

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Remarks by Congressman Thomas G. Morris of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, at the Launching of U.S.S. "Haddock" (SSN621), Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., Pascagoula, Miss., May 21, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1966

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, an esteemed colleague of mine on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Representative THOMAS G. MORRIS, of New Mexico, recently spoke at the launching of the U.S.S. *Haddock* in Pascagoula, Miss. Mr. MORRIS was accompanied by his gracious and charming wife who acted as sponsor for the occasion.

The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] has long been a strong proponent of nuclear propulsion for the Navy, and it is indeed fitting that he should have had the honor of speaking at the launching of our newest nuclear submarine.

At this time, I would like to insert his speech of May 21, 1966, in the RECORD, believing that others will be as interested as was I in reading about such a timely and important subject:

Mrs. Morris and I consider it a great personal pleasure to be able to take part with you today in the launching of our country's newest nuclear attack submarine—the *Haddock*.

In its more than a quarter of a century of shipbuilding, Ingalls has become the largest industry on Mississippi's Gulf shore. Here the nuclear submarines *Sculpin*, *Snook*, *Barb*, and *Dace* have slid down the ways to take their places in our growing nuclear submarine fleet. Three more in addition to the *Haddock* are under construction—the *Tautog*, *Aspro* and *Puffer*. The importance of these ships to the fighting strength of our Navy cannot be overemphasized.

The development of the nuclear submarine stands out as one of the most important technological achievements of this century. In my position as a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, I am constantly made aware of the importance of naval nuclear propulsion to our security through its application to our Polaris submarines, our attack submarines, and our surface warships. Further, the naval nuclear propulsion program has supplied the basic nuclear technology on which our growing civilian nuclear power program is based.

This important and vital program has been developed under the guiding genius of Vice Admiral H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, who is today leading the way to new and even more spectacular developments. His achievements have not come as a surprise to me. When I served with the then Lieutenant Rickover some thirty years ago in the battleship named after my home state, the U.S.S. *New Mexico*, he was just as imaginative, hard-driving, enthusiastic, and aggressive as he is today. He wouldn't take "No" for an answer then and he won't today. Our country is the stronger for it.

The United States has 59 nuclear submarines in operation, including 37 Polaris missile-launching types. By the end of this year, 9 more nuclear submarines should join the fleet for a total of 68 by December 31, 1966. Thirty-one more nuclear submarines have been authorized and this year Congress will add 5 more to this total. Three nuclear surface warships are in operation, the aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, the cruiser *Long Beach* and the frigate *Bainbridge*. The nuclear frigate *Truxtun* will be completed later this year.

The nuclear submarines and surface warships have accumulated an amazing record. Never once in the approximately seven million miles steamed to date has one of these ships had to abort its mission because of a failure in the reactor plant. Since that historic day in January 1955 when the *Nautilus* signaled "Underway on nuclear power" for the first time, the feats of our nuclear naval ships have become legend—the first submerged submarine voyage to England and back by the *Skate*; the first voyages under the Polar Ice Cap by the *Nautilus* and the *Skate*; the first rendezvous at the North Pole by the *Seadragon* and the *Skate*; the 84-day, 36,000 mile round-the-world voyage of the *Triton*; the armed Polaris patrols; the cruise around the world without logistic support of our first nuclear powered carrier task force, Operation Sea Orbit; and the combat records of the *Enterprise* and *Bainbridge* off Vietnam are a few examples.

I am proud of the role the Congress, and in particular the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has played in the remarkable growth of nuclear power for naval warships.

The road has not been an easy one; and there are still major issues to be resolved. The early years of the naval nuclear propulsion program were characterized by a reluctance within the Department of Defense to use nuclear power for the propulsion of submarines. It was the Congress, exercising its constitutional responsibilities to provide and maintain a Navy that took the lead in forcing the shift from diesel-electric power to nuclear power in submarines. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy arranged to buy the nuclear power plants for our first two nuclear submarines, the *Nautilus* and *Seawolf* with Atomic Energy Commission funds because of the lack of interest of the Defense Department. The Defense Department just didn't ask for nuclear ships. There was a lack of imagination and failure in judgment in the Department of Defense—a failure to comprehend that we were talking about a significantly different weapon that would be vital to our defense. But Congress was alert and insisted that we proceed with the nuclear submarine program.

Today the nuclear submarine is a reality. How thankful every American should be that the Joint Committee, Congress, and Admiral Rickover pushed this project through. Everyone now agrees that the Polaris nuclear submarine is the vital cornerstone of our deterrent strength. When you read news accounts of the growing number of Soviet submarine "contacts" off our shores in the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, you must recognize the importance of nuclear attack submarines like the *Haddock* we will launch today. The nuclear attack submarine is one of our best Anti-Submarine Warfare weapons.

In a period when our competitors are trying desperately to catch up, the United States enjoys a wide lead in the successful harnessing of the atom's energy for naval nuclear propulsion.

It has taken a great deal of work to bring this nuclear to the point where we enjoy

such pre-eminence over any other nation. There is no cut-rate, bargain-counter approach available when it comes to providing for the national defense and security. I know the American people recognize this simple fact for they have always responded generously with whatever resources were available when they were needed for the defense of their country.

Unfortunately, the reluctance of the Department of Defense to accept nuclear propulsion appears to be repeating itself in the case of surface warships. The same fallacious arguments that were advanced back in the early 1950's against the nuclear submarine are now being employed with equal fervor by some within the Department of Defense against the construction of nuclear surface warships. We are told that the choice we face is between a larger number of conventional ships and a smaller number of nuclear ships for the same total cost.¹ In other words, the Defense Department is telling us that to improve a weapons system, we must reduce the number of weapons to pay for it.

Time and again "cost-effectiveness" studies have poured forth from the corridors of the Pentagon, purporting to show that the advantages of nuclear propulsion are not particularly significant for surface warships. These studies contain a fundamental weakness that makes their conclusions wrong. These "cost-effectiveness" studies were based on—

1. The assumption that tankers and oilers needed to supply fuel for oil-fired warships will operate unhampered by the enemy and suffer no losses;

2. The assumption that the fuel oil needed to run our conventional warships will be readily available wherever and whenever needed; and

3. The assumption that no cost factor need be included in the studies for losses—or protection of our propulsion fuel oil supply lines.

Would you use such dangerous assumptions in evaluating weapons of war? Of course not! It is "military effectiveness" that must be paramount in planning for wartime.

The aircraft carrier *Enterprise* and the guided missile frigate *Bainbridge* have been operating in Vietnam waters since last December. During hearings before the Joint Committee earlier this year, the Committee was furnished with a firsthand report on the advantages of nuclear power and its utilization in a combat environment prepared by the Commander of the *Enterprise* task group, Rear Admiral Henry Miller.² Admiral Miller's comments are especially important since he has commanded conventional carrier task groups in Vietnam as well as commanding the *Enterprise* task group during the first test of nuclear powered ships in combat. The Joint Committee published this report in its hearings last month so that, as far as security will permit, the citizens of the nation could know how vital nuclear propulsion is to the security of this nation. Some of the advantages enumerated by Admiral Miller concerning the superiority of nuclear power under actual war time conditions were:

Increased tactical flexibility as a result of unlimited endurance at high speed.

¹Joint Committee Report, "Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels," December, 1963, Page 11.

²Joint Committee Print, "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program," January 26, 1966, page 37.

Reduction of replenishment frequency with a greatly reduced dependence upon all forms of mobile logistic support as a result of increased storage space formerly required for fuel oil.

Elimination of stack gases and smoke which not only make it difficult for the pilots in taking off and landing but also results in hundreds of thousands of hours of time and effort by the crews for maintenance of the ship, aircraft, radios and radar because of the corrosive effects of such gases.

The concern for loss of fuel oil facilities is eliminated.

There is the ability, under severe threat situations, to operate from distant bases completely free from mobile logistic dependency, with the capability of high speed return to such bases for replenishment of aviation fuel and ammunition.

These are all real and vital military advantages. But Admiral John Hayward who headed up the task group which included the *Enterprise* during the Cuban crisis had this to say to the Joint Committee about the treatment of military advantages in some quarters in "River City":

"In Washington these often cited advantages of nuclear propulsion seem to get lost in a shuffle of paper—off Cuba they were real."

After much urging by Congress, the Department of Defense has finally accepted nuclear propulsion for its new aircraft carriers. The Secretary of Defense has requested a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier in the Fiscal Year 1967 defense budget and has declared his intention to provide the Navy a total of three new nuclear-powered aircraft carriers over the next several years in addition to the *Enterprise*.

The new aircraft carrier will use two reactors to provide about the same propulsion power as the eight in the *Enterprise*. The development of long-life cores has made so much progress that it is expected the ship will require refueling only once in its life. This is a very significant advance. We would not have gotten to where we are today without actually building and operating land prototypes and ships in addition to conducting the necessary research and development. We cannot continue to learn and to improve nuclear propulsion technology unless we build more ships.

However, despite the fact that the Department of Defense has finally accepted nuclear propulsion in aircraft carriers, they are still dragging their feet in accepting nuclear propulsion for major fleet escorts to protect the nuclear carriers. Left to their own devices, they would take as long to change from oil to nuclear power in our new warships as was taken to change our Navy from sail to coal—that change took two-thirds of a century.

The design of the first nuclear-powered aircraft carrier was started in 1950—16 years ago. In the four years subsequent to the authorization of the *Enterprise*, *Long Beach*, and *Bainbridge*, 12 major warships have been authorized, but only one, the guided missile frigate *Truxtun* which will be completed this year, will be nuclear-powered.⁴ The *Truxtun* will be nuclear-powered only because of the initiative taken five years ago by the Congress to authorize and appropriate the extra funds to change her from an oil-fired frigate to a nuclear-powered vessel.

Other attempts by the Congress to provide the Navy with additional nuclear-powered surface warships have not proven so successful. An additional nuclear-powered frigate included in the Fiscal Year 1963 shipbuilding

program was subsequently cancelled by the Department of Defense because the *Typhon* missile system planned for the ship was not ready. After extensive hearings in 1963, the Joint Committee recommended that the aircraft carrier *John F. Kennedy* be nuclear-powered,⁵ however, that ship is being constructed today with a conventional power plant.

In Fiscal Year 1966, frustrated and impatient at the delay in constructing a nuclear surface fleet, the Congress authorized an additional nuclear-powered frigate and appropriated \$20 million for the purchase of long lead time material for the ship while strongly urging the Defense Department to include the remaining funds for its construction in the Fiscal Year 1967 shipbuilding program. The Department of Defense has failed to carry out this expression of the will of Congress, having neither released to the Navy the \$20 million appropriated for long lead time procurement nor included the additional ship construction funds in the Fiscal Year 1967 shipbuilding program.

For the last three years the Defense Department has not requested construction of a single major fleet escort ship—either nuclear or conventional. Now, ending a three year hiatus, they have proposed construction in Fiscal Year 1967 of two conventionally powered guided missile destroyers of a new class to accompany the new nuclear powered aircraft carrier. This is nonsense.

The war experience in Vietnam shows that two-thirds of the fuel used for a conventional carrier task group—a carrier plus its escorts—is used just to keep the ships running. One-third is used for carrier propulsion, one-third is used for escort propulsion, and one-third is used for aircraft fuel. So if you do away with the need for the fuel for the escorts and the carrier itself, you only need one-third the amount of fuel. This simplifies the logistic problem tremendously. These are simple facts that are not considered by the people who do the "cost effectiveness" studies, because they assume there is no logistics problem before they start the studies.

I assure you that Congress does not intend to let the Defense Department continue to ignore the importance of nuclear propulsion in new fleet escort ships.

Last month the Joint Committee made public a special report which stated:

"It would be a mistake for Congress to authorize new conventionally powered guided missile destroyers when the technology exists to provide them with the increased military effectiveness afforded by nuclear propulsion. Each nuclear-powered ship substituted for a conventional ship greatly increases the capabilities of a task force. For example, the most recent Department of Defense cost-effectiveness studies forwarded to the committee show that when a nuclear carrier is substituted for a conventional carrier, the range of a carrier task group with four conventional escorts is about doubled. When two of the escorts with the nuclear carrier are nuclear, the range of the carrier task group is almost doubled again. When all of the escorts with the nuclear carrier are nuclear, the range of the carrier task group is essentially unlimited. Further, the lifetime cost to construct and operate a nuclear-powered task force is only about 6 percent greater than the cost of a conventionally powered task force."

Also last month the Senate substituted a second nuclear powered frigate for the two conventionally powered destroyers in the fiscal year 1967 Defense Department author-

ization bill. This week the House Armed Services Committee reported to the House of Representatives that they have amended the new Defense Department authorization bill to include two nuclear powered frigates and that they have included language in the bill to make it mandatory that these two ships be built. Their report states in part:

"If this language constitutes a test as to whether Congress has the power to so mandate, let the test be made and let this important weapon system be the field of trial."

Again quoting from the House Armed Services Committee Report:

"Let there be no doubt. This is the time to see that our nuclear-powered attack carriers are the centers of nuclear-powered task groups which can utilize all of the benefits of nuclear power without having to worry about the flow of fuel. As the Chief of Naval Operations said in his memorandum of April 14, 1966:

"The endurance, tactical flexibility, and greater freedom from logistic support of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequalled naval striking force. Our new warships, which the Navy will be operating into the 21st century, should be provided with the most modern propulsion plants available. To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security."

We are at a critical point in the history of the naval nuclear propulsion program as well as of the Navy. Significant strides are being made in the development of longer life reactor fuel to increase the length of time nuclear ships can operate without refueling. New and more powerful nuclear propulsion plants are being developed for both submarines and surface ships. We are now able to put nuclear cores into escort ships that will provide 10 years of operation. Aircraft carriers with cores that will last for 13 years and escorts with cores that last for 10 years will be adequate, as far as fuel is concerned, for the duration of any type of conflict in which we are likely to be engaged.

We must stop making studies and get on with the job at hand of prosecuting vigorously the conversion of the Navy to nuclear propulsion in the surface fleet as well as the submarine fleet.

The intent of Congress is clear! We do not intend to sit idly by, doing nothing, while new already obsolete ship platforms are laid down! We intend to ensure that our Navy remains the strongest in the world!

Now let us turn our attention to the pleasurable task of launching the latest addition to our nuclear Navy. To those of you who are responsible for completing this ship, I pray God will give you the skill to complete your complex tasks with perfection. To those of you who will man the *Haddock*, we wish you well. Never has your role in the defense of liberty been more important. Rest assured that our prayers go with you as you set out to accomplish the great tasks awaiting you. God speed!

The University of Krakow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 6, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this year we celebrate 1,000 years of Christianity in Poland. In commemorating

⁷ House of Representatives Report No. 1536, May 16, 1966, page 18.

³ Joint Committee Print, "Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels," December 1963, page 21.

⁴ Joint Committee Hearing, "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program" January 26, 1966, Foreword, page IV.

⁵ Joint Committee Print, "Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels," December, 1963, page 5.

⁶ Joint Committee Hearing, "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program" January 26, 1966, Foreword, page VI.

this achievement we praise not only a burning faith which has sustained and fortified the Polish people, but we also marvel at the rich culture which has drawn its essence from Christian tradition. Poland has always been the heart of cultural advancement in central Europe, and the names of the great Polish artists, musicians, and scholars are revered throughout the world.

In 1364 King Casimir the Great of Poland established the Jagiellonian University at Krakow. This university over the past 602 years has contributed fully to Poland's greatness. Renowned scholars have taught and learned within its halls and classic scientific theories have emerged from its laboratories and studies. Nicholas Copernicus the father of modern astronomy was a student there from 1491 to 1496, and the university library contains the first edition of his book. The Jagiellonian University was the center of intellectual activity for all of Poland in the early years and its outstanding professors represented Poland at almost all the international academic conferences.

This year's recognition of a millennium of Christianity in Poland renews a faith in God and in man and it brings to mind the value of traditions. The Jagiellonian University was almost always involved in controversies of the day, but even in the heat of debate it never lost sight of its commitment to search for truth and knowledge. Thus through the years a system of values came to be embodied in this institution, and in time of need the Polish people have always been able to rely on the old and glorious Jagiellonian University of Krakow.

Tribute to Denmark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1966

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN], in paying tribute to the people of Denmark on the anniversary of the promulgation of the Danish Constitution. It was on June 5, 1849, that the Danes received their charter of freedom from King Frederik VII.

The United States has been enriched through the years by the arrival in this country of thousands of Danish immigrants, many of whom settled in Illinois and neighboring States. I have found the people of Danish ancestry to be industrious, thrifty, self-reliant, and loyal.

For over half a century it has been possible for Americans who are visiting in Denmark to join the people of that nation in celebrating the anniversary of American independence. At Rebild, near the thriving city of Aalborg, is a beautiful park where Danes and Americans meet each Fourth of July to observe the day upon which liberty was proclaimed

throughout our infant Republic in 1776. I can think of no finer tribute from one nation to another than that.

Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that the existing friendship between our two countries will continue to the benefit of both.

America's Moral and Legal Commitment to the People of South Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1966

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been called upon in the past to sacrifice their lives and material comfort in order that the principles of freedom and justice be maintained. We have always based these sacrifices upon the assumption that without freedom, life on this planet would be cruel and unbearable.

We are being asked again to fight in defense of enlightenment; we are being asked again to lay down our lives and our material comfort to insure that the concept of freedom does not die in the world.

No one would say that Vietnam is a pleasant war; there is no such thing. It is certainly uncomfortable to live daily with the knowledge that our servicemen are fighting and dying in a land thousands of miles away; a strange land with which most of us were unfamiliar a few short years ago. We did not choose to fight there, for those who fight to defend the rights of others seldom are fortunate enough to pick the most advantageous place to do battle. Yet, I am convinced of one thing above all: We must fight in Vietnam—we must win an honorable peace in Vietnam or we will find America's will to defend the cause of freedom questioned throughout the world. This, I feel, would be disastrous to America's position, and, more important, it would broadcast to the world that we were unwilling to support the cause of freedom, enlightenment, and decency, and that we let ourselves become vulnerable to defeat and ultimate slavery by Communist domination.

There are a few who question both our moral and legal right to be in Vietnam. Though I will always strongly uphold the right of responsible dissent in America, I feel that these critics are grievously wrong and indeed are in many cases helping prolong the war which they so vigorously oppose. I for one firmly uphold both our moral and legal commitment to the people of Vietnam and the free world.

Legally, I feel that we are on very solid ground, a position which the American Bar Association also holds. Under the United Nations Charter, which we had a major part in drafting, the right of collective self-defense is recognized for all nations. In 1954, after the French had suffered many reverses in Vietnam, that

area was divided, North and South Vietnam, by the Geneva Convention. The United States, with the cooperation of other nations in Asia and throughout the world, then entered into the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty by which we agreed to protect southeast Asia—including South Vietnam—from aggression.

This treaty was adopted in accordance with the U.S. Constitution, and it is important to note that in a very real sense the misguided and foolish handful of Americans who are sending material aid to the Communists in North Vietnam are violating the spirit and letter of the U.S. Constitution as well as assisting in prolonging a war in which U.S. servicemen are fighting.

While we are not technically in a state of war against North Vietnam, the right of the President to act as he has is clear. Both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have supported the commitment made by President Eisenhower in 1954. In addition, Congress expressly authorized the President to use the Armed Forces to assist any member state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom. We are acting in Vietnam with the expressed consent of, and at the specific request of, the Government of South Vietnam. No matter how confusing the change of governments in that strife-torn country may seem, the facts are clear: every new leader of South Vietnam has renewed this request.

Morally, the case seems to be equally convincing. One point above all should be made absolutely clear: we are dealing with a case of cynical aggression on the part of North Vietnam and Communist China against South Vietnam. Those who completely deny this are totally blind to the facts of the case and indeed even refuse to listen to these facts. Previous to the cold war, patterns of aggression, I agree, were much more clear cut. Armies of enemy nations would openly march across borders, as Germany did in World War II. However, this type of aggression has almost always met with total defeat in the 20th century.

Recognizing this basic fact, the Communists have developed a new, more subtle pattern of aggression. Instead of openly amassing huge armies into a grinding war machine, the Communists seek to infiltrate and gain control of small, dissident groups within a country. When this is accomplished, they feed large quantities of arms, material, and men to fight a war which they call an internal civil war. This is what has happened to South Vietnam, and we are fighting, successfully, I might add, to stop this flagrant violation of the freedom of the people of South Vietnam.

The American people have never hesitated to offer help to support the cause of liberty and freedom in the world. We have done this for two basic reasons: first, because we believe in freedom and have built a great nation on the principles of justice and liberty, and second, because it is in the interest of all Americans to do so. We are fighting for these principles in Vietnam; we are fighting in order to help our friends fend off the

rising threat of totalitarianism and communism. But we are also fighting for our own self-interest because a free nation cannot long exist in a world which is not free. If we did not fight in Vietnam, I am sure that it would not be long before we would be fighting a much more desperate and far greater war much closer to home. We must prove that America is a strong, determined nation—determined to keep liberty and freedom alive throughout the world.

As Joseph Alsop points out in his recent Saturday Evening Post article, "Why We Can Win in Vietnam," the Vietcong is making a last ditch attempt to win the war in the face of overwhelming odds. As he points out:

The present enemy reinforcement is like one of those last high raises that losing players sometimes make to frighten their opponents out of a poker game.

We must not be frightened—we will not be frightened. We have the finest fighting force ever assembled in all the world in Vietnam, and we are winning the war. I urge all Americans to continue their support of our country and the free world, the President, and all of our elected officials, and I look forward, with all Americans, to the day when we can lay down our arms and join with the war-weary people of South Vietnam in building a peaceful, prosperous, free nation, and at the same time proving to all peoples that we can and will fight and win to preserve freedom and destroy the Communists' ambition of world domination with slavery and misery which would so surely accompany it.

My Black Position Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, this year I celebrate a quarter of a century in politics.

In those 25 years, a philosophy which has guided my thought and my every act has evolved out of my life experiences as minister, politician, Congressman, and man from Harlem.

This philosophy is summed up in what I call my "Black Position Paper."

But it is an open-end continuing document whose contents are always subject to the influence of new ideas and changing events.

The black position paper is an outline for living and call to action for America's black people.

It is, above all, that passionate reaffirmation in what black people are today and what we can be tomorrow.

The following 17 points comprise my black position paper:

1. We must give our children a sense of pride in being black. The glory of our past and the dignity of our present must lead the way to the power of our future.

2. Black organizations must be black led. Other ethnic groups lead their own organi-

zations. We must do the same. Jews lead the American Jewish Congress, American Jewish Committee and B'nai B'rith. Irish control the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee and the Irish-American Historical Society. Poles head the Polish-American Congress and the Polish National Alliance. Italians lead the Italian-American Democratic organizations and the Italian-American Labor Council. This kind of honest pluralism is a happy fact of American life.

3. The black masses must be primarily responsible for their own organizations. Only with black financial control can black organizations retain their honesty, their independence and their full commitment to the urgency of immediate equality.

4. The black masses must demand and refuse to accept nothing less than that proportionate share of political jobs and appointments which are equal to their proportion in the electorate. Where we are 20% of the voters, we should command 20% of the jobs, judgeships, commissions, and all political appointments.

5. Black people must support and push black candidates for political office first. This mandate should apply particularly where black candidates are at least equally well-qualified as other candidates.

6. Black people must seek audacious power—the kind of power which cradles your head amongst the stars and gives you the security to stand up as proud men and women, eyeball to eyeball with the rest of the world.

As Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I control all labor and education legislation. This year, my Committee will raise the minimum wage for the second time in five years—both during my chairmanship. When I first became chairman, the Federal commitment to education was \$450 million. It is now \$360 billion—an eightfold increase. The \$1.7 billion for the war on poverty which has given the poor of America their first opportunity to be heard as a national voice derives its mandate from my Committee.

This is legislative power. This is political power. Above all, this is audacious power.

7. Black leadership in the North and the South must shift its emphasis to the two-pronged thrust of the Black Revolution: economic self-sufficiency and political power. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 (with the exception of Title VII or the "FEPC Title") has absolutely no meaning for black people in New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, or any of the northern cities.

It has been difficult for black leadership to grasp these new dimensions of necessary economic and political power for the black masses. This is because black leadership has been saturated too long with too many hustling social workers and professional "Negro leaders" whose only contribution they can make to American society is that they are white handpicked "leaders."

8. Black masses must produce and contribute to the economy of this country in the proportionate strength of their population. Rather than a race primarily of consumers and stockboys, we must become a race of producers and stock brokers.

9. Black communities of this country—whether they are New York's Harlem, Los Angeles' Watts, Chicago's South and West Sides, Philadelphia's North Side or Detroit's East Side—must neither tolerate or accept outside leadership, black or white.

Too many black communities in America today suffer from absentee black leadership.

Black communities must insist on black leaders living amongst them, knowing and sharing the harsh truths of the ghetto. These black leaders—the ministers, the politicians, the businessmen, the doctors and the lawyers—must come back to the black communities from their suburban sanctuaries or be purged as leaders.

10. The black masses should follow only those leaders who have true power—what President Kennedy called clout—and who can sit at the bargaining table with the white power structure as equals in power and negotiate for a share of the loaf of bread, instead of begging for some of its crumbs. These leaders will be chosen by the black masses themselves.

11. Demonstrations and all continuing protest activity must be non-violent. Violence even when it erupts recklessly in anger among our teenagers must be curbed and discouraged.

12. Black people must continue to defy the laws of man when such laws conflict with the law of God. The law of God ordains that "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

13. Black people must discover a new and creative involvement with ourselves. We must turn our energies inwardly toward our homes, our churches, our families, our children, our colleges, our neighborhoods, our businesses and our communities. Our fraternal and social groups must become an integral part of this creative involvement by energizing their resources toward constructive fund raising and community activities.

Too much time is spent on cotillions and champagne sips and running around sipping martinis in the homes of suburban white families. Some of those energies should be directed to helping black families who are starving in the inner city.

14. The War on Poverty must become that more productive crusade for jobs. The only thing that keeps a man impoverished is his incapacity to earn a living. Put some green in his pocket and some bread in his soul and he'll be that better citizen, that more productive father, that finer American.

15. The battle against segregation in America's public school systems must become a national effort, instead of the present regional skirmish that now exists. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act outlaws *de jure* racial segregation. It has no meaning or application to the hard core pockets of *de facto* racial segregation in Northern schools which is just as malicious, just as destructive of the human spirit.

16. We must put pressures on our predominantly black colleges to shift their emphasis from teacher education to nuclear physics and aerodynamics. Black colleges are still grinding out teachers and sociologists while other major schools are graduating space engineers and nuclear physicists.

17. Every black man who considers himself an American must become a *registered voter*. Freedom in a democracy rests on a free electorate. A free electorate only survives when people vote. But do more than vote. Learn to vote for those who are your friends, against those who are your enemies. No black person over 21 must be permitted to walk a picket line or participate in any demonstration unless he or she is a registered voter.

These 17 points are our responsibility in this age of crisis.

Difficult? Yes. Nietzsche said: "Life always gets harder toward the summit—the cold increases, responsibility increases."

Our responsibility must increase. And we must nurse its growth in the bosom of our hopes, defying power which seems omnipotent—loving and hearing and hoping "till Hope creates from its own wreck the thing it contemplates."

Let us, thus, take pride in our black skins in this white man's civilization. In so doing, we will no longer be "wandering between two worlds, one dead and the other powerless to be born."

That other world—our world—the world of the black man's tortured past and his

brilliant future, can take its rightful place in history if we give it the power to be born.

It is time now to glory in the golden legacy of our shackled past.

The glory of our past and the dignity of our present must point the way to the power of our future.

Glory in the proud heritage of black heroes like Crispus Attucks, Sojourner Truth, Dorie Miller, and millions of black men whose blood, spilled all over the world in America's eight wars, has watered the lush foliage of American democracy and given it the beauty of ever-lasting life.

Glory in that mighty fortress of our strength—the Christian faith—"On Christ the solid rock I stand, all other ground is sinking sand!"

For there is a God in Heaven Who asks each of us not to be like Elijah who "came thither unto a cave, and lodged there; and behold, the Word of the Lord came to him and He said unto him, What doest thou here, Elijah?"

What doest thou black people of America? You have looked Southward too long. "Ye have compassed this mountain long enough: turn you northward." And be free!

The Sea Around Us: Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, last week the House agreed to the conference report on S. 944 establishing the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966. The compromise version of the bill declares it to be the policy of the United States "to develop, encourage, and maintain a coordinated, comprehensive, and long-range national program in marine science for the benefit of mankind, to assist in protection of health and property, enhancement of commerce, transportation, and national security, rehabilitation of our commercial fisheries, and increased utilization of these and other resources."

As a member of the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee I have long been concerned about the fact that the national marine science program lacked a legislative base, a legislative commitment of policy and purpose, and a statutory body to plan, evaluate, and coordinate such a program. These will be provided by the enactment of S. 944.

The great sea around us is coming to be recognized as the unexplored "inner space." We need to explore and probe and study this "inner space" to the same extent and with the same enthusiasm with which we are now exploring and studying the vast outer space. For far too long we have taken for granted the oceans. We have ignored their wealth, and failed to realize their potentials.

The Marine Resources Act will stimulate the search for needed knowledge and technology; and it will encourage private investment in endeavors looking to-

ward economic and greater use of the treasures of the sea.

S. 944 proposes expansion of our use of the oceans, the Great Lakes and the Continental Shelf by development of a comprehensive program of marine science activities including exploration, exploitation, and conservation of the resources of the ocean. These efforts will include development of ocean engineering; studies of air-sea interaction and transmission of energy, long-range studies of the potential benefits to the U.S. economy, security, health, and welfare to be gained from marine resources, engineering and sciences; and it will also provide for a thorough study of the legal problem arising out of the management, use, development, recovery, and control of marine resources.

Responsibility for carrying out these activities would be placed with the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, assisted by the Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources. This Council would operate within the Executive Office of the President.

I am especially pleased that private industry will be invited to give significant leadership by its representation on the Council.

There exists in the world's oceans an almost limitless potential for food production, for supplementing the land's minerals, for an inexhaustible supply of pure water, for new sources of fuels and energy, for a revitalized, superior merchant marine, and even for harnessing wind and weather. We only need to learn to apply our American technological genius to their use. There is an opportunity for economic growth unparalleled since the industrial revolution.

The National Council will coordinate the team efforts of the Federal agencies, the Congress, the universities, the States, and the business-industrial communities.

With its shores washed by three great oceans the United States occupies a unique position among the nations as a sea-faring country. Our total coastline of 12,255 miles is second only in length to that of Canada. We now have the means and the opportunity to lead the world in the exploration of the sea around us, as we have led in the conquest of outer space.

The 1966 Gold Pasteur Medal Awarded to Mr. Robert Closson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1966

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to announce that the Milk Industry Foundation's 1966 Gold Pasteur Medal, its highest award, was given yesterday to Mr. Robert Closson, of East Fishkill, N.Y. He received the only gold medal given by the foundation

this year for outstanding bravery and humanitarian service.

Closson, a driver-salesman for Fitchett Bros. Dairy of Poughkeepsie, while on his route, saw a fire on the property of a 69-year-old customer. He ran to the fire. A gust of wind cleared the air for a moment and Mr. Closson saw his customer in the flames, screaming hysterically.

With complete disregard to his own safety, Mr. Closson carried the severely burned man out of the flames and called for help. As if nothing ever happened, he then finished his day's work of milk delivery.

This is the second consecutive year that Mr. Closson has received a Pasteur award. Last year he was awarded an honorable mention for caring for a heart-attack victim.

The gold medal was presented to Mr. Closson following the Milk Day-U.S.A. luncheon yesterday in the New Senate Office Building. Mr. Closson was accompanied at the luncheon by his wife and Mr. and Mrs. Fitchett of Fitchett Bros. Dairy. I was honored to be invited to present the gold medal to him.

I am proud to join my fellow citizens of the Hudson Valley—in fact, all Americans—in paying tribute to this brave, resourceful individual.

Development of the War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1966

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I made May 1, 1966, before the Rotary District 667 Conference at Miamisburg, Ohio, on the development of the war in Vietnam:

DEVELOPMENT OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

(By Congressman CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR., Seventh Ohio District delivered at the Rotary District 667 Conference, Miamisburg, Ohio, May 1, 1966)

Today we face a perilous time in our international relationships abroad because of the critical situation in Southeast Asia. The Buddhists and others opposed to the government of Premier Ky in Saigon have forced special elections to be scheduled in South Viet-Nam sometime within the next three to five months. If the independent government which results from those elections asks the United States military forces to leave Viet-Nam, our nation faces a difficult decision. Let me take a few minutes to review the situation in Viet-Nam for you, with the hope of putting it into perspective.

As you may recall, prior to World War II the French maintained a colonial empire in Indo-China, which makes up most of the peninsula of Southeast Asia. The British in Burma and Malaya were the other colonial power on the peninsula, and the Dutch controlled the islands of Southeast Asia down toward New Guinea and Australia. The people of these areas, which had been occupied by Japan for five years during World War II, threw out their colonial masters one by one after that war.

Before the fall of the French colonial interest, France invited the United States to assist in trying to squelch the Indo-China revolt with economic and military aid. Thus, our involvement began under the Truman Administration with a decision announced by Secretary Acheson on May 8, 1950, only a little more than a year after China fell to the Communists—then called by some only agrarian reformers. That decision was to send "economic and military equipment to the Associated States of Indochina (Viet-Nam, Laos, and Cambodia) and to France in order to assist them in restoring stability and permitting these states to pursue their peaceful and democratic development."

Approximately \$375 million of military and economic assistance was channeled to Southeast Asia from the American taxpayers through fiscal year 1953. In August of 1950, the first American military assistance advisory group of 35 personnel was sent to Indo-China to advise on the use of this American equipment.

Nevertheless, by 1953, when President Truman left the White House, all of Viet-Nam above the 17th Parallel except Hanoi, a narrow corridor connecting to a coastal strip around Haiphong, and a part of the northeastern T'ai Highlands were under control of the Communist Viet Minh. In addition, Viet Minh forces were in effective control of large areas south of the 17th Parallel—including the central highlands and the tip of the Ca Mau Peninsula, the southernmost part of the country.

President Eisenhower continued the program of military and economic aid to France and the Associated States of Indo-China at levels set by the previous Administration until the Fall of 1953. In September 1953, increased aid of \$385 million through 1954 was promised by the United States after two modifications of French policy had been decided on—both of them measures designed to avert impending disaster for the French.

Under the twin pressures of military reverses in Indo-China and the prodding of the United States, France had agreed on July 3, 1953, to take steps "to complete the independence and sovereignty of the Associated States . . . within the French Union." There was hope that the war, even at that late date, could be cleansed of the appearance of colonialism and would no longer seem to Asiatics to be an effort by France merely to hold on to her possessions.

The second significant decision was incorporated in the plan of French General Navarre—a plan of aggressive military action with increased French and native forces.

After the conclusion of the Korean armistice on July 27, 1953, keeping the Chinese Communists from active military participation in Indo-China had become one of the concerns of American policymakers. On the day of the Korean armistice, the 16 members of the United Nations that had helped to defend South Korea had issued a joint warning against Chinese Communist action in Southeast Asia.

On May 7, 1954, the day before the Geneva discussion on Indo-China began, the French suffered their decisive defeat at Dien Bien Phu. On June 11, 1954, Secretary Dulles, in a speech delivered at Los Angeles, detailed the conditions under which the United States would consider additional help to the French: (1) a request for assistance from the states fighting the Communists; (2) clear assurance (from France) of complete independence to Laos, Cambodia, and Viet-Nam; (3) an indication of concern and support on the part of the United Nations; (4) assurance of collective action by other nations along with the United States; and (5) a guarantee that France would not withdraw from the conflict once a further commitment was extended by others.

The last two conditions laid down by Secretary Dulles were the decisive obstacles to

the formulation of any plan for U.S. intervention.

On July 20, 1954, representatives of the nine governments assembled at Geneva signed the agreement which rang down the curtain on the French Empire in Asia—Great Britain, the Soviet Union, France, Communist China, the United States, the Marxist Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam (North), the State of Viet-Nam (South), Cambodia, and Laos. Three similar armistice agreements were concluded relating to Viet-Nam, Laos, and Cambodia, and a declaration was issued.

Besides stipulations on the cessation of hostilities, the armistice agreements provided for withdrawal of foreign troops and prohibited Laos, Cambodia, and the two parts of Viet-Nam from joining any military alliance or granting military bases to foreign powers.

Also, the Geneva Agreements, in effect, recognized as Communist territory Viet-Nam north of the 17th Parallel and two provinces in northeastern Laos. Viet-Nam, north of the 17th Parallel, had already been almost totally occupied by the Viet Minh forces. The treaty provisions formalized this conquest, but they also required the Viet Minh to withdraw from South Viet-Nam, vast areas of which were under their control. Some 80,000 to 90,000 Viet Minh troops were moved out of South Viet-Nam in the execution of the agreement. Perhaps 5,000 to 6,000 melted into the civilian population and remained in violation of the Geneva Agreement. The Geneva Agreements also provided that any civilians who were residing on one side of the partition line could, if they chose, go and live on the other side. By the end of the time limit set for making the move, which was extended to July 20, 1955, almost 900,000 civilians had moved from North Viet-Nam to South Viet-Nam. In contrast, less than 5,000 had moved from the South to the North.

In spite of the relocation of Viet Minh forces into North Viet-Nam, the armistice agreement read that the 17th Parallel "should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." The conference declaration envisaged the reunification of Viet-Nam, providing for the selection of a government for the entire country by free general elections to be held in 1956.

Similar to the splitting of Viet-Nam, the assignment of two northeastern provinces of Laos as sanctuaries for troops of the Communist Pathet Lao not wishing to be demobilized was, by the terms of the agreement, temporary—"pending a political settlement."

The United States did not sign any of the three strange treaties concluded at Geneva, nor the conference declaration; nor did South Viet-Nam.

In fact, before the conference closed at Geneva, the United States issued a unilateral declaration pledging not to use force to disturb the agreements but warning that renewed aggression in violation of the agreements would be viewed as a threat to international peace and security. At the same time, President Eisenhower announced that steps would be taken to establish collective defense against Communist aggression in Southeast Asia.

The attitude of the U.S. Government toward Geneva was summarized by the President thus: "The agreement contains features which we do not like, but a great deal depends on how they work in practice."

Another chief flaw of the Geneva settlement lay in provisions relating to the International Control Commission set up to supervise the execution of the agreements. The Commission, composed of representatives of Canada, India, and Poland, could act only by unanimous vote in cases involving violations of the territory covered by the agree-

ments. This veto in the hands of a Communist representative was an instrument for sabotaging the execution of the agreements.

As I said, the final declaration issued at Geneva in 1954 (subscribed to by neither the United States nor South Viet-Nam) called for free elections to unify all of the Vietnamese in 1956. Recently Senator FULBRIGHT and others have deplored the fact that this election was not held.

The reasons for the refusal of South Viet-Nam to acquiesce in the holding of the election were stated by Prime Minister Diem on July 16, 1955: "We do not reject the principle of elections as a peaceful and democratic means to achieve unity. But elections can be one of the foundations of true democracy only on the condition that they are absolutely free. And we shall be skeptical about the possibility of achieving the conditions of free elections in the north under the regime of oppression carried on by the Viet Minh."

The position of South Viet-Nam on this point was sustained by the United Kingdom, one of the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference.

Among the staunchest opponents of the holding of the 1956 election was the then Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts. He issued "a plea that the United States never give its approval to the early nationwide elections called for by the Geneva Agreement of 1954. Neither the United States nor free Viet-Nam was a party to that agreement—and neither the United States nor free Viet-Nam is ever going to be a party to an election obviously stacked and subverted in advance, urged upon us by those who have already broken their own pledges under the agreement they now seek to enforce."

Now, his brother Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, wants to include the Viet Minh in any negotiated peace!

As South Viet-Nam began its existence, the prospects for its survival were minimal. Independence was thrust upon a people without political experience and without political leadership. It had no sense of nationhood. It had no industry. And, by the Geneva declaration, it seemed doomed to being swallowed up by the Communist rulers of North Viet-Nam in two years.

Yet, when the Eisenhower Administration left office in 1960, South Viet-Nam was beginning to be a stable and established government. Senator John F. Kennedy called the development "a near miracle." In his book, "Strategy of Peace," published in 1960, he said: "In what everyone thought was the hour of total Communist triumph, (meaning the months after the Geneva Agreement) we saw a near miracle take place. . . . Today that brave little state (South Viet-Nam) is working in free and friendly association with the United States, whose economic and military aid has, in conditions of independence, proved effective."

The State Department's white paper of December 1961, entitled "A Threat to the Peace," contains the following analysis of progress in South Viet-Nam: "The years of 1956 to 1960 produced something close to an economic miracle in South Viet-Nam. Food production rose an average of 7 percent a year and prewar levels were achieved and passed. While per capita food production in the north was 10 percent lower in 1960 than it had been in 1956, it was 20 percent higher in the south. The output of textiles in the south jumped in only one year from 68 million meters (in 1958) to 83 million meters. Sugar production in the same one-year span increased more than 100 percent, from 25,000 metric tons to 58,000 metric tons.

"Despite the vastly larger industrial plant inherited by the North when Viet-Nam was partitioned, gross national product is considerably larger in the South. In 1960 it was estimated at \$110 per person in the South

and \$70 in the North. Foreigners who have visited both North and South testify to the higher living standards and much greater availability of consumer goods in the latter.

"The record of South Viet-Nam in these recent years is written in services and in improved welfare, as well as in cold economic indexes. A massive resettlement program effectively integrated the 900,000 refugees from the North, who voted with their feet during these years, into the economic and social fabric of the South. An agrarian reform program was designed to give 300,000 tenant farmers a chance to buy the land they work for a modest price. Under the Government's agricultural credit program, aimed at freeing the farmers from the hands of usurers, loans to peasant families increased fivefold between 1957 and 1959.

"Thousands of new schoolrooms were built, and the elementary school population in South Viet-Nam increased from 400,000 in 1956 to 1,500,000 in 1960. A rural health program installed simple dispensaries in half of South Viet-Nam's 6,000 villages and hamlets. An elaborate malaria eradication program was launched to rid Viet-Nam of its most important infectious disease. Doctors and nurses went into training in South Viet-Nam and abroad to serve their people's health needs.

"This is a part, a very small part, of the setting against which the Vietcong launched their campaign of armed action, subversion, and terror against South Viet-Nam. It is a record of progress over a few brief years equaled by few young countries."

And so, this was the situation 7½ years after Geneva—as 1962 began—just four years ago.

But a viable Viet-Nam had also required security from outside aggression and from terrorism and guerrilla activities within the country. To increase security, the Eisenhower Administration had proceeded promptly in 1954 to form a regional defense organization, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, and to bring South Viet-Nam, as well as Laos and Cambodia, within its protective cover.

Specifically, to meet the threat of infiltration from North Viet-Nam and the depredations of guerrillas in the South, the United States provided military equipment and training to the forces of South Viet-Nam.

The purpose of this conditional offer, Eisenhower said, was "... to assist the Government of Viet-Nam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means."

Recognizing this fact, the Kennedy Administration later did not use American forces to repel Communist aggression in Laos. The legal commitment of the United States to South Viet-Nam is the same as its commitment to Laos. Both of these countries of Southeast Asia were brought under the protection of SEATO.

Although the Government of South Viet-Nam never established unchallenged authority in the entire countryside, a period of relative peace and stability extended from 1955 to 1959. But late in the latter year the tempo of guerrilla attacks began to assume significant proportions.

In 1960, by which time real economic progress had come to South Viet-Nam, the armed forces of the Vietcong operating in South Viet-Nam began to increase from the level of 3,000 at the beginning of the year. During this year the Vietcong assassinated or kidnapped more than 2,000 civilians. Acts of terrorism were directed particularly against local officials in rural areas to leave the countryside leaderless—the same tactic the Communists had worked in overthrowing China some dozen years earlier.

The signal from North Viet-Nam for intensification of the conflict came on September 10, 1960, at the Third Congress of the

Communist Party of North Viet-Nam with a call for liberation of the South from the "rule of the U.S. imperialists and their henchmen." In December the National Front for Liberation of South Viet-Nam was formed by Hanoi. This is the group with whom some Americans would like to negotiate a peace in Viet-Nam and include in the new government on the theory that they are only reformers.

In January of 1961 the United States was confronted not only with problems in South Viet-Nam but with far more acute difficulties in the neighboring nation of Laos. In Viet-Nam sporadic guerrilla attacks were going on. In Laos, Communist Pathet Lao forces were engaged in a full-scale offensive that threatened the government of Premier Boun Oum.

On March 23rd President Kennedy warned, "... If there is to be a peaceful solution, there must be a cessation of the present armed attacks by externally supported Communists ... No one should doubt our resolution on this point ... all members of SEATO have undertaken special treaty responsibilities toward an aggression in Laos."

But sixteen months later, in July of 1962, the Government of the United States acquiesced in a settlement which terminated any responsibility which the SEATO powers had toward Laos and imposed on that country a coalition government including Communist representation. Acceptance of this settlement by the government of Laos, which enjoyed recognition by the United States, was brought about by suspension of American aid.

Infiltrators from North Viet-Nam, together with local dissidents in Laos and South Viet-Nam, stimulated in South Viet-Nam what some prefer to call a civil war, but what can only be honestly referred to as a Communist effort to continue the anarchy which had existed since before World War II. The method was guerrilla warfare, terrorism, kidnapping, assassination, and atrocity. The political approach was to destroy the leadership at the local level by assassination or kidnapping and to persuade or intimidate the populace to revolt against, or ignore, the central government.

It was not difficult to convert antagonism to French colonialism to antagonism to the Viet-Nam government in Saigon. It was not difficult to slip through the jungle and into a village at night and to decapitate or emasculate some respected local leader, be gone before dawn, and return to take advantage of the local confusion and concern by preaching conversion to Communist doctrine.

The year 1961 saw the development of the conflict in Viet-Nam from covert guerrilla action to open, if still small-scale war. In that year, for the first time, the Vietcong committed forces of battalion size to combat. For the first time they launched an attack on a community as important as a provincial capital. The infiltration of Communist troops from the North, facilitated by unchallenged Communist control of eastern Laos, increased. By the end of 1961, the State Department estimated that between 8,000 and 12,000 regular Vietcong troops were in South Viet-Nam—at least double the number present there one year earlier. The United States doubled its forces of military advisors in South Viet-Nam from fewer than 700 stationed there when President Eisenhower left office to 1,364.

In the period 1961 to 1963, the number of American troops in South Viet-Nam grew from 1,364 to 16,575. In this same period we were also faced with the Berlin Wall crisis and the Russian missiles crisis in Cuba. The amount of aid, military and economic, to South Viet-Nam was increased substantially although the exact figures for military aid are classified after fiscal year 1962. But it was then said to be running in excess of half a billion a year.

In the late Summer and Fall of 1963, the internal crisis in South Viet-Nam arising from conflict between the Diem regime and the Buddhists produced a deterioration of the military situation and a decision by the U.S. Government to encourage a change of horses. American aid was cut back. Official U.S. statements indicating lack of confidence in the Diem government and calling for a change of personnel and policy were issued. Diem was removed in a military coup and was assassinated along with his brother, Nhu.

While our government has never admitted it, I have always felt personally that we were severely implicated in the assassination and overthrow of the Diem government. Our sympathy with that overthrow had been motivated by a belief that the best way to deal with the unrest in South Viet-Nam was to bring into power a government that would be more "socially liberal" than that of Diem and Madame Nhu, who had been critical of the United States for not facing the Communist influence for what it was in the anarchy which was gripping the nation.

With the Diem overthrow our involvement in the government of South Viet-Nam became deeper and deeper, to the extent that it would be difficult to call the Government of South Viet-Nam independent of American influence.

Strangely, the setbacks that occurred at the end of 1963 and the beginning of 1964 began only one month after Secretary McNamara and General Taylor returned from South Viet-Nam with an optimistic report. So strong was their optimism, that an immediate reduction of the American force in South Viet-Nam by 1,000 men was announced and the prediction was made that virtually all American troops would be withdrawn by the end of 1965.

In January of 1964, when President Johnson was only one month in office, we still had less than 17,000 men in Viet-Nam. The worst of the war, from the U.S. standpoint, still lay ahead and it might still have been possible to decide to withdraw. It might be pointed out that we also still had, and still do have, the same Secretary of State and the same Secretary of Defense we have had for the last five years. But it was in 1964 that the sharp escalation began, during the same election year when one Presidential candidate was in the posture of the hawk and the other in the posture of the dove.

After the attack on American shipping by Communist forces in the Gulf of Tonkin in August of 1964, President Johnson went to the Congress he had dominated so effectively since President Kennedy's assassination and asked for a resolution of support for the actions he might find it necessary to take in South Viet-Nam. He also asked for a substantial financial commitment to that situation. The Congress voted that support without much hesitation—and without any specific elaboration by President Johnson.

At this point it is well to note that the President of the United States, under the Constitution, is given two clear powers. First, to make United States foreign policy and, second, to be commander-in-chief of American armed forces. The situation in Viet-Nam is not the first time in which a President has committed American men and material to fight in foreign lands without a formal declaration of war from the Congress. It is true that the Constitution requires that Congress declare war, but in view of the powers of the President this almost becomes a technical formality. United States Presidents have, from time to time, sent the Marines into Mexico or Nicaragua or some other place to protect American interests. In the past, major wars did not ensue. The result in Viet-Nam may be different, but the beginning has plenty of parallels.

There is a classic story about Teddy Roosevelt's wanting to send the great white fleet around the world when he was President in order to show off American power which had been built up during the Spanish-American War—which had immediately preceded his Administration. The Congress refused to appropriate the money for this venture. Teddy looked in the Treasury and found enough funds to send the fleet half way around the world and then told Congress if it would like to have the fleet back home, it could appropriate the necessary funds to finance the trip.

The sham of calling American troops in Viet-Nam "advisors" was dropped in 1964 as the guerrilla attacks began to be aimed more and more at American nationals, as well as the South Vietnamese. Whether our commitment to the war began at the Gulf of Tonkin in August of 1964, or at Pleiku six months later, the sharpest escalation of the war began early in 1965, until by year-end there were approximately 181,000 servicemen in South Viet-Nam. President Johnson's posture, after the election in 1964, shifted noticeably from that of a dove to that of a hawk. He ordered limited bombing of selected targets in North Viet-Nam and general air support for the war in the South.

By the Fall of 1965 another noteworthy thing occurred. That was when Lin Piao, the Chinese equivalent of Secretary McNamara (Defense and Foreign Policy Administrator) made a speech in which he outlined the objectives of Chinese Communism in the world. The Western powers, he said, would fall to Communism just as had Free China. The Communists would first take the rural areas of the world and then the cities, as they had done in China. By the rural areas he meant Southeast Asia, Africa and Latin America. And when these areas had been secured, the industrial centers of the United States and Western Europe would fall easily. This is also the way the war was being conducted in South Viet-Nam. (It is worth noting that the approach of Chinese Communism is different from that of Russian Communism, which began in the cities and then spread to the rural areas.)

And so Piao seems to verify the domino theory that, should Communism win in South Viet-Nam, other nations in that area will become principal targets until all Southeast Asia is under Communist or Marxist domination. Thus, developments in that section of the world have an amazing parallel to the situation in Europe immediately before World War II. Piao has spelled out the Chinese objectives much as Hitler spelled out the Nazi objectives in *Mein Kampf* before World War II. *Mein Kampf*, though a best seller, was ignored. Many now suggest we also ignore Piao.

Few people in this country read Chinese, and only a few more have any interest in Asia, because our heritage and our commerce have always directed our attention to Europe. Since America has only recently arrived on the scene of world leadership, we do not have the tradition of knowledge and involvement in world affairs which keeps us closely aligned to remote nations like Viet-Nam.

Whether you consider our world leadership role as having begun with the Cold War 20 years ago, or with the beginning of World War II or World War I, we do not seem to have the tradition or the training for it to the extent that the British have. Someone once said it took 300 years of world leadership for the British to develop a Winston Churchill.

In the face of the obvious threat registered late in 1965 by Piao, President Johnson instituted during the year-end holidays, an unprecedented peace effort. He sent American diplomats out by the plane-load all over the world seeking assistance in urging peace in Southeast Asia and for better than a month halted bombing of North Viet-Nam.

The silence of the Vietcong response was deafening. There was no encouragement whatsoever from the Vietcong, North Viet-Nam, Communist China or from Moscow that the peace offensive launched at that time would get a response. Or perhaps it did get a response from the Communists, to the effect that they felt sure they were winning and nothing short of complete and unconditional withdrawal by the American forces would be acceptable.

At the beginning of this year, the United States reluctantly renewed bombing in North Viet Nam—over the objection of many Americans.

During this month-long peace offensive, the doves were hard at work in this country. With demonstrations against the war, serious arguments to government leaders in favor of peace, and the general suggestion that we should include the Communists in any possible peace discussion. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee undertook its hearings on Viet-Nam under the leadership of Senator FULBRIGHT and others opposing Administration policies.

In the face of this, President Johnson, early in February, personally laid it on the line for the Ky Government in Saigon by flying to Honolulu to meet with General Ky and arrange with him for the future extension of more vast amounts of aid for social improvements in his country.

Immediately following the Honolulu meeting, Mr. Johnson sent Vice President HUMPHREY to Southeast Asia to urge other nations there into active participation in the war in Viet-Nam. And we asked the United Nations to intervene.

Thus the Johnson Administration was trying again, just as Dulles had tried, to get the same kind of international cooperation in Southeast Asia as the free nations had shown in the Korean War. But there was little response; and except for the limited military support which The Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, and South Korea are giving, the United States is continuing to bear the brunt of the burden in South Viet-Nam. The Security Council of the United Nations, at a meeting on February 2nd, agreed to consider the Viet-Nam War by a vote 9 to 2. The meeting was then adjourned for private consultations and discussions, and nothing further has developed since that time.

Some of us at the time of the Honolulu meeting had the feeling that perhaps this would put the President in a position of being able to say later this year that the so-called independent government in Saigon had so benefited from the policy declarations in Honolulu that they could now win the war against Communism by themselves and it would be possible for American troops to be withdrawn—say by election day or Christmas.

The Buddhists now seem to have precluded this possibility. Now the initiative, which shifted to the United States with the fall of Diem, seems to be shifting back to the Vietnamese.

Should the new government ask American troops to leave, President Johnson must decide whether to risk the anger of world opinion and a rear guard opposition from the Vietnamese by staying in that beleaguered country whether they want us or not; or, if we withdraw, he would in effect be writing off the lives of 2,600 American men and billions of dollars in American treasure which have been committed unsuccessfully to the principle of keeping South Viet-Nam independent of the domination of Communist North Viet-Nam.

Can we afford to withdraw in defeat in the eyes of the world? And can we afford to do it in the memory of those who have fallen on the field of battle in Asia? On the other hand, the risks of a more aggressive war are obvious—both to our economy and manpower

and in the eyes of the world. Can we afford it? Would it heal any Chinese-Russian split?

In Viet-Nam, we have been committed to a policy, in the words of the President, "of making it clear that aggression does not pay off for the Communists." And thus, by a self-imposed limitation, we seem to have been committed to a defensive war in which we will not go beyond the 17th Parallel on the ground. And our air attacks north of that line have been limited to supply routes only. The restrictions on our military operations are very similar to those which were self-imposed in the post-MacArthur days in Korea.

And yet, some of the nations which are our allies elsewhere in the world continue to supply North Viet-Nam directly or through Communist China. And reports come back regularly that our troops and the South Vietnamese are being outflanked through Laos or Cambodia—or the Vietcong can escape to those sanctuaries.

As during the Korean War, we are told at home that we can have both guns and butter—that we can fight a war and have "business as usual."

Any questions about the prosecution of the war are turned aside with statistics or involved explanations. Secretary McNamara has made statements which would lead to almost any conclusion one might wish to make about the prospective length of the war. He has denied shortages of bombs and then admitted that we made "distress purchases" of bombs for \$21 apiece that we had earlier sold for \$1.70 each. He has denied mismanagement of the war. But only recently a constituent of mine told me of a letter he had from a senior officer in Viet-Nam advising that the Defense Department had shipped six 6 x 6's of anti-freeze to that tropical land with which to fight the war. Last December Secretary McNamara called for the phasing out of B-52 bombers on the theory that they would no longer be needed in American defense because their capability would be replaced by missiles—and four months later B-52's were being used heavily to push the war in Viet-Nam.

It is my personal observation that Secretary of Defense McNamara and Secretary of State Dean Rusk are, respectively, the least popular and the most sympathized with men in the President's cabinet. Secretary McNamara is unpopular because he won't brook questions and never admits an error. The reporters and Congressmen sympathize with Secretary Rusk because he will admit Administration errors even when they are his own.

It seems evident that a guerrilla war in Viet-Nam is not the kind of war we fight best. We are an industrialized nation used to the so-called conventional war of the World War II variety. The Communists tackled us on that basis in Korea and, once we had gotten into the ball-game, were repulsed and then brought to stalemate. They did not achieve their objective and the peace which ended that war left things at the status quo. It will be remembered that we did not negotiate until we had secured South Korea and were holding the Reds effectively above the 38th Parallel.

As one who gave two years of his life (although no blood, as many others did), to the U.S. goal of keeping South Korea free, I'd feel very unkind about it if our Government had negotiated away the fruits of that war effort. I rather imagine there are a number of boys now fighting in Viet-Nam—and the families of the 2,600 boys who will never fight again—who would be similarly disheartened should we negotiate away the independence of South Viet-Nam for which they fought—not to mention the billions of dollars American taxpayers have put into this principle in South Viet-Nam in the last 15 years.

The situation in the world since the end of World War II has seen the line between

the Free World and the Communist World become firmly established. It goes through Korea at the 38th Parallel; between Quemoy-Matsu and Communist China at the Straits of Formosa; to the 17th Parallel in Viet-Nam; it is blurred in Laos, but by our action or inaction, it includes India in the Free World but leaves Tibet to the Communists. It is also blurred in the Near East. As a result of our non-intervention in the uprising of 1953, it leaves Hungary to the Communists and has its sharpest European definition at the Berlin wall. The greatest crises of the world since the end of World War II have occurred when there have been Communist efforts to breach this line as when the Russian missiles were found in Cuba; when the Communists invaded South Korea; and now the Communist invasion of South Viet-Nam.

Hopefully, and perhaps we should even pray a little about it, whoever wins the elections scheduled in South Viet-Nam will be in a position to stabilize the country and assist us in clearing that land of Communist infiltrators. It might be a lot easier for them to do so—and it might help the right ones to win such an election—if we could be winning the war by the time elections are held.

And so, it looks as if we may have three to five months to try to accomplish that task after four years of "limited defensive war."

Americans must be aware of the situation in Southeast Asia and understand what may happen in the near future and what the causes were. It will be necessary to understand the past and near future to know the influences these events may have in the long run.

As I indicated earlier, only the President can really make foreign policy and command our nation's war effort. The average American citizen is unable to speak with any authority on such matters because there are too many unknown quantities in the picture today. Even the average Congressman is not much better off. Only the President has available to him the sources of data and information necessary to making military and foreign policy decisions. It is apparent from the wide disparity in views held by Members of Congress on the situation in Viet-Nam and what ought to be done about it that there is no single clear-cut "right answer" among them. The President has not kept them that thoroughly informed.

Our foreign policy under President Johnson has been bi-partisan only because the Republicans have made it so voluntarily. But it is beginning to be apparent that many Members of Congress do not feel they have been kept adequately informed. Their viewpoint is best reflected in that classic statement used during World War II by Senator Arthur Vandenberg: "I don't care to be involved in the crash landing, unless I can be in on the take-off."

Since about March 1st President Johnson seems to have been making an effort to bring the Senators and Congressmen more and more into the problems of Southeast Asia. I feel he will also be obliged to bring the people of America more into his confidence in this area. If we are facing the prospect of defeat and may have to write off 2,600 American lives and billions of dollars and the vast effort invested in Viet-Nam and Laos over the last fifteen years, then it will be necessary for us to brace for that. If we face the possibility of deeper involvement and further commitment to a difficult war, it certainly will be necessary to brace for that. Or, if we are to remain on some middle ground, perhaps slow withdrawal from Viet-Nam only to fight in Thailand or Cambodia or some place else on the Southeast Asia peninsula, we should also be forewarned of that, if possible.

It behooves all Americans to be aware of the situation in Southeast Asia in order to meet whatever challenge faces us there in

the future. It also behooves us to understand the history of our involvement in that area in order to learn from it whatever lessons history can teach us. Aristotle said, "That nation which fails to learn from history is doomed to repeat it." That truism is as valid today as it was 2,500 years ago.

Polish Valor and the Battle of Monte Cassino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1966

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, May 18 marked the 22d anniversary of the battle of Monte Cassino, one of the great turning points in World War II.

The Polish Second Corps, under the command of General Ladislaw Anders, played a heroic role in that battle, leading the assault that brought about the fall of Monte Cassino on May 18, 1944. That battle stands today as a symbol of the fighting spirit of the men in the Polish Free Army during World War II and their dedication to the cause of freedom.

Polish Veterans Post 203 and Polish Combatants Post No. 2, both of Cleveland, Ohio, observed this anniversary with suitable ceremonies on Sunday, May 22, at the Alliance of Poles Hall in Cleveland. It was my privilege to send a message of greetings to this observance which I am including by unanimous consent:

POLISH VALOR AND THE BATTLE OF MONTE CASSINO

The Battle of Monte Cassino has won its place in history as one of the great turning points in World War II.

Monte Cassino, eighty-five miles south of Rome, commanded the inland route to the Eternal City.

The Nazi high command selected this strategic location to make its most determined stand against the Allied forces moving northward in the liberation of Italy. Its natural terrain gave the enemy a strong advantage. The Alban Hills, stretching from Anzio to Monte Cassino, had been turned into a virtual arsenal by the Nazi commanders.

From the time the Allied forces landed at Anzio on January 20, 1944, through May 18th when Monte Cassino fell, one of the most severe and costly battles raged. The United States Fifth Army under the command of General Mark Clark struck at Monte Cassino week after week. Our artillery hammered that strategic location without pause.

The Nazis launched four major counter attacks against the Allied forces. Fifty thousand Allied troops were bottled up in this battle for four months. The casualties on both sides were heavy, the material destruction was almost beyond description.

The Polish Second Corps, under the command of General Ladislaw Anders, distinguished itself for outstanding courage and valor during this entire battle. The stories are legion about the dauntless courage of the men in the Polish Corps, their refusal to withdraw under withering fire, their determination to breach the Nazi lines at all costs.

On May 18th, the Polish Second Corps assaulted and took Monte Cassino. There the casualties were great, exceeded only by the

fearless spirit of the Polish assault forces. On that day the Nazi forces were smashed, the inland route to Rome was opened and the tide of battle to liberate all of Europe turned.

The heroic role of the Polish Second Corps in the Anzio and Cassino campaign is well established in the history of free men. Those men who fought and died on the battlefield were determined to fight their way across occupied Europe to liberate their homeland. Their dying hopes were shattered on the rocks of Russian deceit, duplicity, and imperial ambitions.

This 22nd Anniversary of the Battle of Monte Cassino can not fail to remind us of the terrible tragedy imposed upon a once free and independent Poland as a consequence of World War II. We honor the gallant men who fought and died at Monte Cassino. Free men can do no less than reaffirm a common resolve to right the terrible wrong done the Polish nation.

Cotulla, Tex., Group Visits President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIGIO DE LA GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1966

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's first acquaintance with my area of south Texas was when he came as a young man to teach at an elementary school in Cotulla, Tex. He has never forgotten the area. We have never forgotten him. Recently, some young boys and girls from Cotulla were here, and I had the privilege of having them visit me.

The group included Robert W. Cadwell, Betty Cadwell, Orfalinda Garcia, Nina Sue Peters, Martha Ramirez, Dana Weatherford, Mark Martin, Elaine Bahn, Nancy Gebert, Patsy Gilbert, Rene G. Anguiano, Edianne Arnold, Mary Snowden and their leaders and chaperones, Rev. and Mrs. Ben Welch and Mrs. Charles Huffman.

They were an example of our young people of the area—well mannered and with the typical south Texas courtesy and charm. They also were honored and our whole area was honored by having them visit President Johnson. I would like very much to share with my colleagues in the House the words that President Johnson spoke to them at this visit:

PRESIDENT'S REMARKS TO A GROUP OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS FROM COTULLA, TEX., IN THE CABINET ROOM

Reverend Welch, young men and women, ladies and gentlemen:

I am very happy that you boys and girls could come to Washington, your national capital, to see for yourselves how many people are here in your Government and how your national government really works.

Many people think of Washington as a strange and alien place, and think of the government as a remote and sometimes very dangerous power. Now I think you can see for yourselves that there is not anything very dangerous about us.

Your government is just people. We are not very different from yourselves or from your parents. Your President is a former teacher of the Wellhausen School at Cotulla.

Your Vice President is a former druggist from Minnesota.

In the Government, in the Congress, in the Supreme Court we have people from every part of 50 States and you can't tell today which one started out as the son of a tenant farmer or which one started out as the son of a rich banker.

Here the only thing that counts is what they have done with their own lives. They all seem to have one thing in common. They love their country and have a willingness to spend their lives working for their country, serving their country, fighting for it, if they need to.

I hope that some of you will some day make that same decision for yourselves. It was in your school back there in Cotulla, almost 40 years ago, that I decided what I wanted to do with my own life. I thought you might be interested in seeing what the teacher of the 5th, 6th, and 7th grades at Cotulla in 1928 looked like and what some of his pupils were like in those days.

In a moment I am going to ask one of my secretaries to give each of you a picture to take back home with you so that you can at least prove to them where you have been.

That job in Cotulla was one of the first big opportunities of my life and I met some of the nicest people I have ever known. Some of my dearest friends live in that little town.

I was a sophomore in college at San Marcos, living over a garage, working at several different jobs from a janitor sweeping floors to selling Real-Silk socks, to editing the college paper.

But even with all of that, I don't think I could have ever made it, if I hadn't been offered a good job at \$125 a month to teach school in Cotulla. That year of teaching pointed me down a road which I have tried to follow diligently ever since.

I still remember the pain that I felt in realizing when I was a teacher in your town, in your school, that the doors to college were closed to practically every student I was teaching.

In those days, if you didn't have money your opportunities were very limited. So I made up my mind, then and there, at the Wellhausen School in Cotulla, that if I ever got the chance, I was going to help change that situation in this country, and I have changed it.

It was one of the proudest moments of my life when last November I went back to that college, to that town, to San Marcos, Texas, to sign a law as President that is going to provide scholarships and loans and work to millions of boys and girls so they can all go to college.

Last year we passed another law which is going to improve all of our elementary schools and all of our high schools so that all of our children will be better prepared for college when they finally get there.

I think you can see that the doors of opportunity have swung open for all young Americans. I hope you boys and girls will go through those doors of opportunity. I want you to get all the education you can take.

If you need help, then your Government will give it to you. If you need work, then the Government will help you find it. And when you have become outstanding young lawyers, or doctors, or scientists, or nurses as Luci wants to be, or teachers as Lynda wants to be, you can repay your Government and your country by devoting some of your talent to serving your country in public service.

I hope to live to see the day when some of you who are right here at this moment in

the Cabinet Room will be up at the State Capital in Austin, or in the National Capital here as adults helping to carry this country into even greater achievement than I have seen in my own lifetime.

I would say that the odds are better and greater that you will have a chance to go to Austin and serve in your State Capital, or Washington and serve in your National Capital, than there were for me when I was at Cotulla ever getting here.

Someone said the other day that they had been told all their life that every young person born in America had a chance to some day grow up and be President. And they said after hearing me on television the other night in "The Hill Country of Texas", that they now believed that that was true.

Increase the Amount of Property Which May Be Held by the American Academy in Rome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 6, 1966

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, during this period of growing interest both in the arts and humanities and in international education, I would like to remind my distinguished colleagues of an institution which has been one of America's finest and longest contributors to both of these fields—the American Academy in Rome. Since 1894 the academy has provided promising young American artists and scholars with the opportunity to spend one or more years in Rome undertaking independent creative work or research.

The American Academy in Rome was chartered in 1905 by the U.S. Congress to promote the study and practice of the fine arts and to aid and stimulate the education and training of architects, painters, sculptors, and other artists.

The original act in 1905 provided that the American Academy in Rome may hold real estate and personal property in the United States and Italy for the necessary use and purpose of the organization to an amount not to exceed \$1 million.

With the many endowments, gifts, and contributions from individuals and American colleges and universities—the original amount of real and personal property which the academy is authorized to hold was soon increased to \$10 million—Public Law 251, June 6, 1912.

The present bill would permit the American Academy in Rome to receive additional bequests and legacies to enable it to continue its work in Italy and America by authorizing an increase in the total amount of property it may hold to \$25 million.

Under an amendment to the charter in 1913, the academy was consolidated with

the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, and its purposes were broadened to include the study of the archeology, literature, and history of the classical and later periods.

With the exception of a summer session, the Academy offers no coursework. Each year several distinguished artists, composers, and scholars are invited to be in residence, and they are always available to fellows for advice and consultation. The Academy draws its support from endowment funds, gifts from individuals, and yearly contributions of \$250 to \$500 each from American colleges and universities.

The atmosphere and setting of the American Academy in Rome, whose United States office is in New York City, provide an ideal setting for the growth of all who have an opportunity to live and work there. But the Academy's influence is not limited to those who are in residence. It reaches out to the citizens of Rome and each year welcomes many distinguished guests who travel to Rome from all over the world. Through concerts, lectures, and exhibits, the creative talents of those at the Academy and other special guests are shared with a wide range of individuals. Cooperative ventures with European artists, scholars, and institutions are another way in which the educational and creative endeavors of the Academy become truly international.

The significance of the Academy in nurturing some of America's greatest artists and humanist scholars and the growth of their worldwide reputation can scarcely be underestimated. The roster of former fellows shows that some of our most eminent artists and scholars studied there as young men and women. Among them, I am proud to say, are many New Yorkers. John Ciardi, an editor of the Saturday Review, Howard Hanson, director of the Institute of American Music, Randall Thompson, one of our most prominent composers, writers Ralph Ellison and Richard Wilbur, and painter Joseph Lasker are just a few of the many from our State alone who spent some of their important early years at the Academy.

Mr. Speaker, as we look forward to the growth of the study of the arts and humanities in this country, and to a greater stress on international education, I pay tribute to the American Academy in Rome. The farsightedness of its distinguished founders, the efforts of its trustees and directors, and the creative work of its many residents and visitors over the past 70 years have been of great benefit to our country here and abroad and have provided us all with an example we should try to emulate.

I am pleased to be the sponsor of legislation which will enable the American Academy in Rome to continue and expand its splendid work and many contributions to the fields of art and humanity.