Grande, Vincent G., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Grattan, Brian T., XXXXXX  
 Gratzner, Bernard W., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Graves, Forrest V., XXXXXX  
 Green, Edward R., XXXXXX  
 Greene, Richard McD., XXXXXX  
 Greenhaw, Thomas W., XXXXXX  
 Greif, William J., XXXXXX  
 Grier, Edward G., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Griffis, Fletcher H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Griffith, Eugene D., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Griffith, Fenton H., XXXXXX  
 Griggs, Joe H., XXXXXX  
 Guest, James A., XXXXXX  
 Guggenheimer, Max, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Guindon, Richard G., XXXXXX  
 Gulla, John F., XXXXXX  
 Gunter, William J., XXXXXX  
 Hackett, Robert T. G., XXXXXX  
 Hagan, Carl A., XXXXXX  
 Hagen, Lars B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hall, Frederic B., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Halley, Fred N., XXXXXX  
 Hallihan, James J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Halsall, Ronald W., XXXXXX  
 Hamilton, George A., XXXXXX  
 Hanne, William G., XXXXXX  
 Hapeman, Elmer R., XXXXXX  
 Harcke, Howard T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hardenburg, William J., XXXXXX  
 Harder, Frederick R., XXXXXX  
 Hardin, Alva V., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hardy, Albert S., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Harmon, William E., XXXXXX  
 Harnagel, William R., XXXXXX  
 Harris, Martin J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Harrison, Kent E., XXXXXX  
 Hart, Edward D., XXXXXX  
 Hasenel, Gordon J., XXXXXX  
 Hastings, Walter D., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hatcher, Michael J., XXXXXX  
 Haycraft, Thomas J., XXXXXX  
 Hays, Loyd J., XXXXXX  
 Healy, Richard W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hebert, John M., XXXXXX  
 Heckman, George M., XXXXXX  
 Helbock, Richard W., XXXXXX  
 Henderson, Arthur L., XXXXXX  
 Hendrickson, Christopher P., XXXXXX  
 Henigsmann, David N., XXXXXX  
 Henry, Charles W., XXXXXX  
 Henry, George E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Henry, Larry F., XXXXXX  
 Herman, Dean A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hernalz, Alfonso M., XXXXXX  
 Herrick, Curtis J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Herring, John P., XXXXXX  
 Herrmann, Gerald E., XXXXXX  
 Hervert, Richard J., XXXXXX  
 Herzog, Charles W., XXXXXX  
 Hesford, John P., XXXXXX  
 Hickey, John F., XXXXXX  
 Hickman, Stanford W., XXXXXX  
 Hidalgo, Manuel A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hill, Kenneth R., XXXXXX  
 Hindman, John E., XXXXXX  
 Hinds, Jim E., XXXXXX  
 Hittner, Anthony L., XXXXXX  
 Hixson, John A., XXXXXX  
 Hoas, John G., XXXXXX  
 Hodel, Gerhardt W., XXXXXX  
 Hodge, David L., XXXXXX  
 Hoffman, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Hogan, Donal D., XXXXXX  
 Hogarth, John D., XXXXXX  
 Hohman, Roger D., XXXXXX  
 Holland, James C., XXXXXX  
 Holland, Patrick J., XXXXXX  
 Holleman, Richard J., XXXXXX  
 Holmes, Allen E., XXXXXX  
 Holmes, Simon H., XXXXXX  
 Honda, Harry T., XXXXXX  
 Hooverson, Richard L., XXXXXX  
 Hoppe, Howard J., XXXXXX  
 Hopper, James A., XXXXXX  
 Horton, Leland H., XXXXXX  
 Hourihan, William J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 House, John C., XXXXXX  
 Householder, James C., XXXXXX  
 Houston, Darrell G., XXXXXX  
 Howell, Eugene A., XXXXXX  
 Hubard, John B., XXXXXX  
 Hubbard, Donald A., XXXXXX  
 Hubbard, Johnny R., XXXXXX  
 Huber, Thomas H., XXXXXX  
 Huffine, Melvin T., XXXXXX  
 Hug, Jack P., XXXXXX  
 Hughes, Patrick R., XXXXXX  
 Humes, Jack T., XXXXXX  
 Humphrey, Theodore R., XXXXXX  
 Humphreys, James E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Hunter, Robert L., XXXXXX  
 Hutcheson, John D., XXXXXX  
 Hutchison, Joseph W., XXXXXX  
 Hynd, John W., XXXXXX  
 Ichiyama, Ronald S., XXXXXX  
 Isham, George F., XXXXXX  
 Jackson, Charles H., Sr., XXXXXX  
 Jacques, Joseph N., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Jaeckel, Richard A., XXXXXX  
 Janszen, James H., XXXXXX  
 Jarrett, Jay H., XXXXXX  
 Jarvis, Charles W., XXXXXX  
 Jascewsky, Joseph A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Jenrette, Albert W., XXXXXX  
 Jensen, Marvin R., XXXXXX  
 Jeszenszky, John F., XXXXXX  
 Jezlor, Michael A., XXXXXX  
 Jhung, Grafton, XXXXXX  
 Jilbert, Gerald R., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, Alan E., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, Anthony, XXXXXX  
 Johnson, Frederick A., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, James B., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, James H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, Robert C., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, Robert N., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, Thomas M., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, Thomas W., XXXXXX  
 Johnson, William LeR., XXXXXX  
 Johnston, Frederick E., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Johnston, Joseph W., II, XXXXXX  
 Jones, Arland A., XXXXXX  
 Jones, Homer W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Jordan, Paul G., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Jordan, William J., XXXXXX  
 Joyce, Larry E., XXXXXX  
 Judson, Arthur E., XXXXXX  
 Kaiser, George F., XXXXXX  
 Kaiser, Harold F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Kane, George R., XXXXXX  
 Kane, James R., XXXXXX  
 Kane, John J., XXXXXX  
 Kane, John P., XXXXXX  
 Kane, John R., XXXXXX  
 Kanemori, Claude H., XXXXXX  
 Karaman, James W., XXXXXX  
 Keane, John K., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Keating, Albert C., XXXXXX  
 Keene, Jack R., XXXXXX  
 Kelley, Samuel P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Kelly, Robert R., XXXXXX  
 Kelly, William F., XXXXXX  
 Kiernan, Thomas J., XXXXXX  
 Killingstad, Karl P., XXXXXX  
 King, Jack J., XXXXXX  
 King, James R., XXXXXX  
 King, Kenneth L., XXXXXX  
 King, Lyell F., XXXXXX  
 Kinkade, David R., XXXXXX  
 Kirchner, Kenneth E., XXXXXX  
 Klein, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Kleinstiver, Lloyd W., XXXXXX  
 Kling, Larry V., XXXXXX  
 Klosek, James W., XXXXXX  
 Klosen, Douglas F., XXXXXX  
 Kniskern, Bruce E., XXXXXX  
 Kobayashi, Norman T., XXXXXX  
 Kobza, Gene R., XXXXXX  
 Koehler, Douglas T., XXXXXX  
 Kolodziejski, Anthony J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Kopecky, Robert J., XXXXXX  
 Kopp, Thomas E., XXXXXX  
 Kouns, Darryle L., XXXXXX  
 Krahe, Francis X., XXXXXX  
 Krape, Darryl S., XXXXXX  
 Kuhn, Wayne B., XXXXXX  
 Kuklinski, Norman J., XXXXXX  
 Kulish, Jon N., XXXXXX  
 Kuypers, Thomas O., XXXXXX  
 Kwasny, Philip M., XXXXXX  
 Labat, Roger J., XXXXXX  
 LaBlonde, George T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Lacey, William G., XXXXXX  
 Ladehoff, Harold L., XXXXXX  
 LaForgia, Salvatore F., XXXXXX  
 Lagasse, Peter F., XXXXXX  
 Laird, William R., XXXXXX  
 Lambert, Joseph R., XXXXXX  
 Lang, William A., XXXXXX  
 Langseth, Leslie G., XXXXXX  
 Laurence, Edward J., XXXXXX  
 Lawson, Edward K., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Leamy, Charles D., XXXXXX  
 Learned, Samuel M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Lee, Gene H., XXXXXX  
 Lee, Henry, XXXX  
 Lee, Stanley M., XXXXXX

Leech, Robert L., XXXXXX  
 Leedy, Eugene B., XXXX  
 LeFebvre, John A., XXXXXX  
 Le Gath, Joseph S., XXXXXX  
 Lehrer, Glenn H., XXXXXX  
 Lemmer, John F., XXXXXX  
 Lenti, John M., XXXXXX  
 Leonard, Charles F., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Leonard, James E., XXXXXX  
 Lech, Irving A., XXXXXX  
 Letonoff, Victor T., XXXXXX  
 Leuty, Ray S., XXXXXX  
 Lewis, Jerome X., 2d., XXXXXX  
 Lewis, Sterling M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Lincoln, James B., XXXXXX  
 Linebaugh, John M., XXXXXX  
 Linton, James E., XXXXXX  
 Littlewood, Arthur R., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Livingston, Gordon S., XXXXXX  
 Logsdon, Lawrence J., XXXXXX  
 Lohr, Richard A., XXXXXX  
 Loomis, Leonard J., XXXXXX  
 Lopez-Sanchez, Andres, XXXXXX  
 Loscuito, Ned N., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Lott, George B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Lotz, Reinhard M., XXXXXX  
 Loundenslager, Max J., XXXXXX  
 Lovsnes, Neal W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Lowrey, Mark P., XXXXXX  
 Lowry, Mark, 2d., XXXXXX  
 Lucas, Joseph C., XXXXXX  
 Ludovici, Kenneth R., XXXXXX  
 Lusky, Harold H., XXXXXX  
 Luster, Ira T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Luton, Charles G., XXXXXX  
 Lynch, David F., XXXXXX  
 Lynch, Michael J., XXXXXX  
 Lynn, Frederick J., XXXXXX  
 MacAulay, David J., XXXXXX  
 Macinko, James A., XXXXXX  
 Macklin, John P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 MacLachlan, Peter, XXXXXX  
 Maddox, Edward R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Madison, Richard J., XXXXXX  
 Maginnis, Thomas P., XXXXXX  
 Maguire, Michael E., XXXXXX  
 Maksimowski, Ferdinand, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Mallardi, Robert N., XXXXXX  
 Maloney, William H., XXXXXX  
 Mandelbaum, Charles E., XXXXXX  
 Mandry, Paul W., XXXXXX  
 Manley, Edward J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Marcinkowski, Robert D., XXXXXX  
 Marcy, Spencer D., XXXXXX  
 Marks, Samuel L., XXXXXX  
 Marmon, Herman S., XXXXXX  
 Marotta, Joseph R., XXXXXX  
 Marshall, Dahl, XXXXXX  
 Marshall, Marion H., XXXXXX  
 Martin, John A., XXXXXX  
 Martin, Stanley J., XXXXXX  
 Martin, Williams S., XXXXXX  
 Martone, Patrick N., XXXXXX  
 Martz, John R., XXXXXX  
 Mason, John T., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Mason, Leslie P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Maurer, Raymond W., XXXXXX  
 Mawhorter, T. J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Mayo, John O., Jr., XXXXXX  
 McCahan, Alan R., XXXXXX  
 McCarthy, Daniel J., XXXXXX  
 McCollum, James K., XXXXXX  
 McCormick, James P., XXXXXX  
 McCormick, Michael H., XXXXXX  
 McElroy, George J., XXXXXX  
 McFaul, William N., 3d., XXXXXX  
 McGance, Philip V., XXXXXX  
 McGeary, Martin N., Jr., XXXXXX  
 McGough, James B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 McGushin, Edward F., XXXXXX  
 McInerney, Richard N., XXXXXX  
 McKee, Michael R., XXXXXX  
 McKinney, John J., XXXXXX  
 McLaughlin, Eugene J., XXXXXX  
 McManus, George H., XXXXXX  
 McNamara, William T., XXXXXX  
 McPherson, Thomas H., XXXXXX  
 McQuillen, George P., XXXXXX  
 McWain, James T., XXXXXX  
 Meany, George E., XXXXXX  
 Mease, Jennings H., XXXXXX  
 Medenbach, Philip C., XXXXXX  
 Melcher, John F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Menzner, Robert J., XXXXXX  
 Mercado, Robert K., XXXXXX  
 Meriaux, Richard D., XXXXXX  
 Merlick, Carroll W., XXXXXX  
 Merrill, Sherburn W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Meyers, Robert W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Michels, Raymond D., XXXXXX  
 Mierau, Michael D., XXXXXX  
 Miles, John L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Miles, Paul L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Miller, Bill E., XXXXXX  
 Miller, Carl D., XXXXXX  
 Miller, Dyson R. C., XXXXXX  
 Miller, George P., XXXXXX  
 Miller, Gerald C., XXXXXX  
 Miller, John Z., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Miller, Richard S., XXXXXX  
 Mills, Robert H., XXXXXX  
 Minick, John M., XXXXXX  
 Miser, Robert S., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Misura, John P., XXXXXX  
 Mitchell, Edwin A., XXXXXX  
 Mitchell, Stuart G., XXXXXX  
 Mitchell, Tilden A., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Mollohan, Keith C., XXXXXX  
 Molskow, Thomas S., XXXXXX  
 Montgomery, John P., XXXXXX  
 Montgomery, Robert E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Mooney, Michael J., XXXXXX  
 Moore, Frederick T., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Moore, Thomas P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Morabit, Joseph L., XXXXXX  
 Morgan, Charles H., XXXXXX  
 Morgan, Douglas S., XXXXXX  
 Morgan, Kearney H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Morin, Reynold, XXXXXX  
 Morse, Thomas McN., XXXXXX  
 Morrison, Robert G., XXXXXX  
 Morton, John A., XXXXXX  
 Mosbrooker, Michael L., XXXXXX  
 Mostek, Donald S., XXXXXX  
 Mowery, Hartman B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Muck, Jack LeR., XXXXXX  
 Muehlberger, Albert A., XXXXXX  
 Mulholland, Robert B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Munson, Don B., XXXXXX  
 Murphy, Robert C., XXXXXX  
 Murphy, William F., XXXXXX  
 Murray, Marvin R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Murrill, Fredrik H., XXXXXX  
 Myers, Robert M., XXXXXX  
 Myers, William N., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Naatjes, Clarence S., XXXXXX  
 Nadeau, Joseph E., XXXXXX  
 Naftzinger, Joseph E., XXXXXX  
 Napier, Brian T., XXXXXX  
 Neely, Charles R., XXXXXX  
 NeeSmith, Delmus M., XXXXXX  
 Nehammer, Karl F., XXXXXX  
 Nelson, Charles R., XXXXXX  
 Nelson, George W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Nelson, Landy T., XXXXXX  
 Nevins, Bruce S., XXXXXX  
 Newman, John R., XXXXXX  
 Nichols, John W., XXXXXX  
 Noble, George P., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Nobles, Charles S., XXXXXX  
 Noel, Thomas E., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Nolan, Howard J., XXXXXX  
 Norman, William L., XXXXXX  
 Norton, Dale F., XXXXXX  
 O'Brey, Earman D., XXXXXX  
 O'Brien, Joel T., XXXXXX  
 O'Brien, Richard J., XXXXXX  
 O'Brien, Thomas F., 3d., XXXXXX  
 O'Connell, James T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 O'Connor, Roy J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Oerding, James B., XXXXXX  
 O'Keefe, Joseph D., XXXXXX  
 O'Leary, Daniel L., XXXXXX  
 Oliver, John H., XXXXXX  
 O'Malley, Thomas K., XXXXXX  
 Orr, Danford M., XXXXXX  
 Oswandel, Robert E., XXXXXX  
 Otstott, Charles P., XXXXXX  
 Overholser, William H., XXXXXX  
 Owens, Bobby L., XXXXXX  
 Paaso, Thomas H., XXXXXX  
 Pachosa, Matthew H., XXXXXX  
 Painter, Donald E., XXXXXX  
 Painter, William L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Palm, Larry B., XXXXXX  
 Parent, Joseph W., XXXXXX  
 Parker, Elliot V., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Parker, Frank W., XXXXXX  
 Parker, Henry B., XXXXXX  
 Parker, Neal G., XXXXXX  
 Partlow, Frank A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Patch, Robert W., XXXXXX  
 Patterson, Robert G., XXXXXX  
 Paulsen, Hans W., XXXXXX  
 Pearce, David L., XXXXXX  
 Pearl, James H., 2d., XXXXXX  
 Pellicci, Jack A., XXXXXX  
 Pepe, Michael J., XXXXXX  
 Perham, Whitman C., 2d., XXXXXX  
 Perkins, Randall A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Peterson, Levi A., XXXXXX  
 Petter, David T., XXXXXX  
 Pitcher, Thomas B., XXXXXX  
 Pitts, Larry W., XXXXXX  
 Plummer, Frederick B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Plummer, Michael T., XXXXXX  
 Pope, Fred R., XXXXXX  
 Post, Elwyn D., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Powers, James A., XXXXXX  
 Powers, Sidney H., XXXXXX  
 Prall, Eric L., XXXXXX  
 Presley, John R., XXXXXX  
 Prosser, Donald W., XXXXXX  
 Pyle, Richard G., XXXXXX  
 Queeney, Richard K., XXXXXX  
 Quinlan, John G., XXXXXX  
 Radtke, David N., XXXXXX  
 Rains, Franklin D., XXXXXX  
 Ramos, James R., XXXXXX  
 Ramsey, Edward L., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Rapp, Charles G., XXXXXX  
 Rappaport, Arthur N., XXXXXX  
 Rau, Raymond R., XXXXXX  
 Raymond, Charles W., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Raymond, William M., XXXXXX  
 Reber, John L., XXXXXX  
 Redemann, David H., XXXXXX  
 Reece, Frank S., XXXXXX  
 Reed, Henry McD., 2d., XXXXXX  
 Ready, Clyde M., XXXXXX  
 Reese, Eugene P., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Reese, Robert W., XXXXXX  
 Reichard, Birge D., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Reid, John C., XXXXXX  
 Reiff, Jonathan D., XXXXXX  
 Remus, Ernest A., XXXXXX  
 Reynolds, Harry L., XXXXXX  
 Rice, Frederick C., XXXXXX  
 Rich, Terrence LaV., XXXXXX  
 Richards, David J., XXXXXX  
 Richeson, Alfred K., XXXXXX  
 Rider, Frank W., XXXXXX  
 Riley, Paul K., XXXXXX  
 Ritchie, William L., 2d., XXXXXX  
 Rivell, Gerard J., XXXXXX  
 Robbins, Chandler P., 3d., XXXXXX  
 Roberts, Paul A., XXXXXX  
 Robertson, Edward H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Robinson, Tom A., XXXXXX  
 Roboeker, William W., XXXXXX  
 Rollins, Melvin W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Rose, Louis, XXXXXX  
 Rose, Richard G., XXXXXX  
 Ross, Kenneth L., XXXXXX  
 Rossman, Jack, XXXXXX  
 Roth, Howard W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Rouse, Richard F., XXXXXX  
 Rowe, James N., XXXXXX  
 Rucker, Richmond W., XXXXXX  
 Rudesill, Robert S., XXXXXX  
 Ruedel, William P., XXXXXX  
 Rumbaugh, Max E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Ruppert, James D., XXXXXX  
 Rux, William A., 2d., XXXXXX  
 Ryan, Joseph E., XXXXXX  
 Ryan, Michael F., XXXXXX  
 Ryan, Michael T., XXXXXX  
 Ryan, Roger McK., XXXXXX  
 Saalfrank, David C., XXXXXX  
 Safford, Donald B., XXXXXX  
 Sartoris, William W., XXXXXX  
 Saum, Clyde F., XXXX  
 Savio, Paul J., XXXXXX

Scanlon, Shaun J., XXXXXX  
 Schaa, James C., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Schaefer, Grant A., XXXXXX  
 Schatzman, Thomas F., XXXXXX  
 Schiemann, Robert J., XXXXXX  
 Schmidt, Leroy A., XXXXXX  
 Schmidtman, Michael C., XXXXXX  
 Schmitt, Charles T., XXXXXX  
 Schofield, Richard T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Schrankel, Charles B., XXXXXX  
 Schreiber, John H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Schroeder, Fredrick U., XXXXXX  
 Schuler, David B., XXXXXX  
 Schumann, Lawrence J., XXXXXX  
 Schweickert, William J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Schwoob, James F., XXXXXX  
 Scott, Stephen H., XXXXXX  
 Scudder, William L., XXXXXX  
 Seagren, Eric H., XXXXXX  
 Searles, Jonathan W., XXXXXX  
 Seaward, Richard S., XXXXXX  
 Seely, John B., XXXXXX  
 Sexton, William T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Seymour, Roger G., XXXXXX  
 Shepherd, Billy J., XXXXXX  
 Shepcock, Michael L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Shevlin, George L., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Shimek, Daniel W., XXXXXX  
 Shost, Alan T., XXXXXX  
 Shuey, Richard P., XXXXXX  
 Shumway, Richard S., XXXXXX  
 Sills, Edward G., XXXXXX  
 Simmons, Denis L., XXXXXX  
 Simpson, Andrew R., XXXXXX  
 Simpson, William C., XXXXXX  
 Skinner, William J., XXXXXX  
 Slattery, Stephen McL., XXXXXX  
 Slovacek, Anthony S., XXXXXX  
 Smilkis, Peter J., XXXXXX  
 Smith, Daniel A., XXXXXX  
 Smith, Donald E., XXXXXX  
 Smith, Harold B., XXXXXX  
 Smith, Irving B., XXXXXX  
 Snyder, Stephen J., XXXXXX  
 Sorensen, Ralph L., XXXXXX  
 Spain, William H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Spangler, Robert LaV., XXXXXX  
 Spigarelli, Raymond F., XXXXXX  
 Spigelmirre, Michael F., XXXXXX  
 Spin, William A., XXXXXX  
 Spivy, Berton E., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Sprengeler, Ronald J., XXXXXX  
 Sprinsky, William H., XXXXXX  
 Squire, Joseph W., XXXXXX  
 Stacy, Tommy J., XXXXXX  
 Stanfill, James H., XXXXXX  
 Stanley, George R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Starling, James D., XXXXXX  
 Stauber, Jerome E., XXXXXX  
 Steele, John S., XXXXXX  
 Stehling, Joseph M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Stem, David H., XXXXXX  
 Stephens, William J., XXXXXX  
 Stilwell, Joseph W., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Stockman, William L., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Stovall, Rayburn C., XXXXXX  
 Straetz, Donald F., XXXXXX  
 Strasbourger, Edward, XXXXXX  
 Strother, William M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Strzelecki, Leonard S., XXXXXX  
 Stulga, Charles A., XXXXXX  
 Sturgeon, Charles E., XXXXXX  
 Sugdinis, Joel E., XXXXXX  
 Sugg, Barney A., XXXXXX  
 Sullivan, Anthony D., XXXXXX  
 Sullivan, James A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Summers, Don A., XXXXXX  
 Sutton, Adolph, Jr., XXXXXX  
 Sutton, David J., XXXXXX  
 Sutton, Richard O., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Swain, Paul C., XXXXXX  
 Swedberg, Robert C., XXXXXX  
 Symonds, Paul S., XXXXXX  
 Taggart, Homer G., XXXXXX  
 Tamplin, William F., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Tancreti, Roger J., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Taylor, Hurl R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Taylor, John N., XXXXXX  
 Taylor, Thomas H., XXXXXX  
 Ten, Brook, James J., XXXXXX  
 Terry, Frederick G., Jr., XXXXXX

Thacker, James F., XXXXXX  
 Thompson, Francis J., XXXXXX  
 Thompson, Olin R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Thorne, Tommy L., XXXXXX  
 Thornton, William F., XXXXXX  
 Throckmorton, Thomas B., XXXXXX  
 Tichenor, James R., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Tillman, Clifford R., XXXXXX  
 Timmerman, Benjamin R., XXXXXX  
 Titmas, James A., XXXXXX  
 Titus, Charles M., XXXXXX  
 Totten, Robert G., XXXXXX  
 Tousey, Walter C., XXXXXX  
 Tozer, William S., XXXXXX  
 Trauner, Ronald F., XXXXXX  
 Trautmann, Eugene O., XXXXXX  
 Trickett, Frederick R., XXXXXX  
 Triplican, Philip A., XXXXXX  
 Tripp, Robert H., XXXXXX  
 Trodella, Robert A., XXXXXX  
 Trunk, dePaul R., XXXXXX  
 Tuxill, Richard W., XXXXXX  
 Tyre, David H., XXXXXX  
 Tyson, Richard L., XXXXXX  
 Valente, Thomas E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Valliant, Charles M., XXXXXX  
 Vanderslice, Gary E., XXXXXX  
 Van Riper, Thomas P., XXXXXX  
 Varnon, Jerry R., XXXXXX  
 Vaughan, Herbert E., XXXXXX  
 Veal, William T., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Vencill, William A., XXXXXX  
 Vermilyea, Carl P., XXXXXX  
 Vickers, Anthony M., XXXXXX  
 Waddell, Ralph L., XXXXXX  
 Wade, Milledge E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Wagner, Richard W., XXXXXX  
 Waiczak, Edward J., XXXXXX  
 Waldhour, Louis G., XXXXXX  
 Waldrop, Stephen P., XXXXXX  
 Waldrop, William R., XXXXXX  
 Walker, Clifford C., XXXXXX  
 Walker, Philip A., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Waller, Bobbie J., XXXXXX  
 Walter, Richard E., XXXXXX  
 Waters, Russell A., XXXXXX  
 Watkins, Charlie C., XXXXXX  
 Watson, Henry C., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Watts, Pitt M., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Webb, Gerald E., XXXXXX  
 Wecker, David D., XXXXXX  
 Weiler, John E., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Weinhold, Robert W., XXXXXX  
 Welch, Michael N., XXXXXX  
 Wentworth, David B., XXXXXX  
 Whaples, Gene C., XXXXXX  
 Wharton, Gerald M., XXXXXX  
 Wheeler, Mason W., XXXXXX  
 White, Harry N., XXXXXX  
 White, James McR., XXXXXX  
 Whitehead, Floyd D., XXXXXX  
 Whitmore, Thomas N., XXXXXX  
 Wienser, Neil R., XXXXXX  
 Wild, Allen R., XXXXXX  
 Wildenthaler, Leo E., XXXXXX  
 Wiley, Joseph P., XXXXXX  
 Wiley, Noble J., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Wilhelm, Robert S., XXXXXX  
 Wilkes, John S., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Wilkie, David G., XXXXXX  
 Willauer, John H., XXXXXX  
 Williams, Charles E., XXXXXX  
 Williams, Larry M., XXXXXX  
 Williams, Lonnie B., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Willoughby, William H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Wilson, Cyrus C., XXXXXX  
 Wilson, Daniel H., XXXXXX  
 Wilson, Gene R., XXXXXX  
 Wilson, James R., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Wilson, John H., XXXXXX  
 Wilson, Walter K., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Winchester, Wayne, XXXXXX  
 Windsor, Humphrey F., XXXXXX  
 Winston, Lawrence J., XXXXXX  
 Winters, Gerald F., XXXXXX  
 Wisby, James M., XXXXXX  
 Wither, Robert A., XXXXXX  
 Witherspoon, Jerry W., XXXXXX  
 Witschard, Walter A., XXXXXX  
 Wolfarth, William M., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Wolff, James W., XXXXXX

Wollmering, Lawrence E., XXXXXX  
 Wood, Anthony B., XXXXXX  
 Wood, Charles H., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Wood, John W., Jr., XXXXXX  
 Woodbeck, Charles A., XXXXXX  
 Wrockloff, George E., 3d, XXXXXX  
 Yamaguchi, Phillip T., XXXXXX  
 Yeager, William E., XXXXXX  
 Yeagley, John P., XXXXXX  
 York, James J., XXXXXX

*To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps*

Barnes, Perry A., XXXXXX  
 Shannon, Sam Jr., XXXXXX

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

*To be first lieutenant*

Taylor, Horace G. (MSC), XXXXXX

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

*To be captains*

Clark, Richard W., Jr., XXXXXXXX  
 Grasbner, Siegfried L., XXXXXXXX  
 Heller, John M., XXXXXXXX  
 Keller, William K., XXXXXXXX  
 McKnight, Robert W., XXXXXXXX  
 Tambling, Robert F., XXXXXXXX  
 Temperley, Nicholas B., XXXXXXXX  
 Webster, William L., XXXXXXXX

*To be first lieutenants*

DelRosso, Louis J., XXXXXXXX  
 Dierick, James E., XXXXXXXX  
 Hall, John F., XXXXXXXX  
 Massabni, Paolo M., XXXXXXXX  
 Schimming, James L., XXXXXXXX  
 Stewart, James T., XXXXXXXX  
 Williams, Richard L., XXXXXXXX

*To be second lieutenants*

Anderson, Charles, Jr., XXXXXXXX  
 Brooks, William A., Jr., XXXX  
 Click, Ira N., XXXXXXXX  
 Henry, Patrick J., XXXX  
 Mathews, Kenneth J., XXXXXXXX  
 Sewell, Gerald L., XXXXXXXX  
 Volta, Donald H., XXXXXXXX  
 The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293 and 3294:

*To be major, Medical Corps*

Frankel, Alan L., XXXX

*To be major, Medical Service Corps*

Archer, Donald E., XXXXXXXX

*To be captain, Army Nurse Corps*

Johnson, Lois V., XXXXXXXX

*To be captain, chaplain*

Moore, Jesse W., XXXXXXXX

*To be captains, Dental Corps*

Bleich, Charles A., XXXXXXXX  
 Chinn, Clarence Y. L., XXXXXXXX  
 Connelly, Mark E., XXXXXXXX  
 Decker, Richard M., XXXXXXXX  
 Dusterwinkle, Sherwood A., XXXXXXXX  
 Filler, William H., XXXXXXXX  
 Houston, James E., XXXXXXXX  
 Karas, Richard P., XXXXXXXX  
 Singdahleen, Donald A., XXXXXXXX  
 Strock, Richard G., XXXXXXXX  
 Watts, Thomas R., XXXXXXXX

*To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Office*

Taylor, Arthur H., XXXXXXXX

*To be captains, Medical Corps*

Angello, Anthony L., XXXXXXXX  
 Anthony, Courtney L., Jr., XXXXXXXX

Arzola, Ivan F., XXXXXXXX  
 Blount, Robert E., Jr., XXXXXXXX  
 Brandel, George P., XXXXXXXX  
 Feltis, James M., Jr., XXXXXXXX  
 Figlock, Thaddeus A., XXXXXXXX  
 Hager, Harry G., XXXXXXXX  
 Jones, Robert E., Jr., XXXXXXXX  
 Keller, Howard L., XXXXXXXX  
 Kimball, Frank B., XXXXXXXX  
 Konzen, Jon L., XXXXXXXX  
 Halloy, John P., XXXXXXXX  
 Manson, Richard A., XXXXXXXX  
 Martens, Thomas J., XXXXXXXX  
 Mayson, Preston B., Jr., XXXXXXXX  
 Morel, Donald E., XXXXXXXX  
 Mortenson, Francis N., XXXXXXXX  
 Omer, Lewis M., 3d., XXXXXXXX  
 Pollard, William R., XXXXXXXX  
 Rivera-Betancourt, Rafael A., XXXXXXXX  
 Schneider, Robert D., XXXXXXXX  
 Smith, Richard S., XXXXXXXX  
 Stambaugh, Roy A., XXXXXXXX  
 Sube, Janis, XXXXXXXX  
 Sullivan, James A., XXXXXXXX  
 Swanson, David L., Jr., XXXXXXXX  
 Thomas, James A., Jr., XXXXXXXX  
 Thompson, Robert L., XXXXXXXX  
 Walter, John D., XXXXXXXX  
 Webster, Stephen B., XXXXXXXX  
 Weeldreyer, Robert L., XXXXXXXX  
 Wimsatt, Willard B.  
 Zeigler, Michael G., XXXXXXXX

To be captain, Medical Service Corps  
 Loy, Vance A., XXXXXXXX

To be captain, Veterinary Corps  
 Whitney, Robert A., Jr., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps  
 LaMontagne, Mary E., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate  
 General's Office

Heath, Stratton R., Jr., XXXXXXXX  
 Lavine, Sanford V., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Bacon, William L., XXXXXXXX  
 Hutchison, James R., XXXXXXXX  
 Lillie, Homer J., Jr., XXXXXXXX  
 Manuel, Wilbert J., XXXXXXXX  
 Nilges, Thomas C., XXXXXXXX  
 Phillips, Wesley F., XXXXXXXX  
 Robinson, Frederick C., XXXXXXXX  
 SchAAF, Daniel J., XXXXXXXX  
 Schults, Boyd L., XXXXXXXX  
 Segal, Avron C., XXXXXXXX  
 Simmons, James W., Jr., XXXXXXXX  
 Stoller, Jerry J., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps  
 Walker, Jerry S., XXXXXXXX

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Fahle, Leroy D. Jones, Lewis M.  
 Grosshans, John H. Megehee, Jacob H.  
 Mace, James E. Wichelt, Roger H.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287 and 3288:

Adamick, Donald H. Bradford, John D.  
 Anderson, Aggrey V. Brake, Perry F.  
 Au, Larry W. Brassfield, Wallace W.  
 Balrd, Edmund C., Jr. Brewer, Thomas A.  
 Balady, Salim J. Brinkley, Harley L.  
 Banta, Theodore S., Jr. Brookshire, Carl W.  
 Barber, Victor C. Brown, Gerald M.  
 Barovetto, John L. Brown, Ruel R.  
 Battilega, John A. Brunner, Harry J., Jr.  
 Benson, Richard W. Butler, Johnny M.  
 Black, John R. Byard, Johnny R.  
 Bolme, Bruce M. Cady, Donald F.

Carletti, Stephen J. Mellon, Joe S., Jr.  
 Carlson, Albert E. Melton, Stephen A.  
 Carmouche, Joseph M. Mennella, Kenneth R.  
 Carroll, Bartlett J., Jr. Mensch, Raymond G.  
 Charles, Doran W. Miles, Wilson D.  
 Cheal, Arnold E. Miller, James W.  
 Church, Billy E. Mooney, David J.  
 Colavita, Henry J., Jr. Morris, Charles T.  
 Coley, John H., III Mowery, Ralph B.  
 Cook, Alan W. Mulcahy, Charles J.  
 Cook, John E. Mulloid, William A., Jr.  
 Cory, Mark E., III Mulvihill, Lee P.  
 Crouch, William W. Neil, Donald L.  
 Curtis, Wayne C. Ogasaware, Roy M.  
 Cutler, Richard A. Onufer, Barry R.  
 Dansby, James C. Pancoast, Henry M.  
 Davidson, Joe W. Parks, Robert R.  
 Diehl, Richard P. Partridge, Peter E.  
 DiFranco, Salvatore J. Pendleton, Richard F.  
 Domingos, Manuel P., Pettyjohn, Charles S.

III  
 Draughn, James B., Phillips, Jeffrey T.  
 Phillips, Keith J.  
 Pohlman, Dolph O., Jr.  
 Dunn, Thomas P. Powers, Jerry H.  
 Eaglin, Fulton B. Quinones, Joseph M.  
 Ecclestone, John S., II Ragsdale, Jack D., Jr.  
 Elliott, Dick D., Jr. Reed, Charles W., Jr.  
 Engle, Benjamin J. Reed, Donald J.  
 Falkenrath, James H. Reed, George B., Jr.  
 Feliciano, Jose R. Renwick, Harold M., Jr.  
 Freck, William B. Reynolds, Howard I.  
 Glover, Alan F. Reynolds, Irvins, H.  
 Goldstein, Ronald J. Rhodes, Dennis D.  
 Grady, Bernard E. Robinson, Paul J.  
 Graham, Bobby L. Rochon, Everette C.  
 Graham, John F., Jr. Rogers, Don E.  
 Graham, Thomas A., III Rush, Wayne A.  
 Graves, Billy D. Sadler, Orin W., IV  
 Gunn, Walter E. Sarratt, Robert R.  
 Haines, John L., Jr. Scott, William A.  
 Hannah, Douglas W. Sedlock, Michael E.  
 Hansard, James B. Shell, William L.  
 Harrell, George L., II Sivells, James B.  
 Hart, Stacy L. Skilton, Robert H., III  
 Hartjen, Raymond C., Jr. Smith, Nathaniel E.  
 Smith, Vernon L.  
 Haight, Jacob R. Sollinger, Jerry M.  
 Hawken, Harvey H. Sowers, Errol G.  
 Haywood, Charles E. Stallwitz, John F.  
 Higgins, James E. Steadman, Robert P.  
 Hinshaw, William L., Stemler, Orrin A.  
 Stiner, Tommy C.

II  
 Hofer, George M., Jr. Stotski, Chester J.  
 Hohers, Melvin A. Streetmaker, John I.  
 House, Ronald L. Strenn, Carl L.  
 Hudson, McKinley Sullivan, Bloomer D.  
 Hughes, Joe H., Jr. Swan, Alfred W., Jr.  
 Hurst, Bobby E. Tagliaferri, Frederick L.  
 Jones, Tommy M. Tanis, Glenn R.  
 Jung, Leon Thomson, Richard W.  
 Justis, James C. Tilson, James G.  
 Kayes, Joseph E. Tyner, Harris W.  
 Kennard, Robert B. Vaughn, Robert H.  
 Kidd, John C., II Vesey, Joseph T.  
 Kieft, Lewis D. Walker, John J.  
 Kitchens, Larry J. Walker, David P.  
 Kopcsak, Arpad A., Jr. Ward, Richard F.  
 La Greca, John S. Watson, Jerry L.  
 Langston, Jerry W. Way, David E.  
 Leavitt, Thomas P. Whiting, William B.  
 Ledbetter, Charles T. Wilkinson, John H.  
 Litton, James L. Williams, Freddie W.  
 Logan, Lamar B. Williams, Robert G.  
 Lollar, Howard W., Jr. Williams, William J.  
 Long, George L. Willman, Landon P.  
 Long, John A. Wilson, Virgil L.  
 Long, Wendel L. Winder, Gordon L.  
 Lowrie, Michael A. M. Wishowski, Thomas M.  
 Lupardus, Carl R. Wood, Blair C., Jr.  
 Mathewes, Paul H., Jr. Yearout, Paul H.  
 Maylie, Joseph W. Zalaha, John W.  
 McDonald, Benjamin H., Jr. Zimmerman, James E.

III  
 Draughn, James B., Phillips, Keith J.  
 Pohlman, Dolph O., Jr.  
 Dunn, Thomas P. Powers, Jerry H.  
 Ecclestone, John S., II Ragsdale, Jack D., Jr.  
 Elliott, Dick D., Jr. Reed, Charles W., Jr.  
 Engle, Benjamin J. Reed, Donald J.  
 Falkenrath, James H. Reed, George B., Jr.  
 Feliciano, Jose R. Renwick, Harold M., Jr.  
 Freck, William B. Reynolds, Howard I.  
 Glover, Alan F. Reynolds, Irvins, H.  
 Goldstein, Ronald J. Rhodes, Dennis D.  
 Grady, Bernard E. Robinson, Paul J.  
 Graham, Bobby L. Rochon, Everette C.  
 Graham, John F., Jr. Rogers, Don E.  
 Graham, Thomas A., III Rush, Wayne A.  
 Graves, Billy D. Sadler, Orin W., IV  
 Gunn, Walter E. Sarratt, Robert R.  
 Haines, John L., Jr. Scott, William A.  
 Hannah, Douglas W. Sedlock, Michael E.  
 Hansard, James B. Shell, William L.  
 Harrell, George L., II Sivells, James B.  
 Hart, Stacy L. Skilton, Robert H., III  
 Hartjen, Raymond C., Jr. Smith, Nathaniel E.  
 Smith, Vernon L.  
 Haight, Jacob R. Sollinger, Jerry M.  
 Hawken, Harvey H. Sowers, Errol G.  
 Haywood, Charles E. Stallwitz, John F.  
 Higgins, James E. Steadman, Robert P.  
 Hinshaw, William L., Stemler, Orrin A.  
 Stiner, Tommy C.  
 Hofer, George M., Jr. Stotski, Chester J.  
 Hohers, Melvin A. Streetmaker, John I.  
 House, Ronald L. Strenn, Carl L.  
 Hudson, McKinley Sullivan, Bloomer D.  
 Hughes, Joe H., Jr. Swan, Alfred W., Jr.  
 Hurst, Bobby E. Tagliaferri, Frederick L.  
 Jones, Tommy M. Tanis, Glenn R.  
 Jung, Leon Thomson, Richard W.  
 Justis, James C. Tilson, James G.  
 Kayes, Joseph E. Tyner, Harris W.  
 Kennard, Robert B. Vaughn, Robert H.  
 Kidd, John C., II Vesey, Joseph T.  
 Kieft, Lewis D. Walker, John J.  
 Kitchens, Larry J. Walker, David P.  
 Kopcsak, Arpad A., Jr. Ward, Richard F.  
 La Greca, John S. Watson, Jerry L.  
 Langston, Jerry W. Way, David E.  
 Leavitt, Thomas P. Whiting, William B.  
 Ledbetter, Charles T. Wilkinson, John H.  
 Litton, James L. Williams, Freddie W.  
 Logan, Lamar B. Williams, Robert G.  
 Lollar, Howard W., Jr. Williams, William J.  
 Long, George L. Willman, Landon P.  
 Long, John A. Wilson, Virgil L.  
 Long, Wendel L. Winder, Gordon L.  
 Lowrie, Michael A. M. Wishowski, Thomas M.  
 Lupardus, Carl R. Wood, Blair C., Jr.  
 Mathewes, Paul H., Jr. Yearout, Paul H.  
 Maylie, Joseph W. Zalaha, John W.  
 McDonald, Benjamin H., Jr. Zimmerman, James E.

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1963, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieu-

tenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 4353:  
 Adams, Jack E. Cowgill, Parker J.  
 Adams, Peter D. Crumpler, William B.  
 Alakulppi, Vesa J. Cummings, Frederick B.  
 Alexander, William H. Cunningham, Alden M.  
 Alger, Terrence F. Cunnginham, Michael J.  
 Allen, Jonathan W. Curtis, Charles C.  
 Allen, Michael B. Dalia, Jeffrey L.  
 Aimaguer, Joseph A. Daniels, James E.  
 Andersen, Jerome R. Davenport, George W., Jr.  
 V., Jr. Davidson, Sam R.  
 Arbogast, Gordon W. Davis, Jack S., Jr.  
 Armogida, James A. Davis, Robert J.  
 Armstrong, Donald G. De Graff, George C., Jr.  
 Asbury, Lloyd T. De Maret, Will E.  
 Bagby, Durwood R. De Smet, Dennis A.  
 Ballard, Clark T., Jr. De Wire, James E.  
 Banks, Edgar, Jr. Demchuk, Daniel  
 Barron, Max R. Dickey, James S.  
 Barry, Michael J. Dickson, Harry R.  
 Bassett, Byron E. Doherty, James E., III  
 Baucum, William N. Dolighan, Thomas A.  
 Beach, Karl L. Donovan, Robert E.  
 Beatty, Norman E. Dorland, John H.  
 Bell, John P. Douglas, Fred R., Jr.  
 Bentson, Peter M. Dowling, Dean E.  
 Bentz, George H. Downey, Walter D., Jr.  
 Best, Stephen J. Drain, Robert W.  
 Betsaque, Norman E. Drews, Ralph M.  
 Bivens, Rodger M. Drewwy, Arthur C., Jr.  
 Blackgrove, Joseph F. Dunn, John A.  
 Blackwell, Eugene B. Dusenbury, Donald S.  
 Blackwell, James L., Jr. Dwyer, John A.  
 Boehlke, Robert J. Dwyer, John R., Jr.  
 Boice, William M. Earnest, Olen L.  
 Bollinger, Eugene R. Eberts, Miles M.  
 Jr. Eckert, Richard E.  
 Bosma, Phillip H. Ehrenberg, Rudolph, H., Jr.  
 Bowes, Robert S., III Ellerson, Geoffrey D., Jr.  
 Boyle, Michael J. Ellerson, John C.  
 Brendle, Thomas M. Ellis, Bruce H., Jr.  
 Brennan, Thomas R. Embree, Howard D.  
 Brightman, Austin C. Emrick, Michael L.  
 Jr. Empson, A. Holmes, IV  
 Britten, Lawrence A. Entlich, Richard E.  
 Brown, Noel A. Esposito, Curtis V.  
 Brown, Ralph P. Fairbanks, Leigh C., III  
 Brown, Robert E., Jr. Farris, Ivan R.  
 Brown, William R., Jr. Fletter, Wolfgang A.  
 Brownback, Paul T. Foley, Robert F.  
 Bruce, Robert Folsom, Spencer A., Jr.  
 Buchheim, Steven O. Ford, John N.  
 Buckley, Peter J. Forsythe, Thomas K.  
 Byrne, Donald G. Fuller, George D.  
 Byrnes, John W. Gallagher, Thomas F.  
 Caldwell, Harold E. Gallager, Richard C.  
 Capps, Larry R. Galle, Joe F.  
 Cargile, Eugene D. Gantzler, Fred E., Jr.  
 Carney, Thomas P. Garvey, Dale M., Jr.  
 Carns, Edwin H. J., Jr. Genetti, Albert J., Jr.  
 Casey, Thomas E. George, William H., Jr.  
 Caywood, James R. Gibbs, Frank C., III  
 Chapman, Alan A. Gideon, Wendell E.  
 Chase, Jack S. Gilbert, Michael V.  
 Chickedantz, Carl E. Gladfelter, Douglas M.  
 Childers, Stephen A. Goldsmith, Richard H.  
 Chrisman, Ronald G. Goodnow, Walter L., Jr.  
 Christensen, Allen R. Coe, Gary Q.  
 Clark, Allen B., Jr. Cole, David L.  
 Clark, William N. Cole, Richard B.  
 Clay, Michael A. Coleman, Donald H.  
 Clinton, Roy J. Conlon, Arthur F.  
 Coe, Gary Q. Conrad, Donald H.  
 Cole, David L. Cook, Lyndel L.  
 Cole, Richard B. Cooke, William J., Jr.  
 Coleman, Donald H. Coomer, William O.  
 Conlon, Arthur F. Cornfoot, James L.  
 Conrad, Donald H. Coulson, Robert T., Jr.  
 Cook, Lyndel L. Counts, John E.  
 Cooke, William J., Jr. Griffin, Donald K.  
 Coomer, William O. Griffin, Thomas H.

- Griffith, Paul D.  
Griffith, Thomas R.  
Grogan, Timothy J.  
Grolmund, William J.  
Guilhaus, Howard H.  
Guthrie, Richard P.  
Hable, Paul R., Jr.  
Haines, Palmer S.  
Haligus, Joseph D.  
Hall, Francis G., Jr.  
Hall, Garrett S.  
Hall, Peter M.  
Hamilton, George T.  
Handcox, Robert C.  
Hannigan, James R.  
Hanson, Russell V., Jr.  
Harman, Thomas E.  
Harrington, John M.  
Harrison, Jerry C.  
Hartman, Charles D., III  
Hawkins, William C.  
Heiden, Heidi B.  
Heim, Bruce K.  
Henderson, Frederick H.  
Henning, Paul H., III  
Hewette, James B., Jr.  
Higgins, Richard G.  
Hill, Edward F.  
Hingston, William E., Jr.  
Hogg, Charles C., II  
Holland, Homer J.  
Hollander, Kenneth N.  
Holtzman, Gordon C.  
Hotman, Clyde W., Jr.  
Hudson, Roland B., III  
Hughes, James S.  
Hustead, Stephen C.  
Ingram, Lionel R., Jr.  
Ischinger, Martin M.  
Jackson, David S.  
James, Richard D.  
Janof, Lawrence S.  
Jaworowski, Joseph J., Jr.  
Jenison, Raymond L.  
Jenks, Michael M.  
Johnson, Douglas V., II  
Johnston, Reynold A.  
Jones, Alan F.  
Jones, Bradley K.  
Jones, James A., Jr.  
Karoly, Frank J.  
Karr, Thomas W.  
Kauza, John J., Jr.  
Keaveney, Michael W.  
Kelley, William T.  
Kelly, Colin P., III  
Kelly, Peter A.  
Kelly, Peter M., III  
Kelly, Thomas J.  
Keteltas, Gilbert C.  
Kilroy, Michael W.  
Kingry, Roy L., Jr.  
Kinsey, Charles H., Jr.  
Knowlton, David W., III  
Kosevich, Richard S.  
Kunzig, Louis A., III  
La Fond, Clovis O.  
Lang, Stephen A.  
Lawn, Michael J., Jr.  
Leach, Dennis A.  
Lee, Edward M., Jr.  
Lengyel, Joseph W., Jr.  
Lennon, Francis L.  
Lewis, Arthur C.  
Lewsen, Robert F.  
Little, David R.  
Little, William W.  
Loden, George I. P.  
Lujan, Armando  
Lundin, Jon E.  
Lutz, Ward A.  
Lutz, William G.  
Mabardy, David M.  
Mallison, Thomas C.  
Manning, Roger D.  
Marchand, Gary J.  
Mari, Louis A.  
Marrow, Alvin J.  
Marrs, Glenn E.  
Mataranglo, Francis T.  
Matteson, Richard J.  
Maxwell, Paul F.  
Mayer, Haldane R.  
McCabe, Robert L.  
McCarver, James M.  
McClatchey, Jay J.  
McCord, Burton K.  
McCormack, Michael S.  
McCrary, Wiley W.  
McGarity, Robert L., Jr.  
McIntyre, Michael J.  
McKinnon, Richard A.  
McNeill, Robert H., II  
McQuary, Ray J.  
Means, Dale F.  
Meelin, Laurence R.  
Meier, Arthur C., II  
Malanson, Ronald A.  
Mercer, Carl W.  
Merrill, Robert K.  
Merritt, William P.  
Mezger, Robert S., Jr.  
Miller, Bruce F.  
Miller, George M., Jr.  
Miller, Michael D.  
Millerlille, William M.  
Mitchell, Kenny D.  
Mitchell, Ralph M., II  
Mock, Phillip W.  
Moose, Raymond R.  
Morehead, Wayne E.  
Morgan, John F.  
Morris, Henry  
Moses, George L.  
Mosier, Douglas K.  
Murf, James D.  
Murphy, Dennis C.  
Myers, Douglas V.  
Myers, Duane H.  
Nahluk, Charles V.  
Nakashima, Gerald N.  
Natvig, Cliff M., Jr.  
Nelander, James C.  
Nelson, Harold W.  
Nicholas, Walter D.  
Nolan, James T.  
O'Connor, James M.  
O'Donnell, John R.  
O'Sullivan, Kenneth E.  
O'Toole, Robert H.  
Odland, Robert O.  
Oliver, John F., III  
Olsen, Alexander K.  
Orlicki, George A.  
Orndorf, Harvey W.  
Otis, Malcolm D.  
Owen, William J.  
Palmer, Robert C.  
Pappas, George  
Parker, John E.  
Patten, Lynne M.  
Perry, George E., III  
Pierson, Rex F.  
Pogorzelski, Jerome A.  
Popielarski, Stephen J., Jr.  
Porper, Henry H., Jr.  
Prutow, Dennis J.  
Quinlan, Michael M.  
Rasmussen, Ralph J.  
Reh, Paul A., Jr.  
Reilly, Iain  
Reinholz, Richard K.  
Rice, Lewis A.  
Rice, Lewis A.  
Rice, Lewis A.  
Riceman, John P.  
Robbins, John R., II  
Robbins, William Y.  
Robert, Emile A., Jr.  
Roberts, James F., Jr.  
Roberts, Richard H.  
Robertson, Joe B.  
Robey, Lyle G.  
Robinson, William A.  
Rolfe, Charles O., Jr.  
Roth, John C. C.  
Rowan, Edmond M., Jr.  
Russell, Thomas A.  
Ruth, James M., Jr.  
Ryan, Arthur J., III  
Sage, Terence F.  
Sallee, David K.  
Sanchez, Luis T., Jr.  
Sarn, James E.  
Sartor, William M., Jr.  
Sausser, Robert G.  
Sawin, Peter L.  
Scharf, Richard D.  
Schaum, Fred W.  
Scheidig, Robert E.  
Scherrer, George M., Jr.  
Schmidt, Charles L., Jr.  
Schott, Charles R.  
Schwartz, Karl O.  
Scott, Alan H.  
Seidel, Andrew B.  
Seiwert, Anthony J., Jr.  
Senecal, Jan L.  
Shepard, John T.  
Shine, Alexander P.  
Shotwell, James H.  
Siebenaler, Donald L.  
Silberstein, Kenneth R.  
Sill, Louis F., Jr.  
Silvasy, Stephen, Jr.  
Silvay, William J.  
Simmons, Michael D.  
Simonetta, Russell S., Jr.  
Sloane, Robert L.  
Smith, Donald J.  
Smith, Emmette W.  
Smith, Glenn N.  
Smith, Patrick R.  
Smith, Roger M.  
Smith, William D., Jr.  
Solenberger, Thomas M.  
Sorensen, James E.  
Soth, Michael J.  
Speed, James W.  
Spohn, Larry L.  
Stacy, William A., Jr.  
St. Amant, Philemon A., II  
Stahl, Steven P.  
Stanley, Paul D.  
Steele, Robert M.  
Steinig, Ronald D.  
Stennis, William H.  
Stevens, Pat M., IV  
Stewart, Charles W., III  
Stidham, Robert J.  
Stonehouse, Gerald F.  
Stribling, Roger W., Jr.  
Struble, Daniel O.  
Stryker, James W.  
Sturbois, Louis J., III  
Summers, Michael H.  
Sutton, Paul D.  
Swisher, Arthur H.  
Tallie, Dennis K.  
Tate, Christopher P.  
Tezak, Edward G.  
Thompson, Leon G.  
Thompson, Tommy R.  
Thomson, Alexander J.  
Trucks, Robert C.  
Turpin, William C.  
Tyler, Tyron S.  
Vanneman, Robert G.  
Varnell, Allan K.  
Vaughan, Curry N., Jr.  
Vaughn, Tom J., Jr.  
Venes, Richard A.  
Virant, Leo B., II  
Vogel, Robert A.  
Vopatek, Michael J.  
Voss, Didrik A.  
Vote, Gary F.  
Walker, John S., Jr.  
Walker, Ralph B., III  
Wall, Kenneth E., Jr.  
Wall, Sandy K.  
Waller, John S.  
Walsh, Michael E.  
Walsh, Richard R.  
Wangsgard, Chris P. L.  
Warder, Hiram W., II  
Weber, Richard E., III  
Westbrook, Joseph A.  
Westermeier, John T., Jr.  
Weyrauch, Paul T.  
Wheeler, John B.  
Whidden, David L., Jr.  
White, Charles T., Jr.  
Whitehead, William J.  
Wildrick, Edward W., III  
Williams, Douglas T.  
Wilson, Daniel A.  
Wilson, John W., III  
Wilson, Norton B., Jr.  
Wilson, Richard A.  
Wilson, Thomas A., II  
Wilson, William L.  
Winters, Robert F.  
Witt, William W.  
Wolz, Donald J.  
Wood, Robert H.  
Woods, John M., Jr.  
Woods, Luther L.  
Wyrwas, John A.  
Yamashita, Ted K.  
Yangihara, Galen H.  
Young, Richard G., Jr.  
Young, Timothy R.  
Zelley, Robert A.

tenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3284, and 3287:

Wilson, Joe H. R.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 6, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Arthur Lee Kinsolving, St. James' Episcopal Church, New York City, offered the following prayer:

Lord of all, whose balance trieth the nations to lift up or to cast down, we bless Thee for the great heritage of freedom and of faith conveyed to us by the courage, dedication, and sacrifice of unnumbered predecessors.

We implore anew Thy continuing grace and guidance to all who are charged with important trusts of leadership in this era of critical issues and anxious circumstances.

In giving Americans the spirit to claim their rights Thou hast called them to the dignity of accepting their obligations. Believing that the sovereignty of this people derives from Thee, may we exercise it, not only in obedience to the laws which we enact but to Thy moral law. Grant to us each today absolute loyalty to the absolute end and wisdom to discern the measure of our loyalty to all relative ends.

We entrust to Thee again our Nation and our hopes for the fulfillment of Thy will among all nations upon earth and for the realization of the great peace. And not unto us but unto Thee, O God, be the glory from generation to generation, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 2, 1963, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 762. An act to provide for increased wheat acreage allotments in the Tule Lake area of California.

## SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill, 1963—H.R. 5517.

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

There was no objection.

## HON. EMANUEL CELLER

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my

The following-named midshipmen, graduating class of 1963, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3284, and 3287:

Brady, Edward C.  
Eckland, James D.  
Eichorst, Bradley D.  
Farrington, Reed M.  
Gowens, John W., II  
Hecht, Robert G.  
Jacoby, Stephen A.  
McCracken, Robert E.  
McLaury, Jeffrey B.  
Mullen, George M.  
Orlowski, Randolph F.  
Polonis, Lawrence L.  
Potter, Jerome W.  
Frangley, Robert E.  
Reid, Tilden R.  
Sim, Alan E.  
Smart, Neil A.  
Thorlin, Phillip S.  
Wall, John C.  
Yeager, Frederick J.

The following-named cadet, graduating class of 1963, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieu-