

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] for the fine, intelligent, and very well thought out proposal he has just made on the floor.

I think it shows he is still contributing to this Congress of the United States, as he has in the past, in a very intelligent manner.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR TVA TO ISSUE REVENUE BONDS AND NOTES

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce a bill which will raise to \$1,750 million the authority of the TVA to issue revenue bonds and notes.

This simply adds to the existing authority of TVA to finance needed electricity facilities through issuance of revenue bonds backed by the revenues which TVA obtains from the sale of electric power.

These bonds are not obligations of the Federal Treasury. The interest from the bonds is subject to Federal income taxes. The bonds are backed by power revenues, and TVA must, under the law, charge rates sufficient to cover all costs, including principal and interest payments on the bonds.

The fact is that the growing demand for electric power in the Tennessee Valley has led TVA to add the power facilities necessary to meet the area's requirements. And now, when the initial congressional authorization of \$750 million has been essentially exhausted, it is time to extend the authority for an additional \$1 billion.

In 1959 Congress authorized TVA to have revenue bond financing authority in the amount of \$750 million for a sort of trial period. Revenue bond financing has worked in an excellent manner, and I believe the Congress should speedily enact a bill to extend the authority for an additional \$1 billion, to meet the power demands in the area.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. GOODELL (at the request of Mr. HORTON), for 30 minutes, on May 31; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HORTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. QUILLEN.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. BERRY in three instances.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JACOBS.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 3105. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 31, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2441. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report summarizing the 1965 operations of the Department of the Interior regarding the desalting of sea and brackish water, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 83-443, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2442. A letter from the Director, Congressional Liaison, Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the Agency's reply to the Acting Comptroller General's report of March 11, 1966, on effects of foreign currency sales in commercial sales of wheat to the United Arab Republic; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2443. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report showing grants for basic scientific research made by the Department of Defense to nonprofit institutions during calendar year 1965, pursuant to Public Law 85-934; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 14929. A bill to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, to further economic development, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD: H.R. 15341. A bill to permit the city of Garden City, Mich., to count expenditures in connection with the Florence Primary

School as a local grant-in-aid to the Cherry Hill urban renewal project; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 15342. A bill to provide that disabled individuals entitled to monthly cash benefits under section 223 of the Social Security Act, and individuals retired for disability under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act without regard to their age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 15343. A bill to amend section 15d of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to increase the amount of bonds which may be issued by the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 15344. A bill for the relief of Settimo Li Mandri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 15345. A bill for the relief of Caroline G. Junghans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 27, 1966

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. SPASSARD L. HOLLAND, a Senator from the State of Florida.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, in this temple of freedom we bow at the altar of devotion which our fathers set up at the Nation's birth. We would pause now so that before we speak we would listen. In such a time, with its tumult and shouting, for our soul's sake we must find the quiet places, the still waters, the green pastures, if our jaded spirits are to be restored.

May our individual lives be as lighted windows amid the encircling gloom. In this global contest beyond the light and darkness, make us as individuals the kind of persons which Thou can use as the instruments of Thy purpose for all mankind. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 27, 1966.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SPASSARD L. HOLLAND, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HOLLAND thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KUCHEL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 26, 1966, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 26, 1966, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1098. An act to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes;

S. 1748. An act for the relief of Virgilio Acosta-Martinez; and

S. 2696. An act for the relief of Abraham Ezekiel Cohen.

ESTABLISHMENT IN THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA OF A LABORATORY
FOR THE TESTING OF MATERIALS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish, or cooperate in the establishment of, a laboratory for the testing of materials, and for other purposes, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 10476. An act to retrocede to the State of Kansas concurrent jurisdiction over Haskell Institute (Rept. No. 1192).

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 2912. A bill to declare that certain federally owned land is held by the United States in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe (Rept. No. 1193); and

S. 2948. A bill to set aside certain lands in Montana for the Indians of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont. (Rept. No. 1191).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 12264. An act to declare that 99.84 acres of Government-owned land acquired for Indian administrative purposes is held by the United States in trust for the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation (Rept. No. 1190).

By Mr. ALLOTT, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 10451. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer certain lands in the State of Colorado to the Department of Agriculture for recreation development, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1188).

By Mr. SIMPSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2595. A bill to place in trust status certain lands of the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming (Rept. No. 1189).

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION
INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 3421. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands and improvements thereon to the University of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3422. A bill to authorize the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands in Fairbanks, Alaska, heretofore conveyed to Hillcrest, Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 3423. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Va., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. DODD:

S. 3424. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide that the amount of Federal financial assistance available thereunder with respect to certain State expenditures shall not be affected because of the identity of the particular State agency giving rise to such expenditures; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 3425. A bill for the relief of Donald G. Blaylock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 3426. A bill to authorize the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the State of Maine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself and Mr. MONDALE):

S. 3427. A bill to provide a temporary program for dairy farmers under which production adjustment payment shall be made to such farmers who voluntarily adjust their marketings of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3428. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Department of Commerce to be available until expended or for periods in excess of 1 year; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. BIBLE:

S.J. Res. 165. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the 93d annual session of the Imperial Council, Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America, to be held in Washington, D.C., in July 1967, to authorize the granting of certain permits to "Imperial Shrine Convention, 1967, Inc.," on the occasions of such sessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING
TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE
MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. KUCHEL, and by unanimous consent, statements during

the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

TRANSFER OF FACILITIES OF ALASKA
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT
STATION AT PALMER, ALASKA, TO
THE UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce today, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the transfer of the buildings, land, and other facilities of the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station at Palmer, Alaska, to the University of Alaska.

In 1948 administrative responsibility for the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station was transferred from the University of Alaska to the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Experiment Station has been operated directly by that Department since that time. The Federal Government has been responsible for all of the administrative and operational expenses of the station in addition to the research programs it conducted. The time has come to return the responsibility for agricultural research to the University of Alaska.

Let me point out that the Federal Government will not be suffering a loss by this transfer. The physical property has reached such condition that considerable sums of money must be spent to rehabilitate it and the University of Alaska is willing to take over the station in its present condition. Additionally, the Federal Government will no longer have the financial responsibility for maintenance and operation.

This bill will have the effect of placing the Agricultural Experiment Station with respect to its relationship to the University of Alaska in the same position as agricultural experiment stations in the other 49 States and I am hopeful that the bill may be passed this year so that the State of Alaska will have sufficient opportunity to make the budgetary provisions necessary for continuing the station's operation. At this point, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3421) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands and improvements thereon to the University of Alaska, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3421

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to determine and to convey by quitclaim deed and without consideration to the University of Alaska for public purposes all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of the Alaska Agricultural Experiment Station, including improvements thereon, and such personal property as may be designated, located at Palmer and Matanuska, Alaska.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, TO HILLCREST HOME FOR BOYS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands, in Fairbanks, Alaska, which were conveyed to Hillcrest Home for Boys under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of January 24, 1961.

Hillcrest Home for Boys was first organized at a meeting at the Eagle's Hall on September 11, 1958. Hillcrest, a home for boys without a home, is a community project and will accept all boys without regard to race, creed, or color. It is not a detention home nor a correctional institution. Rather, it is a home to live in during their 4 years of high school. Hillcrest will provide housing, school guidance, counseling, part-time opportunities for work, and the interest and care of a director and his wife who will reside at Hillcrest.

Surveys have made apparent the need for Hillcrest, and Hillcrest has the support of both public and private agencies and service groups. Hillcrest plans to cooperate to the fullest degree possible with others in the field including Federal, State, and private organizations.

Hillcrest is in the process of acquiring property to accommodate 8 to 10 boys and personnel at a location close to schools, part-time job opportunities, medical and dental care, and the general educational and cultural offerings at Fairbanks. The land acquired under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act can be used as income property if the bill I introduce today is favorably considered by Congress. The original plan to locate the home on that property is not at present feasible or desirable but future plans provide for expansion to the subject property.

Mr. President, the Hillcrest organization has expressed an interest in congressional action on my bill during this session of Congress. In view of the fact that there are many bills already pending, I know this will be difficult. Nevertheless, I hope it will not be impossible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill which is very brief be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3422) to authorize the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands in Fairbanks, Alaska, heretofore conveyed to Hillcrest, Inc., introduced by Mr. BARTLETT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3422

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Interior is authorized and directed to convey to Hillcrest, Incorporated, without consideration, all of the right, title,

and interest of the United States in and to the tract of land (together with any buildings or other improvements thereon) described as the SE¹/₄, Section 26, Township 1 North, Range 2 West, Fairbanks Meridian, such tract being the tract conditionally patented to Hillcrest, Incorporated, by Patent Numbered 1216565 under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of June 14, 1926 (43 U.S.C. 269), for use as a home for juvenile boys.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WOLF TRAP FARM PARK IN FAIRFAX COUNTY, VA.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Va., and for other purposes.

This legislation is the culmination of long and fruitful negotiations between the Department of the Interior and the civic-minded owners of valuable property in northern Virginia who have donated the land to the United States for public use as a unit of the national park system.

The bill was submitted and recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the legislation together with the letter accompanying the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3423) to provide for the establishment of the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Va., and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of establishing in the National Capital area a park for the performing arts and related educational programs, and for recreation use in connection therewith, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish, develop, improve, operate, and maintain the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Virginia. The park shall encompass the portions of the property formerly known as Wolf Trap Farm and Symphony Hill in Fairfax County, Virginia, to be donated for park purposes to the United States, and such additional lands or interests therein as the Secretary may acquire for purposes of the park by donation or purchase with donated or appropriated funds, the aggregate of which shall not exceed 145 acres.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the park in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of this Act and the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1-4), as amended and supplemented.

Sec. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The letter, presented by Mr. ROBERTSON, is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1966.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To provide for the estab-

lishment of the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Virginia, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Wolf Trap Farm Park in Fairfax County, Virginia, on such portions of the property formerly known as Wolf Trap Farm and Symphony Hill as may be donated to the United States and such additional acreage as the Secretary may designate. The total amount of the property so donated and designated may not exceed 145 acres. Wolf Trap Farm Park will be a park for the performing arts, and will provide educational programs and recreational opportunities.

The property known as Wolf Trap Farm and Symphony Hill is within a 20-minute drive from the District of Columbia. It adjoins the limited-access road to Dulles International Airport and consists of rolling landscape, mostly forested, with some pasture land. Mrs. Jouett Shouse, owner of Wolf Trap Farm, has offered to donate approximately 58 acres of it, together with a 3,500-capacity amphitheater, to the United States for a park. The American Symphony Orchestra League has also offered to donate for park purposes approximately 37.8 acres of adjoining land known as Symphony Hill. The two donations will form the nucleus of a park which will provide a unique cultural opportunity for visitors to the National Capital Region, and serve to inspire similar developments by other communities throughout the Nation.

The amphitheater will be constructed under the supervision of this Department. It will be used for the presentation of all forms of the performing arts as well as for conferences and educational programs in the arts. The woodland character of the property surrounding the amphitheater will be retained, and we propose to develop paths, benches, and picnic tables on this property for public recreational use. Small cabins will also be provided for use by the public and by creative artists in the performing arts.

In addition to the lands comprising the two donations, we believe that approximately 19.2 acres of land adjacent to these tracts should be acquired for proper development of the park, and that scenic easements should be acquired in another 20 acres of surrounding property to protect the scenic quality of the park. The estimated cost of acquiring the additional lands and interests in lands is approximately \$107,500.

As stated above, the amphitheater will be developed with donated funds. A facility costing not more than \$1,750,000 has been proposed by the donor. Federal developments, which will consist of a visitor center complex, parking facilities, trails, picnic areas, and a water system, are expected to cost approximately \$476,500, on the basis of preliminary information.

Annual administrative costs will be about \$82,000 after the park is developed.

The Federal park lands in the Washington Metropolitan area are already heavily used. Land in this area is expensive and difficult to acquire. The proposed Wolf Trap Farm Park will augment the park and recreation opportunities in the National Capital Region and will involve the expenditure of only a minimum amount of Federal funds. We therefore urge the enactment of the enclosed bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of this legislation would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Enclosure.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE XIX OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, Connecticut has long been recognized as one of the leaders of State medical and health programs. Today there exists in Connecticut a well-organized health program that for years has aided the needy and less fortunate, particularly in the area of specialized medical services such as those required by crippled children.

Section 1903(a)(2)(3) of title XIX of the 1965 social security amendments authorizes Federal support for 75 percent of the costs for compensation or training of skilled professional medical personnel and staff directly supporting personnel of a State welfare agency; but only 50 percent of such costs when these personnel are employed by the State health department.

This provision of section 1903 is in contrast to the stated desire of many of the Nation's health leaders who have urged greater coordination and cooperation among State health programs.

The bill that I am introducing today Mr. President, would amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide that the amount of Federal financial assistance available to train skilled professional medical personnel would be the same regardless of the identity of the particular State agency giving rise to such expenditures.

Thus, those States that have already invested many hours of staff effort to coordinate and consolidate services concerning comprehensive health care for the medically indigent would not be penalized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3424) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide that the amount of Federal financial assistance available thereunder with respect to certain State expenditures shall not be affected because of the identity of the particular State agency giving rise to such expenditures introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

TEMPORARY PROGRAM FOR DAIRY FARMERS UNDER WHICH PRODUCTION ADJUSTMENT PAYMENT SHALL BE MADE FOR THOSE WHO VOLUNTARILY ADJUST THEIR MARKETINGS OF MILK AND BUTTERFAT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator MONDALE and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a temporary program for dairy farmers under which production adjustment payment shall be made to such farmers who voluntarily adjust their marketings of milk and butterfat.

This program is designed to strengthen farm income from dairying, maintain a better adjustment of supply to demand, and provide greater assurance of adequate supplies of milk and dairy products for consumers.

The program is needed to meet the current emergency situation in the dairy industry and to provide stability for the dairy industry. It is an emergency program, to be effective for a 2-year period during which time it will be possible for Congress to review the entire dairy problem and make much needed adjustments and improvements in the permanent dairy programs.

For many years the dairy farmers of the Nation have suffered from depressed prices for milk. They have not shared in the past 5 years in the general higher level of returns characteristic of other groups in the economy. While the cotton, wheat, feed grain, and other commodity programs have been adjusted and improved in recent years, there has been no significant dairy legislation enacted.

Since 1949 there has been a program to provide a national support price for manufacturing milk and butterfat. During most of this period the market price for milk used for manufacturing has moved with the support price, at the most slightly higher, and since 1953-54 the support price has been at or close to the minimum legal level of 75 percent of parity. Because of restrictions in existing legislation, the support price from April 1, 1962, to March 31, 1966, was continuously at the minimum of 75 percent of parity.

It is understandable why so many dairy farmers have become discouraged and discontinued dairying. Others have reduced their herds. The supplies available to many cooperative creameries and other processors have been reduced and their welfare is threatened. Shortages of fluid milk have developed in some areas. The dairy industry today is in a period of distress and there is great uncertainty about the future.

The seriousness of the dairy problem is reflected both by the decline of production and the reduction of the number of cows and heifers.

Nationally, milk production in the first quarter of 1966 was down 5 percent from the same period in 1965. In April it was 4 percent lower than April of 1965, the smallest April output since 1953.

The total cows and heifers 2 years or older kept for milk numbered 16,607,000 on January 1, 1966. This was the smallest number since 1900 and represented a decline of 6 percent from the number a year earlier. Dairy replacement heifers 1 to 2 years old were 4,068,000 on January 1, 1966, a decline of 7 percent from the previous year. The number of heifer calves under 1 year of age being raised for milking purposes was 5 percent less on January 1, 1966, than the total a year earlier.

The dairy situation is far more serious in those regions where production goes primarily for manufactured dairy products.

Minnesota and Wisconsin together produce about 23 percent of the entire milk supply of the United States. This is the area of heaviest production of manufacturing milk. In Minnesota the decline in milk production was 14 percent in January, 14 percent in February, 10 percent in March, and 7 percent in April compared to the same months in 1965.

In Wisconsin production was down 7 percent in January, 8 percent in February, 7 percent in March, and 6 percent in April compared to production for the same months the previous year. The April 1966, decline compared to the same month in the previous year was 9 percent in Iowa, 11 percent in North Dakota, 9 percent in South Dakota, 11 percent in Nebraska. In New York, which is traditionally the second or third highest ranking State in terms of total production, the April 1966 decline was 4 percent.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture held three emergency hearings on milk prices in the Federal market orders in March and as a result increased the April-June minimum prices for bottling milk in 47 Federal milk market orders by 22 cents per 100 pounds over the usual formula prices.

I regret that the price support for this marketing year, beginning April 1, was not higher. The 1966-67 price support for manufacturing milk was raised to \$3.50 per 100 pounds, which is 78 percent of parity. The butterfat support price was set at 61.6 cents per pound, which is the minimum 75 percent of parity price.

Today, dairy farmers are receiving somewhat higher prices in the market as a result of shortages, but their returns are still generally far below parity.

Dairy farmers cannot be expected to maintain herds and increase production if they know that their response will again result in pushing prices down to the legal minimum. They need the assurance that if they work and invest to maintain adequate supplies they will receive a better return than they have averaged over the past decade.

The present price support program is designed as a floor under prices. When the market price over several years continues to be about the same as the minimum support price, something is wrong with the program and adjustments are required.

The entire dairy program needs to be studied and adjustments and new procedures developed if reasonable stability is to be achieved and if adequate supplies are to be available to consumers at fair prices.

The bill I am introducing today authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make production payments up to 50 cents per 100 pounds of milk marketed for manufacturing usage. The Secretary could also extend the program to make payments for milk marketed in a Federal market order for fluid use but which is utilized for manufacturing purposes.

The program is designed to give the Secretary flexibility in providing incentives to adjust supply to demand. He could make payments to voluntary co-operators who adjust their production above, or below, their marketing base, depending upon the supply needs; or to those who maintained production at their marketing base level, if he determined that supply and demand were in balance. The marketing base for each producer would be his marketings during the year April 1, 1965, to March 31, 1966, with provision for adjustments because of unusual or abnormal conditions.

The payments under the program would be made either directly to producers or indirectly through milk handlers, as determined by the Secretary.

The proposed program is a temporary measure, to be effective until April 1, 1968. It is a supplemental program. It does not change the present price support law which requires a minimum support of 75 percent of parity.

The Government costs of the dairy program have declined sharply in the past year because of the drop in production. The net Government expenditures for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1963, was \$377 million—excluding Government costs under titles I and II of Public Law 480—for a milk equivalent of 7.5 billion pounds. The costs for the 1964 marketing year were \$360 million, with a net removal of 8.2 billion pounds of milk.

For the marketing year beginning April 1, 1965, the net Government expenditures were \$173 million, for a net removal of 2.9 billion pounds of milk. In view of the continued downward trend in production, it can be assumed that CCC purchases will be less this year.

The costs of the program provided in the bill I am introducing today would vary, depending upon the size of the payment set by the Secretary and the degree of voluntary participation in the program.

About half of the milk produced in the United States is used for manufacturing purposes. In 1965, total production of milk in the United States was 125.1 billion pounds, of which 49.8 percent went into manufactured dairy products, 43 percent into fluid use, and the remaining 6.8 percent for farm usage.

If the Secretary determines that direct payments of 25 cents per hundred are required to achieve and maintain adequate supplies, the cost of direct payments might range between \$110 to \$150 million for the marketing year depending upon the degree of voluntary participation and whether or not payments were made for milk marketed for fluid use in Federal market orders but utilized for manufacturing purposes.

This money will go directly to dairy farmers. It will encourage them to maintain production so adequate supplies will be available to meet domestic and foreign needs. It will be far less costly in the long run than what will result if the present decline in production and the decline in the number of dairy cows is not checked and if the instability and uncertainty in the dairy industry is not reduced.

This bill is similar in several respects to measures I introduced in the 87th and 88th Congresses. They also were voluntary programs providing for direct payments to producers who cooperate in adjusting supplies of manufacturing milk. They maintained the basic minimum support price of 75 percent of parity, while offering an opportunity to improve the income of dairy farmers. At that time the dairy problem was particularly acute in the regions where milk is used principally for manufacturing purposes. Several of us warned then that unless

the Congress took action a dairy crisis would develop. The Senate did not act, and unfortunately, the dairy problem has grown much worse.

Today there is widespread concern about the dairy situation across the Nation. There is general agreement among dairy farmers and spokesmen for dairy groups that the industry is in serious difficulty and that adjustments are necessary to halt the decline of production and to bring stability to the industry. I am hopeful that the Department will give strong support to a voluntary program providing production payments. It will give the Secretary the flexibility to meet the kind of serious problems experienced in the past 5 months. I urge the Committee on Agriculture to hold hearings on the dairy situation and to recommend a voluntary production payment program for approval by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk until next Friday, June 3. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 3427) to provide a temporary program for dairy farmers under which production adjustment payment shall be made to such farmers who voluntarily adjust their marketings of milk and butterfat, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. MONDALE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that a program of production adjustment payments to dairy farmers would promote the general welfare by creating greater assurance of adequate supplies of milk and dairy products, maintaining better adjustment of supply to demand, including the requirements of domestic and foreign programs, and strengthening farm income from dairying, the Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby authorized to make payments to dairy farmers who voluntarily agree to adjust their marketings of milk and butterfat during any one or more marketing periods as determined by the Secretary in relation to the quantity of milk and butterfat marketed by them during the base period, or a percentage thereof: *Provided, however,* That no payment shall be made with respect to marketings after the 1st day of April 1968. Payments hereunder shall be made only with respect to milk for manufacturing usage and shall be at such rates not to exceed 50 cents per hundred pounds of milk or milk equivalent as the Secretary determines appropriate to effectuate needed adjustments in the marketing of milk and butterfat. Payments shall be made to producers who agree to adjust their marketings on the quantity of milk that they market and different rates of payments may be established for individual producers according to the amounts by which they change their marketings: *Provided, however,* That payments to producers marketing their milk under Federal milk marketing orders shall be made on the quantity by*

which they adjust their marketings used to produce manufactured dairy products at such rates as the Secretary determines. Payments to all producers, whether or not they are marketing their milk under Federal milk marketing orders, may be made at such times in such areas either directly to producers or indirectly through milk-handling plants, and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the Government and accomplish the objective of production adjustment.

(b) The Secretary shall establish a marketing base for each producer in the continental United States, excluding Alaska, who desires to enter into an agreement with Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to subsection (a) of this section. Such marketing base shall be the number of pounds of milk, or the number of pounds of milkfat, or such units of dairy products as the Secretary may deem appropriate for the administration of this subtitle which is the lower of (1) the producer's marketings during the marketing year ending March 31, 1966, or (2) the Secretary's estimate of what would be marketed in a marketing year by the producer based on the rate of his marketings when he enters into the agreement with Commodity Credit Corporation, adjusted for seasonal variation. In establishing a marketing base, the Secretary may make such adjustments in the producer's marketings as he deems necessary for flood, drought, disease of herd, personal health, or other abnormal conditions affecting production or marketing, including the fact that the producer may have commenced production and marketing after April 1, 1965. A producer's marketing base for the marketing year shall be apportioned by the Secretary among quarterly marketing periods thereof in accordance with the producer's prior marketing pattern, subject to such adjustments as the Secretary determines necessary to enable the producer to carry out his herd management plans for the marketing year. The quantity thus apportioned to a quarterly marketing period shall be the producer's marketing base for such period.

(c) The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary for the enforcement and the effective administration of this Act and may require buyers, processors, and handlers of milk and butterfat to furnish reports with respect to purchases and utilization of milk and butterfat.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appropriations to the Department of Commerce to be available until expended or for periods in excess of 1 year. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of the purpose and need.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3428) to authorize appropriations to the Department of Commerce to be available until expended or for periods in excess of 1 year, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed herewith four copies of a draft bill "to authorize appropriations of the Department of Commerce to be available until expended or for periods in excess of 1 year" and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that from the standpoint of the Administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce.

Enclosures.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO BE AVAILABLE UNTIL EXPENDED OR FOR PERIODS IN EXCESS OF 1 YEAR

Legislation to provide statutory authorization for appropriations to be on a multiple year basis or to be without fiscal year limitation would materially assist the Bureaus of the Department in planning and administering many of their programs more efficiently and effectively. This bill would not increase the cost of any Government operation and would promote efficiency and economy by providing for more effective planning and management of research and multi-year operations. No estimate of savings has been made. A few examples of specific problems such legislation would solve are as follows:

1. Historically, for each census the Congress has made annual appropriations based on fiscal year phases of the work, but has approved appropriation language which allowed the funds to remain available until the end of the census period in the event that the work could not be accomplished as fast as contemplated in the budget plan.

Since each census is a single interrelated project extending through several fiscal years, the present continuity of financing has contributed materially to efficient and effective management of the censuses. It has allowed and encouraged decisions regarding planning, implementation, control and adjustments to be made in the context of the total census operation, rather than being related to fiscal year deadlines which do not have operational significance. This has been an important factor in achieving important savings and cost reductions, as well as improving the content, quality, and timeliness of the information. In addition, providing a single appropriation symbol for the entire census simplifies recordkeeping and reduces accounting and bookkeeping costs.

Since the value of the data is greatly increased by timely publication, the Bureau of the Census is under continuous and responsible pressure to improve the timeliness of the publication of results from the censuses. Accordingly, the budget planning and appropriation requests are based on the earliest release of information believed potentially feasible at the time the appropriation request is prepared.

However, the information collection and some other early stages of a census are often affected by circumstances outside of the Bureau's control, and experience has shown that these unpredictable situations can cause significant variation in work progress as compared to the work plan. Weather, respondent cooperation, and recordkeeping and

recalls are examples. Such developments usually occur too late in the fiscal year to be considered in the regular appropriation process for the following fiscal year, and, with the previous funds lapsing, supplemental appropriation would be required frequently. In addition, the uncertainty and timing problems inherent in this situation would tend to create inefficiencies of operations and slow down the release of the data. With the carry-over provision we usually have been able to make adjustments in the financial plan and the scheduling of the later phases of the work in order to meet the original time table and budget goals.

Unforeseen circumstances largely beyond the control of the Bureau which may delay a census can be illustrated by the Economic Censuses and the Census of Agriculture. For the Economic Censuses, timeliness in the collection of returns (which is conducted by mail) is dependent upon the cooperation which can be obtained from respondents. If a lower than anticipated level of cooperation is received from reporting firms, or if their returns are incomplete and substantial follow-up is required, considerable delays will occur. In the Census of Agriculture (which is conducted by personal interview) unusual weather conditions during the collection phase can cause substantial delays.

Since the completion of the periodic censuses over a span of several years is quite parallel to the construction of large buildings, the amendment requested finds precedent in 31 U.S.C. 682 which provides that "All moneys appropriated for the construction of public buildings shall remain available until the completion of the work for which they are, or may be, appropriated; and upon the final completion of each or any of said buildings, and the payment of all outstanding liabilities therefor, the balance or balances remaining shall be immediately covered into the Treasury."

2. Research and development projects, particularly in the National Bureau of Standards, could be more effectively carried out by the availability of "no-year" funds. Justification is found in the uncertainties inherent in R&D programs, unpredictable factors, and need for flexibility. Problems arise in obtaining or developing essential equipment or recruiting essential scientists. Funds available for only one year are lost to the project and must be replaced in succeeding years for later stages of the project. Opportunities to hire scientists and engineers frequently arise at the most inopportune time in the budget cycle. Rapid deadlines or short-time availability of funds may lead to premature decisions concerning initiation of a task or purchase of equipment. Congress has recognized the validity of these needs in the past by legislative approval of "no-year" appropriation authority for scientific agencies such as the National Science Foundation (42 U.S.C. 1875), the National Aeronautic and Space Administration (31 U.S.C. 699), and the Office of Coal Research of the Department of the Interior (30 U.S.C. 668).

3. The no-year appropriation not only would introduce opportunities for greater economies and efficiencies in negotiation of certain kinds of contracts with the attendant decrease in cost, but would also reduce the need for supplemental appropriations which requires much time and effort on the part of the Bureau and the Congress. If an urgent item cannot get underway by June 30, under an annual appropriation, a supplemental request would be required or it would be necessary to again request funds through the regular budget process which would introduce a delay of almost eighteen months.

The no-year appropriation, while providing needed flexibility, would still be subject to annual Congressional review and control.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF
RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 19, 1966, the names of Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PELL, and Mr. YARBOROUGH were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 268) relative to appointment of a commission to study the Selective Service System and make recommendations thereon, submitted by Mr. NELSON on May 19, 1966.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Territories of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold a hearing on June 21 on three bills which would amend the Organic Acts of Guam and the Virgin Islands: H.R. 13298, to authorize the Legislature of Guam to provide by law for the election of its members from election districts; H.R. 13277, to provide for the reapportionment of the Legislature of the Virgin Islands; and S. 3080, to increase the special revenue bond borrowing authority of the Virgin Islands.

The hearing will be held in Room 3110, New Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m., at which time any interested parties are invited to testify on this legislation.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, for action on nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Kenneth L. Payne to be postmaster at Leadwood, Mo., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jacob D. Beam to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. Tuthill to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Brazil.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eugene M. Locke to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Pakistan.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Elliott P. Skinner to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Upper Volta.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. KUCHEL, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WHAT THE SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM MEANS IN NUTRITIVE TERMS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, since the Senate convened in January I have been speaking out daily on the need to maintain the school milk program at its present level. As we all know the administration proposes to cut the program by 80 percent.

Now, in presenting the case for the school milk program I have proceeded on the assumption that milk, as Nature's perfect food, is the most essential part of the schoolchild's diet. I have always considered it the most perfectly balanced food available.

The Department of Agriculture in its testimony on my bill to make the school milk program permanent seems to question this assumption. They object to the bill because it "is concerned with only one, albeit an important one, part of the nutritive needs of the child. It provides a separate program for one essential commodity and not for any other essential element of the diet of the child."

Of course, the most obvious reply to this complaint is that the companion school lunch program is specifically intended to provide for additional nutritive needs. However, it is also worthwhile to examine why milk has been picked out for special treatment in view of the Department's implication that it should be considered as just another component of a child's dietary requirements.

For this purpose I ask unanimous consent to insert at the conclusion of my remarks an article that appeared in the Washington Star for Friday, May 13 on the nutritive value of milk in the diet. Written by a doctor, the article reaffirms my assumption that milk does indeed deserve a special place in our children's diets. It points out, for example, that—

Milk gets an A for its contribution of all three food constituents (protein, minerals and vitamins)... Milk has an added value because all of the constituents are present in such a well-balanced combination that it has been reliably stated: "Milk's value as a whole is greater than just the sum of its known constituents."

The article goes on to say:

Every boy or girl between 12 and 18 who fails to have a daily intake of two or three glasses of milk is greatly decreasing the chance for healthy growth and a healthy future.

Of course, this is the prime purpose of the school milk program—to insure that every child gets one or two glasses of milk a day in addition to the half-pint he receives under the school lunch program. This is the largely unspoken reason why the program is so highly regarded and strongly supported by my colleagues in the Senate.

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

NUTRITION QUIZ ON THE VALUE OF MILK IN THE DIET

(By Frederick J. Stare, M.D.)

Milk has a great reputation. It is said to be perfect for the newborn, popular with grandparents and a valuable health aid at every age between. Is this true or false? The right answer could make a difference to you. How about testing yourself on today's quiz?

1—Which of these constituents is well supplied by milk?

a) protein b) minerals c) vitamins

2—Which is the right answer?

a) milk is low in calories
b) milk is high in calories

3—For whom is milk desirable?

a) pre-teens and teens
b) parents and grandparents.

In 1, milk gets A for its contribution of all three food constituents. Milk (with its products) is a good source of many important minerals, and it is far and away the very best source of calcium. This is the mineral which the body must have for building bones and teeth and also for blood clotting and muscle contraction.

ESSENTIAL VITAMINS

Similarly, milk is filled with many essential vitamins. Its content of protein, too, is of exceptionally high nutritive value since it contains an excellent proportion of all the essential amino acids. The fact that milk contains all of the essential amino acids, some of which are low or lacking in grains, explains why cereal and bread are most healthful when accompanied by milk.

Finally, milk has an added value, because all of the constituents are present in such a well-balanced combination that it has been reliably stated: "Milk's value as a whole is greater than just the sum of its known constituents."

In 2, a is correct. Skim milk contains only 90 calories and these are packed with a whole storehouse of healthful nutrients. Milk fat in whole milk adds another 75 calories, but

with this comes a liberal bonus in the form of all the fat soluble vitamins. And 165 calories isn't very much compared for instance to the 330 calories in a candy bar or the 440 calories in a serving of iced chocolate cake. So we consider skim milk, a low calorie food and whole milk is average in calories. It is not high.

EVERY AGE NEEDS MILK

In 3, it is certainly correct that milk is desirable for both these age groups. Because adolescence is a time of rapid growth and many body changes, pre-teens and teens have greater need for the nutrients that built bone and tissue. All of these are richly supplied by milk and it is almost impossible to obtain an adequate amount without the use of milk or its products. Therefore, every boy or girl between 12 and 18 who fails to have a daily intake of two or three glasses of milk is greatly decreasing the chance for healthy growth and a healthy future.

Although parents and grandparents have stopped growing in height (and hopefully in weight) they have not outgrown their need to maintain and repair body tissues. A wisely balanced diet of many varied foods probably fills this need, but a daily intake of one or two glasses of milk is a desirable safety factor. This is particularly important in order to insure an adequate supply of calcium. Many doctors believe that older people (especially women) suffer from osteoporosis (softening of the bones) as a price for long neglect of foods containing calcium.

Definitely milk is valuable at every age.

INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, recent studies have shown that industrial sources now account for the greater part of the present volume of pollutants being discharged into our lakes, rivers, oceans, and groundwaters. Yet industrial pollution control is a relatively neglected aspect of our national pollution abatement program.

I think the time has come to recognize that industries which dump raw wastes are avoiding the costs associated with disposing of such material in a manner which would not pollute water. These costs are passed on to other industries, municipalities, private citizens, and others who must pay for purifying polluted water before use, and for the deleterious and often injurious effect of pollution.

I believe that we must have a system of economic incentives, including outright grants-in-aid, favorable tax treatment, and an effluent charge, to encourage and assist industry—and coerce it, if necessary—to accept responsibility for its pollution activities. This system of incentives should allow firms of differing economic strengths and technological capabilities to undertake pollution abatement and prevention on an equitable basis without damaging themselves economically.

Dr. Fred A. Clarenbach, professor of urban planning at the University of Wisconsin, has prepared a paper on the hidden costs of industrial pollution and the use of an effluent charge to encourage industry to meet its share of these costs which clearly explains these complex matters. I ask unanimous consent that Professor Clarenbach's article be entered in the RECORD.

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

INCENTIVES FOR INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION CONTROL

(By Fred A. Clarenbach, the University of Wisconsin; presented at the Industrial Wastes Institute, University of Wisconsin, Madison, March 2, 1966)

A big billboard near the edge of town proclaims that Quality Doesn't Cost, It Pays. Like many such messages, this advertising slogan is somewhat less than half right. A more accurate statement is that an improvement in quality usually does cost, and sometimes it pays more than it costs. A great deal depends on how you define and identify and weigh or measure the "costs" and the "benefits."

If in looking at the economics of stream pollution abatement you adopt the limited viewpoint of the single industrial firm, the typical outcome of engineering-economic calculations is that significant additional outlays for pollution control will not pay off in dollars and cents. Sometimes yes, usually no. Ordinarily the single firm concludes that the dollar costs would considerably exceed the dollar benefits to the firm. Rational business managers are not likely to favor major "unproductive" outlays and thus deliberately and surely reduce the company's profits. The stockholders would not want earnings to be reduced by, say, 20 cents a share and the stock's capital value to fall by perhaps \$3 a share. Therefore the private company may well say that sizeable pollution abatement outlays don't make economic sense from its point of view and that it just can't afford to squander hard-earned corporation profits in such a way.

Now there's nothing wrong with this logic as far as it goes. But it doesn't go far enough. The single-firm calculation fails to take into account large elements of cost which are external to the polluting firm. Downstream users and would-be users of the water may suffer serious economic losses. Such damages can be very real and important, not only in the eyes of the private persons who are hurt economically, but also from a regional public viewpoint. Downstream municipalities and industries may be forced to bear much heavier costs of treating their water supplies because the river is badly polluted. Some downstream industries may need to get process water from different, high-cost sources. New industry may decide to locate elsewhere. Existing and possible future recreation uses may be restricted or even eliminated. If these kinds of real costs are in the picture, and rarely are they missing in populated areas, then both economic logic and common sense suggest that such costs be taken into account when public policy decisions are being made.

Considerations of this sort do in fact influence not only government policies but also private company actions. The managements of some firms have a sense of responsibility to their own communities and to those downstream, and such firms may take care to meet or exceed the minimum regulatory requirements for pollution control. Unfortunately, not all company managements succeed in maintaining a lively sense of civic responsibility in practice. In truth, most of the ostensibly voluntary attention to pollution abatement seems to stem from concern that otherwise an adverse public opinion would stimulate much stricter government regulation of industrial waste disposal.

Here, then, is one fairly obvious incentive to industry for quasi-voluntary pollution control: it is to forestall a strong and effective assertion of public authority to abate nuisances and to maintain a generally higher level of quality of stream waters. In 1966 it is reasonably clear that the semi-voluntary methods have largely failed. In increasing

numbers of localities and regions, these methods do not work even tolerably well to protect water quality and to prevent mounting damage to downstream economic interests and deprivation of benefits to recreational users. It is likewise clear that semi-voluntary and state-local regulations have failed to prevent the development of great support for strong federal action for cleaner streams.

The evolving federal programs include research and training, technical assistance and demonstration, comprehensive basin surveys, grants for partial support of state pollution control agencies, construction grants to municipalities, provision of reservoir storage for low-flow augmentation and effluent dilution, and some enforcement activities with respect to interstate waters.

In addition to those broad and expanding elements of the federal program are various existing and proposed devices to provide further incentives to industry. Among these are the investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation for income tax purposes, loans at low interest rates, government guarantee of loans, and direct cash subsidies to the industrial firm for construction of waste control facilities. Similar devices (plus property tax exemptions) could be and sometimes are used by state and local governments. Finally, there has arisen recently a good deal of discussion about effluent charges which could provide powerful financial incentives for both industries and municipalities to handle their waste problems in ways which would be both efficient and equitable from a basinwide or regional viewpoint.

In this short paper it is not my purpose to review in any detail the incentive aspects of existing state-local-federal water quality programs or the currently proposed extensions along established lines. Most members of this group undoubtedly are at least moderately familiar with present and proposed measures, with the possible exception of the effluent charge idea. I shall therefore give primary attention to the principles of an effluent charge system incorporating broad incentives for regionally efficient handling of both industrial and municipal wastes. Along the way and in the latter part of the paper I will comment on relative advantages and disadvantages of some of the other kinds of incentives.

Let's try to be clear at the outset what the proper economic objective is, what the aim ought to be. It is not the elimination of all pollution from all streams, for that is technically and economically impossible. Nor is it necessarily even the reduction of all kinds of pollution everywhere. The rational objective is to reduce pollution damage to the point where the cost of further reduction would exceed the value of the damages avoided. In other words, from a regional viewpoint it makes sense to spend more dollars for pollution abatement so long as the additional benefits exceed the additional costs. If the discharge of wastes into a stream causes no damage, then on rational economic grounds no expenditure for abatement can be justified; both the industrial firm and the regional community would be better off spending the money for something beneficial. Similarly, if the costs of abatement are clearly higher than the expected regional benefits (reduction of damages), then again the outlays could not be justified. On many or most streams, however, the potential for pollution damage reduction is exceedingly great, though typically the costs also will be high. One problem, then, is to make valid comparisons of benefits and costs from a regional public viewpoint and to abate pollution to the extent that benefits exceed costs. Because some kinds of benefits—namely the aesthetic and recreational kinds—are notoriously hard to evaluate, the problem is not easy to solve in practice. Implicitly or explicitly, legislatures and administrative

agencies of government must and do attach "shadow prices" or "public account values" to the so-called intangible benefits (and to intangible costs, also). To fail to take these values into account as carefully and as explicitly as possible is to fail in an important public responsibility.

The recent federal legislation requiring the setting of stream quality standards on interstate waters undoubtedly will focus attention on the necessity for more adequate evaluations of those benefits for which the market does not yield specific and usable price tags. For in order to set meaningful standards, it is necessary to consider the range of water uses and to make tentative decisions about what is a proper mix of private and public uses, on which reaches of which streams, and when. Too often in the past there has been little or no objective analysis of policy alternatives. Relatively obscure political processes of pressure and emotion seem to have operated along with a good deal of sheer guesswork and chance. If the stream quality standards approach to providing a rational basis for decisions is to give much better results, more careful attention must be given to evaluating benefits and costs of alternative combinations of uses of streams. Although benefit-cost analysis of this sort is still a fairly crude instrument today, experience in using it will undoubtedly bring improvement. Even today it can be of great service in policy making if administrators and legislators will learn to understand its advantages as well as its shortcomings.

Now suppose that, with the help of benefit-cost analysis, our administrators and legislators arrive at honest and serviceable judgments as to the patterns of multiple uses of stream waters which may best serve private and public interests. Suppose further that these judgments are faithfully and adequately reflected in a fairly elaborate set of stream quality standards. Suppose also that among the uses judged to be necessary or/and beneficial on many or most streams is the discharge of limited quantities of municipal and industrial wastes. Then, what principles and formulas should be adopted for allocating "pollution quotas" among the various cities and firms? Who is going to be allowed to discharge how much wastes of what kinds, where, and when? Starting from the existing "over-polluted" situation, how can our democratic governmental machinery solve this thorny problem in all its detail and dynamism? What would a reasonably efficient and equitable solution be like? This is where the idea of a system of effluent charges comes in.

Effluent charges are properly to be regarded as administered prices to be paid for the use of public waterways for waste disposal. These charges are analogous to payments for the use of many other kinds of public facilities and services: water supply by municipal enterprises, sewerage and sewage treatment and disposal by municipalities and metropolitan districts, public transportation services, postal service, and so on. Knowing the schedule of charges, each user is free to use the service or facility to whatever extent he may judge it to be in his interest to use it. If he has (or is stimulated to find) alternative opportunities for getting the same or closely similar services at lower costs, he is free to take advantage of those opportunities.

By successive approximations, the pollution control agency can arrive at a set of effluent charges which will result in achieving the stream standards at the least cost for the region as a whole. Whenever and wherever the standards are not met with regard to particular parameters, the charges could be raised. Conversely, if a quality standard were substantially exceeded in practice, the charge could be lowered. It is important to note that a stream standard operates as a

"constraint" in the process of moving toward an optimum combination of stream uses and toward the least-cost combinations of measures for handling wastes. In the absence of stream standards, a system of effluent charges could in principle also operate effectively to achieve economic optima. To exclude certain toxic substances, the charges could be fixed so high as to be absolutely prohibitive. In practice, extremely dangerous substances probably should be excluded by direct prohibition, and such a constraint would function in effect as a stream standard. Furthermore, the stream standards themselves should be subject to adjustment upward and downward and also by the addition or subtraction of particular parameters of quality. Adjusting the constraints as well as the charges would probably be necessary from time to time in any dynamic economy.

The effluent charge system, then, provides a good answer to the question posed earlier: who will be permitted to discharge how much wastes of what kinds, and where and when? Within the bounds of the stream standards and direct constraints, the actual and prospective dischargers of waste will make their own decisions in the light of the effluent charges which they would be required to pay. Such a system closely resembles the "automatic" character of competitive markets, and it would tend to put the optimum economic values on the "waste carrying services" of streams. Waste disposal is regarded as a cost of doing business, and the external costs (pollution damages to others) are reflected in the effluent charges. In a competitive system, a firm which cannot meet its costs of production may not stay in business very long unless it can adjust its operations to reduce costs or increase earnings or both.

The beauty of an effluent charge system (if such a thing can be beautiful) is that it not only allows the individual firm to make its own choices: it also sets up some powerful financial incentives to find and to apply alternative lower-cost measures for dealing with the industrial waste problem. Fortunately, the specific technical measures and combinations of measures for reducing damaging discharges of industrial wastes to streams are numerous and are continually increasing in numbers and usability. Many kinds of changes in industrial processes are practicable; changes in the product itself may be possible; production may be reduced or suspended during periods of low stream-flow (adjusting vacation and plant maintenance schedules accordingly); effluents may be held temporarily and timing of discharge may be regulated advantageously; careful housekeeping and maintenance in the plant can avoid accidental spillages, leakage, or bypassing of polluting substances; segregation of some wastes and disposal by means other than discharge to streams; recirculation and re-use of some waters; various kinds and levels of waste treatment (physical, chemical, biological) by the industrial firm itself; treatment of industrial wastes in municipal, metropolitan, or regional treatment plants; and combinations of partial treatment by the industrial firm and further treatment in a public system. All these and other procedures could be used singly or in combination—or a firm might find it best simply to pay the effluent charges. Often the most economical combination would include various measures to reduce the amounts of pollutants discharged and also the payment of an effluent charge for the quantities actually put in the stream.

No public agency can possibly know in adequate detail what are the various waste-handling alternatives available to all or most industrial firms. Much less can a public agency staff be expected to evaluate realistically the "economic reasonableness" of combinations of possible alternative measures for each firm. Under an effluent charge system the administrative agency does not have

to attempt the impossible job of assigning and continually adjusting "pollution quotas" for separate industrial firms and municipalities on an economic basis. A system of effluent charges—carefully related to the spillover costs—would permit the firm to choose a combination of measures most appropriate to its own circumstances, and thus an efficient over-all use of resources would be achieved.

A highly important aspect of a well-designed charge system must be emphasized: this approach can provide *strong incentives* for (1) better perception or recognition by the firm of the waste-handling alternatives actually available to it; (2) more careful analysis and less laggard adoption of least-cost combinations of available measures; and (3) possibly more vigorous search and research to find additional and better alternatives.

One of the alternatives likely to be attractive in many situations is for the industrial firm to send its wastes to a public system for treatment and disposal. Already, more than one-fourth of the waste volume handled by municipal and metropolitan treatment systems is of industrial origin. Often the charges to the industrial firm take into account not only the volume of waste water but also the composition or strength, and sometimes other factors such as the time and variation of flow. All these factors obviously affect treatment costs, and thus here the principle of tying charges to costs is essentially the same principle on which the broader proposed system of effluent charges (for disposal to streams) is based. The underlying principle is sound and can be adapted and extended in practice. In the long run, the whole pollution problem can be handled far more effectively through well-planned regional systems of water quality management. To bring more and more of the industrial wastes into the public plants is to move in the right direction. Surplus funds collected as effluent charges by state, interstate, and possibly federal agencies could be used to finance the planning, facilities construction, operation and maintenance, and administration of the needed regional systems for water quality management. Such regional systems would be concerned not only with municipal sewage and industrial wastes, but also with other significant factors including rural and urban land run-off.

To the extent that special incentives (tax credits, fast write-offs, loans, or grants) to industry might actually stimulate separate industrial waste treatment facilities, such incentive policies could have adverse effects on a desirable trend toward handling both industrial and municipal wastes in public regional plants. Existing and prospective federal grants for municipal plants can indirectly but significantly benefit the industrial firms using the aided municipal systems. Further, in view of the rather feeble and uncertain incentives which could likely be provided by further tax-tinkering (federal or state), these approaches also probably should be regarded with considerable reserve. In general, the schemes for direct subsidies for industrial waste control suffer from several grave disadvantages. The administrative difficulties are likely to be large and complex; the inequities are likely to be considerable; the efficient and desirable allocation of economic resources may be adversely affected, especially when marginal enterprises may be only temporarily prolonged; and the "incentive" may not be important enough in any event actually to influence significantly the waste-control policies of major and substantial firms.

On the other hand, the federal policy of providing essentially free of charge a great deal of costly reservoir storage for low-flow augmentation of streams would seem to operate as an important *disincentive* for in-

dustries and cities to invest in treatment plants and to take other measures which in combination would probably often be considerably less expensive and more efficient than flow augmentation. The propaganda slogan, the-solution-to-pollution-is-dilution, seems to be much less than half right in most situations.

To return briefly, in conclusion, to the effluent charge idea: there are technical and administrative problems in practical application, but these can be overcome—as the successful experience in the Ruhr region of West Germany shows. In his message to Congress of February 23 on conservation and pollution, the President called for substantially increased federal assistance for acceptably planned initial construction of treatment works. Then he added significantly: "Thereafter, local communities will collect revenues from users sufficient for the operation, expansion, and replacement of the facilities. Continuing responsibility will reside where the benefits accrue—with local authorities." Thus the principle of user charges is enunciated in direct association with expansion of the federal grant program. Clearly both are needed now. And the user charge idea may well be extended to embrace a system of effluent charges on both industries and municipalities who discharge damaging effluents into public streams. Such charges could be designed to function as powerful incentives to reduce damaging pollution to an economic minimum acceptable to the regional community of water users.

MORATORIUM ON CCC WAREHOUSE SUSPENSIONS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this morning my office received a call from the Commodity Operations Office of the Department of Agriculture informing me that, effective today, the Commodity Credit Corporation had declared a moratorium on its arbitrary suspensions of grain warehousemen who have been unable to comply with its load-out orders. The moratorium will be in effect until November 1.

Mr. President, this is good news.

The announcement is welcome, but long overdue news. The suspension policy is unfair and discriminatory at best. The suspension resulted from conditions completely beyond the control of elevator operators, yet they were the ones penalized.

As you know, Mr. President, the CCC under the direction of Secretary Freeman has been engaged in a massive grain dumping program since the first of the year. Also, the U.S. Government has agreed to ship additional wheat to India in great quantities. These extra demands have been placed on an already overburdened rail transportation system straining to meet the requirements and priorities of the Vietnamese war effort. These factors, coupled with the chronic boxcar shortage meant that many boxcar orders this year went unfilled.

The CCC has adopted a policy which calls for automatic suspension of any warehouseman under contract who fails to comply with its load-out orders after the expiration of a 90-day period. Apparently, this policy was formulated under a grant of authority in the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act of 1949 which provides in part that the Corporation "may contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of

trade and commerce, of plants and facilities for the physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subject to its control."

Mr. President, I want to emphasize the words "in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce" appearing in that language. The suspensions have been placed on the warehousemen for conditions completely beyond their control. To the best of my knowledge there is no custom in the trade comparable to this suspension policy.

In any event, the policy is in effect and it has worked a real hardship on warehousemen, particularly in my State. Our warehousemen have borne the brunt of these suspensions to date. For example, on May 20, there were 90 suspensions in effect. Of this total, 38 were Nebraskans. My information is that this has been the case all year long with the Nebraska suspensions running between 40 and 50 percent of the national total.

A letter which I received from Mr. Howard Elm, executive secretary of the Nebraska Grain and Feed Dealers Association, forcefully states how this suspension policy has hurt so far and how it would have continued to hurt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and accompanying editorial from the Grain and Feed Journals be inserted in the Record at this point.

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

GRAIN AND FEED DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Lincoln, Nebr., April 20, 1966.

HON. ROMAN HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.,

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: This is an urgent request that you investigate a policy adopted by CCC-USDA of suspending from the approved list, those grain warehouses which, after 90 days time, have failed to fully comply with CCC loading orders.

Nebraska Grain Warehousemen are being suspended and/or removed from Commodity Credit Corporation's approved list of warehouses for causes beyond their control which we feel is in violation of the Uniform Grain Storage Agreement and beyond the authority of the Corporation.

When CCC removes a warehouse from the approved list of warehouses, it means that warehouse receipts issued by the grain warehouse to farmers will not be eligible for price support loans and also that the warehouse will not be used by CCC to receive grain owned by the Federal Government for storage or handling. Neither will the elevator be paid for services already rendered or accrued storage charges due the elevator until such delivery order has been fulfilled and the suspension order cancelled.

We would not condone or approve, nor ask for special considerations for a warehouseman who was willfully negligent in taking all necessary steps to comply with all loading orders issued by CCC. We would like to insist, however, that he should not be subjected to the inexcusable injury caused by the suspension order when he has been unable to comply due to failure of the railroads to furnish sufficient box or hopper cars to make delivery.

We have one of the most severe rail car shortages that has ever beset this nation. The Interstate Commerce Commission has recognized this fact by issuing a number of service orders designed to encourage better use of existing facilities and imposing

penalties on shipping delays. Likewise, the problem has been recognized in both the United States Senate and the House of Representatives as both houses have before them legislative bills which deal with the problem.

The suspension of a warehouseman on such technical grounds that he has failed to do something which is physically impossible for him to do has these side effects:

1. General knowledge of the suspension creates the false, but actual, impression that the warehouseman has been guilty of some ethical violation, or that he is in legal violation of the contract or State Warehouse Law.

2. Removal from the approved list by suspension even for the shortest time tends to divert the warehouse's customers to other assembly points and the injury to his business may become permanent to a degree great enough to threaten the very existence of his business.

3. The policy of CCC-USDA does not in any way or degree increase the box or hopper cars available for grain shipment.

In addition to the many warehouses currently removed from the approved list, it is estimated that between now and harvest time—which is only 60 to 75 days in the future—nearly all of the elevators in Nebraska who have received loading orders will be under suspension. This means that they will not be able to accept new crop wheat for CCC price support loans. If farmers are unable to be eligible for a crop loan as a result of action by CCC-USDA against the local warehouseman, which we feel is illegal and unethical, the whole price support program will become ineffective. This you must not permit to happen. The appeal from the trade to the Department of Agriculture fell on deaf ears. Urgent help is needed to change CCC's-USDA's policy and to allow the industry to adequately serve its farmer customers.

Yours very truly,

HOWARD W. ELM,
Executive Secretary.

[From the Chicago Grain and Feed Journal,
Apr. 27, 1966]

INTERPRETING CURRENT EVENTS
(By Ray B. Bowden)

In this first week of April the grain warehouse trade is completely bewildered by the unrealistic demands of USDA-CCC for grain shipments.

The government agency, under pressure to deliver the grain it has contracted for sale, draws against the stocks it has stored in hundreds of grain elevators, on forms known as "loading orders."

To emphasize its need for the prompt shipment of the grain, and to discourage possible negligence among warehousemen, the government announces that it will "suspend" from its approved list any warehouseman who, after 90 days, has failed to complete his loading order shipment.

Suspension means that the warehouseman can no longer issue storage receipts which the producer can use to obtain government loans and supports. In some situations, suspension could virtually mean business failure.

There is a joker right here. There is a nationwide shortage of boxcars, a shortage so critical that another government agency, the I.C.C., has issued service orders intended to relieve the emergency.

Grain warehousemen are among other shippers who find that it does little good to order cars if the carriers simply do not have them available.

Many grain warehousemen are trying desperately to avoid the disaster of suspension, but find they simply cannot obtain boxcars sufficient to load the government orders.

And until quite recently, the government office has continued to pile loading order on top of loading order, burying the ware-

houseman deeper under a requirement which he is physically unable to meet.

Over the years the CCC has made grain storage agreements with literally thousands of grain warehousemen, and by the law of averages there have been a few moral accidents.

These mishaps usually came to public notice through the "suspension" of the warehouse. Thus, the public unconsciously associates suspension with some inference of improper practice.

But now the suspension may happen to the warehouseman of finest reputation and outstanding performance record, through a fault certainly not his own.

As government has abandoned the former program of burdensome surpluses, the volume of grain going under loan each year has grown less.

The local country warehouseman has been more and more under the necessity of merchandising grain which he bought from the producer.

Thus he is under the necessity of shipping much grain for his own account, and for the CCC now to demand a virtual monopoly on all available boxcars reaching the elevator is, to say the least, shaky behavior for a government agency.

What will be the cure? Barring an immediate change of policy in the government office, suspension of very many warehouses at harvest time could conceivably deprive farmers of facilities for loan storage.

That would bring a change in policy more quickly than would trade protests, even those being made through members of congress.

As the government grain agency goes through the transition period from "surplus" to "reserves," there will be recurring irritations.

There is naturally more grain storage space available than there is loan grain to fill it, and few warehouses can hope for enough storage volume to insure annual income.

Government being, so to speak, in the jaybird's seat, there would be little reason to expect their more tolerant treatment of trade demands.

The CCC cannot be enjoined by court action and unless there is considerable sympathetic understanding in USDA, about the only recourse left to individual warehousemen hurt by the suspension action, would be to bring suit or claim for damages, itself a cumbersome and costly process.

The trade is hoping that fair-minded USDA officials will join with businessmen in preventing unfair damage to either CCC or the local warehouseman.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this Senator registered several complaints with Secretary Freeman. As recently as May 18, his department gave no indication of a letup on suspensions as the letter which I now ask unanimous consent be placed in the RECORD at this point indicates.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1966.

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: This is in further reply to your letter of May 5, 1966, enclosing correspondence from two of your constituents concerning action by the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service in removing warehouses from the approved list that fail to ship government-owned grain.

As you know, export sales of grain have increased substantially over the past few years, a part of which must be filled from

government-owned stocks. Everything possible is being done by all segments of the trade and the Department to keep needed stocks of grain moving into export position to meet demand.

By most careful planning in making early movements, we have been able to give warehousemen up to 90 days in which to ship if cars could not be obtained sooner. At the present time only about four percent of the warehousemen in Nebraska have not been able to meet the 90-day requirement. We feel this 90-day limitation was necessary in order to get as much grain moved as possible before the harvest. In view of the known car shortage there was every indication that some warehousemen would be able to slow down shipments. Thus, Commodity Credit Corporation would again receive most of the criticism for using rail cars at harvest time and prevent farmers from shipping their new crop grain to market.

The removal of a facility from the approved list does not necessarily jeopardize a firm as far as future business with the CCC is concerned. In fact, the warehouseman will be reinstated as soon as he completes the loading order shipments.

While our policy may seem harsh to some warehousemen, we think most people will agree it has assisted us in moving a vast quantity of grain. As a result, we are hopeful that with this early movement we will be able to meet our obligations with a minimum of rail car usage during the harvesting season.

As the harvest season approaches we are watching the situation closely and we will consider the need for an extension of the 90-day period.

Sincerely yours,

E. A. JAENKE,
Associate Administrator.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the moratorium announced today means a reprieve has been granted that will carry through the fall harvest to November 1. I might add that this will also carry through the forthcoming elections.

But then every indication is that the policy will be resumed once the political heat is off.

Mr. President, I sincerely urge that this moratorium will be converted into a full burial and that it will not be revived next fall.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, Sunday will mark the birthday of John F. Kennedy. It is indeed fitting that we should honor him on that day. In three short years he gave this Nation a new sense of dedication and direction that will be a part of our lives for decades to come.

I shall not attempt here to eulogize his memory. His accomplishments and his vital spirit are now a part of all of us. Undoubtedly there will be many ceremonies across this land—public and private—in homage to him.

In the 3 years since the tragedy of his assassination there have been memorials both upon the day of John Kennedy's birth and upon the day he was taken from us. Mr. President, if we are to honor the memory of this great man with special attention on an anniversary day, is it not more fitting that that day be the anniversary of his birth rather than that of his death?

This would be the anniversary of hope rather than that of despair. We remem-

ber John Kennedy for his spirit of life, not for the tragedy of his death. His widow has expressed her desire to so honor her husband. I hope that those who would set aside one day in his honor will choose the date of his birth, and I would suggest that any official observance by any branch of the Government be held on that day. By so doing, we will most appropriately honor this great man and renew our dedication to achieve those new frontiers which he has charted for us.

BETTY FURNESS SELLING VISTA

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on many occasions most, if not all, television viewers have enjoyed being persuaded of the virtues of one appliance or another by Betty Furness, television's former No. 1 saleslady. The attractive Miss Furness is now engaged in "selling" an important and exciting national program.

As described in articles by Olivia Skinner and Beulah Schacht which appeared on May 10 in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the St. Louis Globe-Democrat respectively, Miss Furness is busy recruiting volunteers for VISTA, the war on poverty's domestic Peace Corps. As a result of a trip to the White House to see Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson about Project Headstart, she is also helping to promote that important part of the anti-poverty program.

Mr. President, I am confident that I speak for all her television audience in saluting Miss Furness for her efforts on behalf of our Nation's poor. I ask unanimous consent that the articles referred to be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 10, 1966]

BETTY FURNESS BANGS SHUT ICE BOX, FACES NEW VISTA

(By Olivia Skinner)

Betty Furness, about \$1,000,000 richer by demonstrating electric appliances on television, has slammed that refrigerator door for good.

"I'm out of the kitchen, and well out of it," said the pencil-slim ash blonde, here to recruit for VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America), the domestic Peace Corps.

"I get an enormous satisfaction out of this work," she said. "Poverty needn't be tolerated and it mustn't be."

She is currently on her fifty-ninth flight this year for VISTA. Her nationwide tours began when Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson asked her to the White House to hear about Project Head Start.

"It occurred to me, since I'd been a saleslady for 11½ years, that I could sell Head Start as well," she said. "So I combined it with the VISTA program and here I am."

Miss Furness, interviewed at the Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, said that the project needed older workers as well as college students.

"The widowed housewife of 51 who says she hasn't ever done anything but raise a family is immensely useful in the poverty war," she said. "She has helped persuade youngsters to stay in school, she may well have tutored her own children, and she certainly has marketed for nutritious, economical meals. All these are skills we can use.

"One of our volunteers found a family with a desperately sick baby," Miss Furness continued. "When the doctor ordered medicine to be given every half hour, our VISTA girl discovered that not only did the family have no clock, but that no one could tell time. So she stayed with them, gave the baby medication on the half hour, and meanwhile taught the family to tell time."

The ex-Miss Refrigerator now has her own radio program, "Ask Betty Furness." She said that she never could go back to acting, either in commercials or anything else.

"It was all the Westinghouse Company's fault for sending me to national conventions," she said. "There I met newsmen and politicians. What they were doing was real—I was just playing with make-believe. When I quit the Westinghouse show, I thought I'd go back to acting, but I found I just couldn't."

"There is so much going on in the world, so many people looking for information and just not getting it—I'd like to act as a catalyst, get people together with other people they need to know. What I want is to get into the news department of television while I can still be photographed, but I've met with total resistance."

Miss Furness said that she became an all-out feminist during the three years she presented a radio program called "Dimensions of a Woman's World."

"I am so excited about how women are breaking out of total domesticity," she said. "To play the three parts of wife, mother and career girl all at the same time is a darn good trick. I'm extremely interested in continuing education for women. With the pattern of early marriage and girls dropping out of college, this is a must. Every time I say this, everywhere I go, some woman says quietly, 'Why, I'm back at college.'"

In one town Miss Furness met a slim, attractive, fortyish woman with five young children who was studying for an advanced degree. She told Miss Furness that with the price of college going up constantly, her education was just good insurance for that of the children.

The VISTA promoter has large, expressive blue eyes and speaks in a low, throaty voice that makes her listeners sit back and purr. But somehow she exudes an aura of honor that makes other women trust her.

"When I was in Hollywood, I found that it was a pity I was not very, very sexy. But for commercials or your own television show, that's just fine," she said. "Women say to me, with no rancor at all: 'You're my husband's favorite girl and he sends his love.'"

"Women trust me and men like me, and that's sheer luck for such a business. Somehow I don't think that Zsa Zsa Gabor should do a program for women, and she's a darling girl."

"I do try not to look like the girl next door—I think that if women want to see her, all they have to do is look out the window."

Miss Furness's career began in Hollywood 32 years ago when at the age of 16 she starred in "Renegades of the West," opposite Tom Kean.

"You've never been to Hollywood?" she exclaimed in amazement. "You've got to—it's like going to the zoo. Of course, I was there in the Golden Age, and all I could think of was 'How could this possibly be happening to me?'"

"Things I remember? A short fling with Cary Grant when I was 18, but of course I knew it couldn't last. Joan Crawford's graciousness. She was very nice to me, but Constance Bennett had me thrown off her set when I wanted to watch her work."

Of her highly lucrative decade in commercials, she stated:

"I was NOT the girl who couldn't open the refrigerator door, even though people said I was. One night I couldn't get the

hose off the vacuum cleaner, so after I'd struggled a while I just went on with my commercial, saying, "Well, you take it off when you can get it off."

Betty hopes that her television talks on VISTA will catch the eye of New York television producers.

"The sad part of it is that everywhere I go when I say I want to do newscasting, television producers tell me to come right in, sit down and talk about it. But I don't want to work anywhere but New York. There they either tell me that I have no news background, or that I'm just the Refrigerator Girl. But I'm sure that the public will forgive me that.

"What I want to do is a person-to-person interview newscast for women. Women are up to so many interesting things these days.

"Sometimes I think men don't want to hear about them. I wish men would come out of the bedroom and let me out of the kitchen just long enough to sit down and talk to them in the living room sometimes—not always, but sometimes," she said, a bit wistfully.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, May 10, 1966]

BETTY FURNESS SELLS NEW PRODUCT—VISTA (By Beulah Schacht)

Betty Furness, television's former No. 1 saleslady, is on the road selling a different kind of product—VISTA (Volunteers In Service To America), better known as the Domestic Peace Corps.

Still as attractive, vivacious and untiring as she was in the days when she broke records for swinging open refrigerator and range doors and demonstrating the simplicity of operating vacuum cleaners, Betty said she appointed herself as an all-expenses-paid, no-salary ambassador for the cause.

"I just got all steamed up about the war on poverty," she said during a one-day visit to St. Louis Monday. "In February last year, Mrs. Johnson invited me to a luncheon at the White House when they were starting 'Project Head Start.'

"Frankly, I was so flattered to be invited, I wanted to do anything I could do, so I went right to Sargent Shriver and asked if I couldn't help by doing something on radio and television, because, after all, that's my racket.

"Somebody on the sidelines overheard me and said: 'Would you mind talking about VISTA at the same time?'"

Betty has been doing that ever since. This is the fourteenth city she's visited to encourage those interested to volunteer their services.

Members of VISTA serve for one year, living and working with the poor. They receive living expenses, medical care and \$50 a month, which is banked for them until they complete their year of service.

Headquarters for the recruiting drive, which is headed by Mrs. Dorothy Barker, is the VISTA information center at the YWCA, 1411 Locust st., room 214. The office will be open from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday. The telephone number is: CHestnut 1-2974.

"You must be at least 18 years old and you can't have any dependents under 18," Betty said, "but there is no upper age limit. Frankly, you can almost pick the spot where you would like to work in the U.S."

It's only because her present career permits her an elastic schedule that she's able to grab a plane at a moment's notice when a VISTA jaunt is dropped in her lap. She now has a five-minute daily New York radio show and she tapes them a week at a time.

"And I go around the country lecturing before women's groups with my own speech. I speak to college groups for VISTA. That last one's a challenge. I haven't done a commercial for five years. College kids don't

know who I am or what I am and I really have to sell but, boy, am I crazy about those kids. You just hear about the bad ones. Not the good ones. The good ones are not bad news."

She's not at all interested in being a product demonstrator again on TV and she's not interested in acting. She wants to do news and public affairs on radio, but she's having a tough time selling her point. "I keep telling them I don't want to be Walter Cronkite. Just me. I'll wait.

"I'm the only person doing this kind of thing for VISTA," she concluded.

"You mean you're a one-girl gang on the program?" our photographer, Ken Winn, asked.

"I like that," Betty said and grinned. "I'm a one-girl gang."

OPPOSITION OF STATE OF MICHIGAN TO SEAWAY TOLL AND FEE INCREASES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on June 9 and 10 the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation will be holding hearings in Chicago on proposals to increase the tolls on the seaway and reimpose lockage charges at the Welland Canal.

There is widespread opposition to these increases in the State of Michigan. This opposition is reflected in House Concurrent Resolution 262 adopted last month by the Michigan House and Senate. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 262
(A concurrent resolution stating the policy position of the State of Michigan relative to tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway and memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to action to be taken thereon)

Whereas under the joint sponsorship of the the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada, the St. Lawrence Seaway, a dream of these two great countries for many years, has become a reality and, as a product of this reality, a great international area has been opened to the commerce and industry of the world and as a consequence thereof, the international commerce of both the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America, especially the Midwestern Provinces and States, has greatly expanded; and

Whereas certain tolls were placed upon the waterway traffic of the world using the St. Lawrence Seaway although this was in opposition to the freedom of world traffic; and

Whereas increasing tolls or fees on the St. Lawrence Seaway would be of great detriment to the shipping of the world and to the expanding economy of the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America; and

Whereas in the face of persistent statements that have emerged from various knowledgeable sources in the shipping and commerce industry of the world that tolls might be increased on the St. Lawrence Seaway, the State of Michigan wishes to state its position most emphatically regarding any increases in tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the members of the Michigan Legislature wish to state the position of the State of Michigan regarding the tolls and charges on the St. Lawrence Seaway: (1) That the State of Michigan most emphatically opposes any increase to such tolls and fees; (2) That the State of Michigan is very much in favor of a reduction in present tolls and fees and to provide even-

tual elimination of all tolls and fees on the St. Lawrence Seaway; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of Michigan urgently requests that the Congress of the United States reexamine its present reciprocal legislation regarding tolls and charges on the St. Lawrence Seaway with the eventual goal of supporting the position of the State of Michigan relative to reducing and eventually eliminating such tolls and charges; and be it further

Resolved, That the Michigan Legislature urgently requests the Michigan delegation to the United States Congress to deem this a high priority necessity and that the members do everything within their power to prevent any attempt to increase tolls or charges upon the St. Lawrence Seaway; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the Michigan delegation to the Congress of the United States work closely with the U.S. Department of Commerce in order to make known the position of the State of Michigan and other Midwestern States relative to their position regarding tolls and fees on the St. Lawrence Seaway; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, Prime Minister of Canada, to the presiding officer of the U.S. Senate, to the presiding officer of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the presiding officer of the Canadian Parliament, to each member of the Michigan delegation to the U.S. Congress, to the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, to the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, to the U.S. Department of Commerce, and to the Governors of the following States of the United States.

Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Adopted by the House April 7, 1966.

Adopted by the Senate April 12, 1966.

EUGENE B. FARNUM,
Secretary of the Senate.

T. THOS. THATCHER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, it is very difficult to find the proper words to use in saluting our beloved Vice President on his birthday. For there is the sure knowledge that whatever I say, he has said it before.

But I would like to be on record in support of the idea that HUBERT HUMPHREY has brought to his job a combination of talents that has served all Americans very well. He has the vision to conceive new ideas for the benefit of all Americans and indeed all mankind, he has the knowledge to form those ideas in realistic ways, and he has the skill and experience to translate his ideas and knowledge into action.

Much of the legislation which this record-breaking 89th Congress is enacting into law found its beginnings in the mind of our Vice President. His career, from the counter of the little drugstore in South Dakota to the high position he holds today is proof that the American dream still is pertinent to the space age. I salute HUBERT HUMPHREY on his birthday and wish him many more of equal happiness and achievement.

MEXICAN-AMERICANS FEEL NEGLECTED IN WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Tom Littlewood, of the Chicago Sun-

Times, has written a very informative article on the problems of the Mexican-American citizens of the Southwest. I ask unanimous consent that the article, which appeared in the May 26, 1966, Washington Post, under the title "Mexican-Americans Seek Federal Aid—Many Feel Neglected in War on Poverty," be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEXICAN-AMERICANS SEEK FEDERAL AID—MANY FEEL NEGLECTED IN WAR ON POVERTY
(By Tom Littlewood, Chicago Sun-Times)

In the Mexican-American settlements of the Southwest, the idea is gaining currency that he who squawks the loudest will receive most of the Federal "candy" in the war on poverty.

There are about 4 million Americans of Spanish-Mexican ancestry in a crescent-shaped poverty belt from the Gulf Coast of south Texas into California.

Job discrimination, lack of educational opportunities, and large families in shanty housing have combined to create continuously oppressive social problems.

Spanish-speaking leaders are disappointed and angry because they believe the political leverage of the Negro voting bloc has caused their own needs to be ignored in the war on poverty. In all of California there are almost twice as many Spanish-speaking residents as Negroes, with widespread poverty in both groups.

According to Federal standards of poverty, San Antonio, Tex., has two-thirds as many poor people as Chicago. San Antonio's poverty program, bothered by city-county political conflict, is still getting off the ground; by now Chicago has already consumed millions of anti-poverty dollars.

SOME INCOMES DECLINE

In Los Angeles County, where the median income of some 850,000 Mexican-Americans actually dropped between 1960 and 1965, new youthful and aggressive leaders have been wondering whether rioting is necessary to attract Washington's attention. Some thought is being given to picketing next month's White House Conference on Civil Rights protesting its exclusive attention to Negro problems.

A new militant spirit recognizing the necessity of banding together for political action is emerging. The two states where this movement is likely to have its greatest impact are Texas and California.

By uniting in California, leaders of the ethnic group are making plans to be more demanding of the Democratic party and the political action arm of organized labor.

In Texas, if the movement catches on, its pressure would be felt by the unique "Anglo" power structure in south Texas. There the alliance between political rulers—the conservative Democratic faction under Gov. John Connally—and the oil and other economic interests operates ruthlessly.

The Federal poverty program has not even begun to penetrate the controlling apparatus in south Texas. In rural communities where a maid can be hired for \$8 a week and a Mexican-American warehouseman is paid 40 cents an hour, the local rulers have not been anxious for uplift.

TOO MANY GROUPS

It has been said that there are 10 Mexican-American political organizations for every social service organization—and this is one of the problems.

Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, of San Antonio, has referred to political "brokers" who so confuse the masses that they become apathetic. GONZALEZ was a national leader of the 1960 "Viva Kennedy" movement. The

successor to this campaign organization later broke apart over disagreement on which Mexican-American should receive a Federal judgeship in Texas.

Another Democratic Congressman EDWARD R. ROYBAL, of Los Angeles, was a leader of PASSO—Political Action for Spanish-Speaking Organizations—founded in an effort to land more high government appointments.

Then there is the League of United Latin American Citizens, the American G.I. Forum, Political Unity for Mexican-Americans, the Mexican-American Political Association and many others.

Voting registration among Mexican-Americans has been uniformly low. Those who do vote usually can be depended on to vote Democratic.

Although Texas has gotten rid of its poll tax, a tightly restrictive registration system has been kept in force by Connally and the legislature.

GONZALEZ said that there is serious division among Mexican-Americans about how much ethnic muscle they ought to show—whether only a Mexicano can ably represent a Mexicano; whether, by doing so, the group may in fact be promoting its self-segregation.

NEBRASKA RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ESSAY CONTEST WINNERS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, each spring the winning participants of the Nebraska Rural Electrification Association essay contest visit Washington, as part of their prize. This year, 24 youngsters will be guests of the association. Their essays were judged the best of hundreds of entries on the subject "The Value of Rural Electrification in Our Home and Community." It is my privilege to place five of these winning essays in the RECORD.

We are no doubt inclined to take electricity for granted without considering the benefits, the convenience and the continuing improvements of this priceless commodity and its effects on our lives.

Recently a large section of the eastern seaboard learned how accustomed and dependent it is on just flicking on a light, turning on the radio or sitting down to watch the evening newscast on television. As a result of the blackout we have a deeper appreciation of what we often think of as one of the "simple things of life."

In farm areas, such as in Nebraska, electricity has not been taken for granted for quite as long a time. The youngsters whose essays are printed herein have captured realistically and vividly the advantages of rural electrification in their communities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the essays written by the following:

Ann Jameson, 17, a junior at Elsie High School; the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Jameson, of Elsie, Nebr. Sponsor: The Midwest Electric Membership Corp., Elsie, Nebr.

Caren Lucille Hay, 17, a junior at Trenton High School; the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Hay, of Trenton, Nebr. Sponsor: Southwest Public Power District, Palsade, Nebr.

Wayne Johnson, 16, a junior at Trenton High School; the son of Mr. and Mrs. Orval Johnson, of Trenton, Nebr. Sponsor: Southwest Public Power District, Palsade, Nebr.

Jeretta Cass, 17, a junior at Beaver City High School; the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Dean Cass, of Beaver City, Nebr. Sponsor: Twin Valleys Public Power District, Cambridge, Nebr.

Gayland Regier, 16, a junior at Madrid High School; the son of Mr. and Mrs. Pete Regier, Jr., of Madrid, Nebr. Sponsor: The Midwest Electric Membership Corp., Grant, Nebr.

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

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Ann Jameson; age 17; grade, junior; school, Elsie High School; name of father, Marvin Jameson, Elsie, Nebr.; contestant sponsored by the Midwest Electric Membership Corp., Grant, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

"What in the world is REA?" Can you answer that question and give a meaningful explanation of why it exists? Well, my friend, REA stands for Rural Electrification Administration. Yes, we have come out of the dark ages into electrified light; a power that makes the whole world shine in its glory.

The REA was created on May 11, 1935. This order granted power to an REA administrator to "initiate, formulate, administer, and supervise a program of approved projects with respect to the generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy in rural areas."

To start the process electric co-operatives had to be formed. These are private, non-profit enterprises, locally owned and managed and incorporated under state law. Since these co-operatives are owned by the members, each one has a vote on the affairs despite the amount of electricity he uses. When more farmers joined, the lines were strung and mile by mile lights were provided. Even after the poles and wires were erected, there was the problem of wiring the houses to use the electricity. The high cost of wiring a house caused some to go without it. The REA worked this out also, by a "group-wiring plan" which cut costs.

The night the lights came on will long be remembered by many people. Farm houses shined throughout the night marveling over their new found friend. And a friend it was indeed, for the first time suspicious farm owners knew the indispensable helper was to their advantage.

In this day and age electricity is one of those modern conveniences thought of as never failing. Its very existence isn't even very noticeable "until" you are without it; then its importance to life is amazing.

Did you ever stop to realize how indispensable electricity really is? A small farm motor can do the work of eight men, the blood of the soil, water, is pumped by electricity for faster service. A poultry farmer uses electricity every step of the way: to hatch eggs, brood the chicks, feed and water chickens, cool, clean, and grade the eggs. In the same respect, the livestock business depends on electricity. The very environment provided for cattle, sheep, hogs, and other livestock can be predetermined by electricity for success or failure in business.

We own a grade A dairy farm and without electricity, absolutely nothing will operate. In running an efficient dairy, everything is on a set schedule; each milking must be completed within a certain amount of time to assure a regular maximum of production.

The first step in milking electrically is to wash and dry the cow's udder. Milk is then stripped from each teat to check any disorder, after which an electric milker is put on to complete the process. When the milking is finished, the milkers are taken down

to be washed electrically by a flip of the switch. The milk which has been taken from the cow, converted through a glass tube into a large bulk tank is then ready for cooling. The production of milk takes approximately two and one-half hours to complete, twice a day, every day of the year, by this reduction it is impossible to operate without electricity.

In this day and age the thought of having to go without electricity is an incredible impossibility.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND THE VALUE OF ELECTRICITY IN THE HOME AND ON THE FARM

(By Caren Lucille Hay; age, 17; grade, junior; school, Trenton High School; name of father, Clarence Hay, Trenton, Nebr.; contestant sponsored by the Southwest Public Power District, Palisade, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

Have you ever thought about what that little cartoon character, Willie Wiredhand, stands for?

He has an electric socket for a head with a plunger switch as a nose. His hands are like the rubber gloves worn by REA linemen. His arms are small wires like a lamp cord. His body is a piece of heavy conductor terminating in a standard cord plug.

But Willie Wiredhand is much more than a few pieces of electrical equipment. He is a symbol—a symbol of the hard work, the electrical power, the service, the many dreams and all the other factors that make up the REA.

To Grandma, he is the symbol that changed her life. When electricity came, most of her hardest working years were just over. Nevertheless, electricity has affected her. Her retirement years are made even happier. Modern electric conveniences make the housework she must do easier and quicker. Many avenues of relaxation are opened to her that she never dreamed of before.

To Grandpa, Willie has come just in time to make his retirement pleasant. For once in his life he can keep abreast of the world news by way of television and radio. Saturday and Sunday afternoons are spent watching his favorite teams on television. The few farm chores he must do outdoors are lightened by electrical equipment.

To Mother, Willie is more fulfilling. Her years of work are just beginning and Willie Wiredhand is doing everything he can to make her life easier. A freezer and refrigerator store the food until the time comes for it to be cooked on the electric stove. Cleaning is done with new electrical appliances such as the vacuum cleaner. Electricity makes sewing quicker and easier. Washing and drying of clothes is done in the completely new automatic washer and dryer. Good lighting makes her work even easier, and her leisure hours in the evenings can be spent in a well-lighted room instead of in the dark.

To Father, Willie means even a greater variety of benefits. In the dairy barn electricity feeds, waters, and milks his cows for him. Grain and hay are dried so there is no thought of crop loss. The milk is hardly seen as it just goes to the bulk tank via pipe line. Willie gives him a cleaner barn in just a few minutes. Willie is a workshop that sharpens tools, repairs machinery and performs all the other tasks Father never dreamed of doing before. Electricity lights each farm building and provides light for the farmyard. Willie does things for Father that he isn't aware of.

To the children—well, Willie is nothing new to them. They appreciate good lighting. They enjoy the entertainment provided by radio, television and phonograph; and some of their favorite toys are electric. Anything

run by electricity is natural to them. They've never known anything different—thank goodness.

But Willie is even more than this. He is all of the elements that make up the REA—the consumers of the District, each and every employee of the REA, and the cooperation. He is the dreams of the past and future.

Who would have thought that a little character like Willie Wiredhand could mean so many things to so many people?

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND THE VALUE OF ELECTRICITY IN THE HOME AND ON THE FARM

(By Wayne Johnson; age, 16; grade, junior; school, Trenton High School; name of father, Orval Johnson, Trenton, Nebr.; contestant sponsored by the Southwest Public Power District, Palisade, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

Times were quite prosperous for me until the REA brought electricity to my owner's farm. Until then I was used every morning and night to provide light for doing chores, as well as light for all the other night-time jobs my farmer-owner had to do.

But now I have been thrown back into an old dirty corner, and my chimney is cracked. Willie Wiredhand, who symbolizes the REA, has really screwed things up for me. Since he was brought to the farm by that dern wire and pole, he revolutionized the whole place. The farmer can now complete the chores I helped him with in so much shorter an amount of time that is used to take, that it amazes me. This is because of the electric lights in the barn and milkhouse, the electric milking machines and separators, and all kinds of other handy gadgets.

Willie came here back in 1933. My boss was very proud of him because most people around here didn't have electricity then, and were still using my friends and relatives to provide light. My farmer just had electric lights back then, but in the past 33 years, he and almost all the other farmers around here have really put Willie to work.

Mr. George Norris had a pretty big hand in organizing bills in the Congress to bring Willie to the farm. I knew him because he used to come and visit my boss a lot before he went to Washington. This wasn't because he was any relation of my owner or anything; it was just that Mr. Norris lived in the town nearest to us before he became so important. Therefore, when he decided to run for the Senate, he campaigned among "us farmers" so he could get elected. He told my farmer that if elected, he hoped to be able to push a bill through congress that would provide electricity to the farmers. He said that electricity was very handy, and could be readily put to use if only it could be brought out to where we were. My boss thought the idea sounded quite good and beneficial, and I guess everyone else did too, because George Norris was elected and went to Washington. He then got things rolling, and since then, the REA has spread to every state in the Union, except Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Hawaii, with more than 96 per cent of America's farms electrified.

Yes, the future looks pretty dim for us kerosene lamps. But, I guess we just had to move to make way for progress, and I feel it is quite a privilege to move for the REA. They have put the farmer on an equal status with the city dweller. The farmer can now do thousands of things electrically that 40 years ago, he had to labor long hours to complete.

Not only is the farmer freed from much drudgery, but his wife also benefits. With electricity on the farm, she can do the daily chores and still have time to relax, to enjoy cultural events, and to do many other useful things for mind and body that were impos-

sible to complete only a century ago. Yes, I feel contented to retire and let this giant of farm progress take over.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND HOW IT AFFECTS US

(By Jeretta Cass, age 17; grade, junior; school, Beaver City High School; name of father, Dean Cass, Beaver, City, Nebr.; contestant sponsored by the Twin Valleys Public Power District, Cambridge, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

Thirty-five years ago wheat was selling for 37 cents, corn was being burned for fuel, and unemployment was reaching staggering totals. Farmers were crying for progress—progress which would give them a fuller, more productive life.

It was in this atmosphere of unrest that the Rural Electrification Administration, known universally as REA, was born in May of 1935. Although the agency was first developed as part of Roosevelt's depression relief measures, it was soon converted into a loan agency. Under the direction of Morris Cooke, REA was to act as banker for local groups of citizens who wished to establish their own local electrical distribution systems. They, in turn, were to hire employees, build lines, and contract to buy wholesale electric power. This job of bringing power to the rural areas was a difficult one. Privately-owned companies had refused to distribute power to the farm, and they were bound to make it difficult for the farmer to serve himself. REA was not only criticized by privately-owned companies but also by interested people who charged that such use of federal funds would be immoral, destructive to free enterprise, and socialistic. Despite this opposition, thirty years later, the Rural Electrification Administration has almost accomplished its purpose. Locating nearly 1,000 consumer-owned rural electric systems in 46 states, it has provided 20 million people with electric service.

Thanks to rural electrification, city life is no longer more comfortable and modern than that in the rural areas. Today farm housewives depend a great deal on the aid of electricity to run their homes efficiently. Electricity provides the power that refrigerates food, cooks meals, heats water, washes, dries, and irons clothing, regulates heating and lighting, and cleans the home. It also allows for enjoyment of television, radio, and stereo.

To the farmer, electric power is essential in the management of the farm itself. By taking advantage of the electrical equipment on the market, he saves both time and money. Electricity offers a more efficient way of watering and feeding livestock, drying grain, gathering eggs, milking cows, fencing animals, and irrigating crops. Also, now as a service of the local rural electric, automatic mercury vapor yard lights are installed on many farms to provide light from dusk to dawn for the security of the home and farm.

Besides offering the farmer and his family a more comfortable, more efficient way of life, rural electrification affects us in even more ways. Estimates indicate that rural people create a market in appliances and equipment alone that totals \$1¼ billion yearly. In addition, since mid-1961, 135,000 new jobs have been created directly or indirectly by the rural electric. Even rural schools, churches, business firms, and industry owe their power and success to local rural electric.

Edison's light rolled back the darkness to make way for progress. Seizing the opportunity, farmers joined together to better themselves, and they succeeded. Perhaps my generation can maintain this pioneering spirit which made rural electrification possible and work for even greater achievements in the future.

THE VALUE OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION IN OUR HOME AND COMMUNITY

(By Gayland Regier; age, 16; grade, junior; school, Madrid High School; name of father, Pete Regier, Jr., Madrid, Nebr., contestant sponsored by the Midwest Electric Membership Corp., Grant, Nebr., in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association)

I reside on a dairy farm northwest of Madrid. Its operations are centralized upon electricity supplied by our Rural Electric Association. This supply promotes the success and productivity of our dairy business. There are numerous electrical equipment that need this constant electric power in our dairy operation. Among this equipment is a deep well pressure pump that must maintain a constant water pressure, both hot and cold. Also, electricity provides a source of power to operate the milker as well as the milk cooler. One of the most helpful and useful is our automatic self-unloader feeding system in our silo. The amount of time and work it saves us is unbelievable. Once the hay is blown into the steel structure, our work is reduced to push-button and the cows are automatically fed.

A product sold is one thing, and the product's service is another. Yet it is the least thing to worry about with REA. As we decided to change from an old costly irrigation motor to an electric motor, we experienced service never known. Now our new electric irrigation well, equivalent of producing 1,200 gallons per minute, is only a push of a button away.

As I stop to analyze rural electrification, I like to think of it in comparison to the human body. REA is the "life stream" of the Western rural communities. And as our blood, REA keeps a constant and sufficient supply of energy to its organs—the farms. Thus it keeps the body—the Great Plains—in a healthy and prosperous condition.

Another aspect brought to our community with electrification is industrialization. In 1820, when Stephen Long explored the Midwest, he proclaimed it as a vast desert. But contrary to his belief, modern methods of irrigation powered by REA, have made the Midwest an important industrial area of the United States. This makes profits as well as beautification easier.

With the increase of rural services, there are presently over 200 mercury vapor lights in the community. These not only tend to bring neighbors closer together but also aids them economically.

Recently when the mid-March blizzard struck it paralyzed the county. Several days after the storm, when communications were restored, I heard much of the storm's results. Listening to two farmers talk of the storm I heard this statement: "We sure rely on the necessities and luxuries of REA." Too many take this valuable energy for granted until the power is cut off. No doubt, electricity has raised the standard of living of the farmers and their families. From my farm life experience "I do not know what is more important on a farm than REA."

CIVIL RIGHTS ADVANCE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Washington Star presents strong arguments in favor of President Johnson's proposal to outlaw racial discrimination in housing.

In the Star's opinion, the basic goals and motives of the President's recommendation are sound. Furthermore, the Star in an editorial points out, it is morally indefensible in this day and age to deny access to housing to anyone solely on the basis of race.

Another point made by the Star is that a universal law against discrimination would ease the pressures felt by those

builders and homeowners who fear integration would cause them economic loss.

I offer the editorial as persuasive testimony in behalf of the administration bill and ask consent that it be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

HOUSING: THE NEXT CIVIL RIGHTS ADVANCE

It is time, said President Johnson on April 28, for Congress to ban racial discrimination in all aspects of private housing. And with that the '66 round in the civil rights battle began. It might turn out to be the bloodiest round of all.

Federal requirements for fair housing practices are by no means unique. By Executive Order, racial bias has been forbidden since 1962 in government-owned housing and in new private apartments and houses financed under FHA and GI insurance. The categories were extended somewhat by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In all, however, these actions cover a mere 3 percent of the nation's total housing supply. They barely scratch the surface.

The current bill, which is part of a larger civil rights proposal, covers all types of housing—old and new. It would outlaw, for the first time as a matter of federal law, discriminatory practices by builders, realtors, banks, homeowners or anyone else engaged in the sale, rental or financing of housing. It proposes, also for the first time, a legal remedy by which any individual discriminated against might seek redress in the federal or state courts. And it would authorize the Justice Department to initiate suits where it found prevailing "patterns" of discrimination.

It is too early in the game to discuss at length the specific provisions of this proposal. It is clear that a good many of them will not survive in precisely the form they were drafted.

Attorney General Katzenbach had barely begun his explanation of the bill to a House subcommittee the other day, for example, when he was asked if its provisions need extend all the way to the operator of a small boarding house—the symbolic "Mrs. Murphy" of the 1964 public accommodations law. The Attorney General conceded that such an exemption in the housing bill, as in the 1964 act, would not seriously impede its effectiveness. He was right, in our opinion, to say so.

Apart from details, however, the basic goals and motives of the administration bill are sound—and overdue.

Administration officials frequently repeat the remark that housing "seems to be the one commodity in the American market that is not freely available on equal terms to everyone who can afford to pay." That statement is sufficiently accurate to make a crucial point. The point is that to deny anyone access to this "commodity" solely on the basis of race is, in this day and age, morally indefensible.

No law can solve, by itself, the problems of slums and poverty, or provide decent homes in decent neighborhoods for people who cannot afford them. The end of segregation would not dissipate the powerful force which the economics of the situation exert on housing patterns, especially in the suburbs. It would, however, give many Negroes a far greater opportunity than now exists to improve their conditions.

By now nearly everyone recognizes the need to revitalize our central cities, for the benefit of all the parts of our growing urban regions. Yet, while new suburban growth is continuing at a rapid pace, larger and larger portions of our cities are turning into racially segregated slums. It is evident that this pattern must be broken if cities are to sur-

vive. One part of the answer is to accommodate some portion of the Negro populations in suburban areas. Another, equally important, is to attract increasing numbers of white families back to the city. Under present practices, however, both these trends are discouraged.

In their House testimony, both Mr. Katzenbach and Secretary Weaver argued at length that landlords and builders who resist integration frequently do so not out of personal bigotry, but out of fear that their investments will suffer if they become the first to break the pattern of discrimination. There is strong evidence to support these views.

In a recent survey of apartment living in Washington suburbs, where there is only token integration, The Star was told by several large developers that they would welcome an anti-discrimination law, and that very little is apt to change until one is secured.

These same pressures and fears stimulate panic selling on the part of individual homeowners when the first Negro families move into previously all-white neighborhoods. They encourage blockbusting tactics by unscrupulous realtors who too often are eager to play on the uncertainties of the situation. Perhaps Mr. Katzenbach goes too far in his conclusion that if all those in the housing industry "are bound by a universal law against discrimination, there will be no economic peril for any of them." But surely such a law, applied across the board, would ease the pressure of current fears.

In putting forward this legislation, the administration is relying for constitutional authority on the commerce clause of the Constitution and the "equal protection" clause of the 14th Amendment.

Senator DIRKSEN contends that the housing measure is "absolutely unconstitutional." He has offered, if he can be persuaded that interstate commerce is involved in selling or renting a house "fixed to the soil," to "go out and eat the chimney."

This is a difference which, of course, can only be settled by the courts. The Supreme Court has demonstrated no hesitancy on previous occasions, however, to stretch both the commerce clause and the 14th to cover an increasing number of activities which were deemed to be in the public interest.

Senator JAVITS, meanwhile, is vigorously attacking the bill not on its merits, but on grounds that it is a tactical error. His motive is to avoid at this point the "divisive struggle" of congressional debate. He argues—and his view is shared by many civil rights leaders—that the administration could and should accomplish the same ends by expanding to extreme lengths the 1962 Executive Order which now bans bias only in new FHA and VA-insured housing projects.

It seems to us that the error, however, is on Senator JAVITS' side. The Executive Order approach would cover only a fraction of the housing covered by the administration bill. It would rely largely on banks and other private lenders to police discriminatory practices, posing, as the Justice Department has pointed out, the most perplexing sort of practical problems. Even if the backdoor approach of the Executive Order were practical, however, it would be a mistake. You cannot solve the problems of racial discrimination in housing by refusing to debate them.

For the biggest subject of all, perhaps, is that the whole subject has been brushed under the rug for far too long.

Mr. HART. In addition, Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention to a recent resolution of the general board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church. The resolution addresses itself to the need for fair housing legislation at the Federal and State levels. The position of the general conference of

the Methodist Church is quoted in this resolution and it states the official position of the Methodist Church that "the right to choose a home should be guaranteed to all regardless of race, culture, national origin, social class or religion.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

FAIR HOUSING LEGISLATION

The harsh facts of racial discrimination in the housing market are notorious in the United States. Many studies and surveys reveal that minority group members are barred from many housing areas and are forced to pay more for less when they can buy or rent.

Without question, racial discrimination in housing represents a fundamental violation of Christian convictions and of democratic principles. Race discrimination in housing represents a denial of justice and of equal opportunity: It is morally wrong.

Therefore, the General Conference of the Methodist Church has issued strong statements concerning housing discrimination and its cure:

"Christians must insist that all people have the freedom to reside wherever their economic means and their personal wishes permit.

"The right to choose a home . . . should be guaranteed to all regardless of race, culture, national origin, social class, or religion." Note the word "guaranteed" in the foregoing statement. No rights are guaranteed in a constitutional democracy except by law.

We, therefore, call upon Methodist people in every state and territory to work for the passage of State and Federal laws which will bring an end to racial discrimination in the sale and rental of housing. The police power of the States, in support of the general welfare, provide broad authority for State fair housing statutes.

It has long been established that private property rights are limited by the larger demands of the general welfare when there is conflict between them. This well-established governmental principle cannot properly be denied application to the housing market. As of June 1965, nineteen states had already made this application.

The Biblical principle of neighbor-love destroys any attempt to absolutize the freedom of the housing seller, for this amounts to destroying the freedom of the housing buyer. Here, equal opportunity and neighbor-love coincide. Fair housing legislation, balancing the rights of buyers and sellers, appropriate to all levels of government, should be enacted speedily as part of the long, painful struggle of the people of the United States to bring to fuller reality the clear meaning and purpose of our fundamental laws and principles.

EXTREMIST GROUPS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, because we on the majority side of the aisle hold firmly to the belief in the two party system, we can sympathize with our friends who face the problems arising out of what Life magazine calls the Rowdies and Dowdies of the Right.

Life, last week, editorialized upon these groups who operate with the name of Republicans, but who do no good to the cause of true, reasonable conservatism in this country. They are not alone, of course, for there are many other extremist groups at work undermining the

average American's confidence in his Government, in our democratic institutions and in our very form of political life. That they endanger all of us is, I think, apparent. I ask unanimous consent that Life's editorial on the "Rowdies and Dowdies of the Right" be printed in the RECORD.

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

ROWDIES AND DOWDIES OF THE RIGHT

This could be the year for the Republicans to gain a march on '68. But the chance will be missed unless the party finds a way to do something about the "Rowdies and the Dowdies" on the far-right fringe.

That descriptive epithet has been applied to the National Federation of Republican Women and the Young Republican National Federation. Meetings of the Young Republicans have broken up in power-plays and fist-fights more reminiscent of German beer halls of the '30s than of the Grand Old Party, and some members have been tabbed "gray-flanneled Hell's Angels." The ladies restrain themselves to verbal hair-pulling, but between them the two groups inhabit a never-never land far to the right of Barry Goldwater.

As campaigns get under way for this fall's off-year elections, the ladies and the Young Turks seem as determined as ever to drive voters out of the G.O.P. camp—thus providing more aid and comfort to the Democrats than Senator FULBRIGHT has given to the cause of the Vietcong.

The New Jersey "Rat Finks" started the process. That lunatic splinter group entertained at YR meetings with rabidly anti-Semitic and anti-Negro songs (and led local wags to rename their state "the Southern California of the East Coast").

Then there was the case of Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly, first vice president of the Women's Federation, who electrified her blue-rinsed colleagues with the announcement that the Johnson administration planned to legalize polygamy for the elderly. The plan, as she outlined it, would limit a man retiring at 65 to one wife, but if he quit at 60, thus helping to alleviate unemployment, he could have a second spouse. At 72, he would qualify for a third, and even a fourth, if he were also blind.

Asked for the source of this "Administration plan," Mrs. Schlafly produced a news clipping and explained, "He's a Salt Lake City physician, Dr. Victor Kassel, and I assume he must be a Democrat."

The people hurt most by the antics of the rowdies and dowdies are the moderate Republican officeholders and candidates. And the incredible thing is that it is difficult for the sensible Republicans to do much about the situation.

While bearing the name "Republican," neither the Women's Federation nor the Young Republicans is responsible to the National Committee. They raise their own funds, disburse them as they please, and bear no responsibility to the party except to link its name to their idiocies.

Without a financial club to force the fringe groups into support of the majority views of the party, alternative pressure can only come from firm leadership at the top of the Republican National Committee. And Ray Bliss, national chairman, doesn't see things this way, at least yet.

Bliss, trying to rebuild on the ruins of the '64 disaster claims, "If you're going to build an organization, you don't do it by banging heads." We don't agree that the G.O.P. has the time to indulge in Bliss's hopes for evolutionary change.

We lean to the view of Pennsylvania's Republican Senator HUGH SCOTT who found, just before he spoke to a Young Republican meet-

ing in Washington, that it was about to consider a motion offering support to the racist Rhodesian regime of Ian Smith. Furious SCOTT told the audience, "Go ahead with your program of self-destruction if you will . . . after a while there'll be so few of you you'll have what you want—a tiny little smoke-filled room of the white Anglo-Saxon super-privileged country-club set.

THE BATTLE FOR MEN'S MINDS IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, of all the battles that are going on in Latin America today between freedom and despotism, there is none more important than the battle for men's minds.

The people of Latin America will have gained nothing if they win their epic struggle against poverty and disease, but lose their love of freedom and their faith in democratic institutions.

In the marketplace of ideas, nothing sells as well as the truth and, for that reason, the United States has a built-in advantage in the relentless competition with Cuba, China, and Russia. We have truth on our side.

Our problem has always been how best to exploit this advantage; how best to communicate to the Latin people that they have everything to gain by retaining their faith in freedom, and everything to lose by turning to the lying blandishments of the Communists.

The spearhead of our communication effort in Latin America is the U.S. Information Agency. Through trial and error, through Republican administrations and through Democratic administrations, through budgetary squeezes and through sudden expansions, the USIA has sought for the best ways to convey the story of democracy.

Today, Mr. President, I believe that the USIA has found the key to effective competition in the marketplace of ideas.

That key is books and other printed material. Books occupy a special place in the minds of Latin Americans. For many years, reading and the ability to use a book were skills reserved for the educated elite and, although there has been a great increase in literacy, the printed word still maintains its almost mystical authority for millions of people.

USIA was a little slow in recognizing the importance of a good book program in the Latin countries. It was not until 1962, in response to a directive from President Kennedy, that the publications effort began to receive the attention it deserved.

The steady improvement since then shows up dramatically in the statistics.

In the last year before the Kennedy directive, USIA published 253,000 books in Spanish and Portuguese. The next year, the figure was nearly four times that number, and by 1965 USIA was producing nearly four and a half million books per year for Latin America. Since 1962, over 11 million books in 1,100 editions have been produced.

This is a cooperative venture. USIA does not publish the books, but works with Latin American publishers to bring out the selected titles.

USIA support sometimes takes the form of outright purchase of an agreed-

upon portion of the first printing. These copies are used for presentation to key individuals in Latin America, such as government officials, educators, and media personnel, as well as for augmenting book collections of our libraries in the area. The support may also consist primarily of sharing costs of production and promotion. Whatever the mechanics of the arrangement, however, the USIA requires cooperating publishers to market the books at the lowest practicable prices.

This is important, and has been a major factor in the success of the program. Prices for USIA-sponsored books are consistently below those of the Communist competition, and often cost only half as much.

The books selected concern one or more of the following themes:

"The Alliance for Progress": This takes in a variety of subjects, including books on development, economics, agriculture, business, labor, education, health, housing, community development, self-help, sociology, mass media, and citizen education.

"U.S. Foreign Policy": This may be historical, general, or up to the minute. The book program supported, for example, the publication of books dealing with both the Vietnam and the Dominican Republic situations. In the first instance, incidentally, the program-supported book on Vietnam, in an edition of 12,000 copies, sold out. Sold, too, were more than 21,000 copies of a book on the Dominican situation.

"American Civilization": Much of the effort under this heading involved providing information and facts to refocus the distorted image of the United States as a materialistic, uncultured society.

"Unmasking the True Nature of Communism," the dangerous falsity of its specious appeals, and its drive for world domination, especially through the medium of the so-called wars of national liberation.

This is a good selection, but I do not believe that it is enough. For the fiscal year 1967, USIA's book budget is only \$1,548,938. I am advised that that will mean an additional 5 million copies can be produced and distributed. In my opinion, we should be aiming for at least twice that many. Ten million books would not seem to be excessive, when you consider that annual book sales in the United States are nearly 1 billion.

Our enemies are as aware of the value of the printed word as we are.

Over 75 publishing houses are engaged in publishing Communist books, and there are nearly 150 outlets for this material scattered throughout the region.

In Montevideo, the Communist publishing house, Ediciones Pueblos Unidos, which is also an outlet for the U.S.S.R.'s foreign language publishing house, lists over 1,500 titles in its catalog. A series of Communist books on the theme of American economic imperialism was initiated in 1963 and includes such titles as "Dollar Imperialism: The Empire of High Finance," and "The Empire of Oil."

The keystone of the Communist propaganda structure in Latin America is the printed word. The Soviet Union's press agency, TASS, is represented in at least

10 Latin American countries, Communist China's New China News Agency—NCNA—in 9, and Cuba's Prensa Latina—legally or otherwise—in 17.

Throughout the area, there are over 425 Communist or pro-Communist newspapers and periodicals.

In the face of this massive opposition, and with our own limited resources, we must choose carefully the methods we use to get the publications of the USIA to the Latin American audience.

One of the most effective ways we have developed are the USIA libraries which are located in key cities.

Free, public libraries—from which one may borrow books on the strength of one's signature and within which one may freely use reference books and other information sources—have been all but unknown in the countries of Latin America, as in many other parts of the world.

Aside from the function they fulfill, therefore, the USIA libraries and reading rooms are physical symbols of some of the finest aspects of American culture and civilization. It is regrettable, but hardly surprising, that, from time to time, our libraries should attract, like lightning rods, Communist violence. As monuments to the truth and free dissemination of knowledge, they must, by their very existence, infuriate those whose ideology has no place for either truth or freedom.

The 29 USIA libraries and reading rooms in 13 Latin American countries contain a total of over 237,000 books. During fiscal year 1965, book circulation came to nearly 747,000, while the number of those who visited the libraries and reading rooms to use books on the premises approached 2 million.

But this is not the whole library story.

To varying degrees, the USIA helps support, throughout Latin America, 113 cultural institutions known as binational centers. These centers—through such activities as seminars, cultural presentations, and the teaching of English—which produces revenue from fees—stimulate understanding between the host countries and the United States.

The binational centers also have libraries, with a total of nearly 406,000 books. Last year, attendance at these libraries totaled over 220,000, and book circulation approached 500,000. These attendance figures are for binational center libraries, only; the total number of people who attended various activities at the centers last year came to nearly 2,500,000.

But here again, we are not doing the job we could be doing because of limited funds. Our libraries in Latin America do not meet the demand for what they have to offer, which is another way of saying that their potential for improving our dialog with Latin Americans is far from having been realized.

The problems can be summed up in five words: budget and limitations on personnel. Mr. President, I would suggest that a program as valuable as this should receive all the support it needs from Congress and, if more money is needed, we should provide it.

Turning to newspapers and periodicals as vehicles of the printed word, we find

conditions which would seem strange—perhaps intolerable—to the average citizen of the United States.

We take for granted our morning and evening newspapers, complete with news of the day and replete with commentary, advertising, and features to satisfy every member of the family. We do not question the comparatively low cost, even grumbling when a daily raises its price to, say, 10 cents. We accept without wonder the rapid reporting of news from wherever in the world it happens to be made. The fat, heavy Sunday paper is practically a fixture of the American way of life.

In many parts of the world—and Latin America is one of them—this is not the way things are.

About 85 percent of the world's consumption of newsprint occurs in North America, Europe, and the U.S.S.R.—where only a third of the world's population lives. The rest of the world—Africa, Asia, and Latin America—uses the remaining 15 percent for the other two-thirds of the world's people. Looking at it from another angle and more specifically, we see that there are some 25 copies of daily newspapers per 100 persons in the United States—but, in Latin America, only 8 per 100.

Nor can the Latin American take for granted a low-priced daily newspaper, complete with news from all over the world, plus assorted features. Economic conditions being what they are, the price of the newspaper represents something tangible. Newsprint limitations do not permit the inclusion of many features, by our standards. And the publishers, with a few notable exceptions, cannot afford to buy the fast, up-to-the-minute news from the commercial press wire services.

None of this, however, makes the Latin American press any the less an important factor in the area's politics.

The USIA's Press and Publication Service engages in activities designed to strengthen the responsible Latin American press, without in any way competing with American commercial press wire services. For example:

Monday through Friday of each week, via teletype, an "American Republic File" is transmitted in Spanish to USIA's posts in 19 countries of Latin America. This schedule permits the transmission of 50,000 words weekly. The file carries all important texts—such as presidential statements—interviews, features, selected news stories, and USIA-produced commentaries. Additional material is supplied for weekend editions.

Another wireless file, in English, is transmitted daily, Monday through Friday for a total of 20,000 words each week. This is sent to Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo in Brazil, where it is translated into Portuguese; but it is also monitored by Kingston, Georgetown, and seven other Caribbean and Latin American posts.

The press and publications service further processes about 15,000 words a week of "mailer" copy, known as "slow output." Included are special packets—on, for example, U.S. cultural developments, women's activities, and so forth—picture stories, labor items, youth news,

Alliance for Progress material, and items which factually unmask Communist objectives and activities.

Approximately 2,000 photoprints on 70 to 90 subjects are airmailed monthly to 28 posts in Latin America, with 19 of the posts additionally receiving copy negatives of the same subjects from which they can reproduce additional photos.

About the same number of plastic plates of five different cartoon strips are serviced weekly to 250 Latin American newspapers. One of these—"Liborito"—is designed specifically for Latin American audiences and calls attention to the sinister nature of Castroism by means of satirical strokes of the cartoonist's pen.

Over 50 million copies of cartoon books have been produced and sent out for distribution. Fourteen deal with the Alliance for Progress and self-help, eight with the menace of Castroism, and six with democratic citizenship.

The output of USIA's Press and Publications Service for Latin America is supplemented by a regional service center in Mexico City. Additionally, 19 USIA posts in the area publish 26 periodicals, mostly low-cost and in keeping with the appearance and style of locally published magazines.

What kind of results are we getting?

Reports from the field indicate that the publications program is one of the most effective weapons that we have in countering the lies and distortions of the Communists about the United States.

One series of 18 books on science subjects for students, following initial publication with USIA support, racked up such impressive sales figures that the publisher undertook a second printing, with assistance, of all 18 titles, plus a third printing of 12.

In Colombia, two titles were adopted as university texts.

In Mexico, a book published through USIA sponsorship had such an impact that the Soviets published a "reply" in an attempt to reduce its influence.

In the past 2 years, 60 Spanish-language editions and 77 Portuguese-language editions have been sold out, while 45 books in Spanish and 57 in Portuguese have been reprinted.

These are impressive statistics, Mr. President, and they show we have made great strides in our "war of words" in Latin America.

But much still remains to be done. There are still many areas which are not being reached.

The major problem is distribution.

Distances are great in Latin America, and customs regulations are varied and frustrating. Surface transportation from country to country is slow and uncertain. The cost of air freight is prohibitive. Systems for payment and accounting among outlets, wholesalers, and publishers are, at best, inadequate. There is always the possibility that a book may be produced in large quantities at low cost for a known market but—because of any combination of the factors cited—gather dust in a warehouse or in a forgotten railway car on a remote siding.

We must redouble our efforts to eliminate these problems, and if it is necessary to increase the budget of the USIA book program to do so, I would strongly urge such action.

A failure in the distribution system means that the whole effort to produce a book has been wasted. Effective, comprehensive distribution is every bit as important as the selection of the titles, the choice of translators and the contract with the publishers.

It is of the utmost importance that we reach into every corner of every country with the message of freedom, because when the people of Latin America read of the deeds of Washington and of Lincoln, when they read of the goals and aspirations of Roosevelt, Kennedy, and Johnson, they will know that we and they have a common destiny.

Understanding cannot be accomplished without communication, and in a region as large and diverse, both politically and geographically, as is Latin America, this is a task of extraordinary difficulty.

Language differences complicate the problem. Before overestimating the magnitude of this particular obstacle, however, we would do well to recall George Bernard Shaw's description of Great Britain and the United States as two countries separated by a common language.

Communication between ourselves and the people of Latin America, in brief, is a complicated task, demanding maximum effort. Understanding needs care and attention to survive and grow. Misunderstanding, unfortunately, feeds on itself and grows like a cancer.

Overall, Mr. President, I think we are making real progress in overcoming the distorted image which the Communists have painted of the United States. Much more must be done. There are weaknesses and shortcomings in our present programs, but the dedicated men and women of the U.S. Information Agency are doing everything in their power to overcome them.

We in Congress must give them all the support they require. When we do, we cannot fail because we have truth and right on our side.

LLOYD W. SMITH RETIREMENT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the recent retirement of Lloyd W. Smith, of the Burlington and Great Northern Railroads marks the end of a remarkable and effective career. He has been in the industry for 39 years.

Mr. Smith has served the railroad industry and Congress by his professional and always candid work. It has been my great privilege to have known Smitty both personally and professionally. I must also refer to his charming wife, Bess, who was the power behind the throne. I am certain that many in the Senate join me in wishing him a long and most pleasant retirement.

The man and his performance are perfectly captured by Harry L. Tennant's article in the April 1966, issue of the *Cahners publication Modern Railroads*. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the *RECORD*.

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

END OF A LEGISLATIVE ERA?

The retirement of Lloyd W. Smith, of the Burlington and Great Northern Railroads from the Washington legislative scene marks what may very well be the end of the personal handling of railroad problems in Congress. After some 24 years pushing the cause of his railroad—especially in recent times during the heated per diem battle—Mr. Smith retires as the industry moves toward a more consolidated approach. Many persons in Congress see in this trend less emphasis on efforts to fight for single rail causes.

Mr. Smith's determined fight to win more support for the western railroad's car ownership cause touched nearly every facet of Congress at one time or another. One Senate source pointed out that his personal efforts in bringing about a boosting of car rentals undoubtedly returned to western railroads a sizable profit. This was because he continuously kept not only the leaders in Congress aware of the issues, but saw to it that everyone down to the receptionist in a congressional office was acquainted with his railroad's problems. His personal and effective approach is not likely to be seen again.

SO-CALLED RIOTS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, when I reported to the Senate recently on my trip to Vietnam I remarked on the nature of the so-called riots there, saying they were not aimed at Americans directly but at the domestic political situation.

In a recent column in the *Evening Star*, Foreign Affairs Editor Crosby S. Noyes has written from Saigon to the effect that the riots are staged examples of what he calls tactical anti-Americanism not really meant to intimidate Americans, but to cause us to reconsider our support for the policies of the Ky government. The riots happen, as Mr. Noyes points out, but they do not constitute a way of life in Saigon. Says Noyes:

The impression that Saigon today—or at any time is a seething cauldron of violence is entirely fanciful.

So it is, Mr. President, that we get a distorted picture because the riots, quite naturally, make news. There is another type of distortion, and it is an indefensible sort, to which the *Washington Post* called attention in its editorial "The Revisionists" yesterday. This is the distortion of some critics of our foreign policy, who in order to prove their point have been busily rewriting history. The *Post* editorial gives us an excellent example to digest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both Mr. Noyes' article from the *Evening Star* and the *Washington Post* editorial be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the *Washington Post*, May 2, 1966]

THE REVISIONISTS

Some of the critics of American policy in South Vietnam, in order to prove the Chinese Communists devoid of aggressive purpose, have been trying to rewrite the history of the last 20 years.

A notable example of this kind of double-think is an article entitled: "Chinese Aggression: Myth or Menace," written by Charles S. Burchill, printed by The Study Group on China Policy of Vancouver, B.C., and circulated by the American Friends Service Committee office in Seattle.

He begins his proof of Chinese virtue with the Korean War and produces a rewrite of that episode that is an affront to scholarship, an outrage to history and a triumph of double-think that even transcends the facility of the Soviet rewriters who do over Soviet history to suit annual alterations of policy.

"On May 30, 1950," he writes, "the government of Syngman Rhee in South Korea was decisively defeated in a general election, winning only 49 out of 219 seats."

The election actually resulted in the election of 133 Independents, 46 Rhee minority party members and 31 members of minority parties opposed to Rhee. In the previous election 85 Independents were elected, 55 Syngman Rhee followers, 28 Korean Democrat Party candidates and 32 from minor parties. So the Rhee party support dropped from 55 to 46—but the coalition that had previously ruled then re-elected P. H. Shinsky chairman of the Assembly, and went on to form the government that ran the Korean War. So Rhee's coalition regime was not "decisively defeated" but continued to command a ruling majority in the Assembly.

Then, says Mr. Burchill, "John Foster Dulles flew to Korea, and on June 19 (1950) addressed the South Korean National Assembly, pledging continued American aid, but only if Syngman Rhee's minority government continued in power."

Now, the truth is that John Foster Dulles, as a special assistant to the Secretary of State, did address the Assembly and did pledge American aid—but he did not say one word about making that aid contingent on the continued rule of Syngman Rhee or on any other political decision in South Korea. Without condition of any kind, he promised, "The American people give you their support, both moral and material, consistent with your own respect and your primary dependence on your own effort." There is not a single word in this address about continuing the Rhee government.

Then came the invasion from the North. By all competent accounts the North Koreans attacked the South, but Dr. Burchill finds the genesis shrouded in obscurity. He is not sure who attacked first. He says:

"Both sections had large armies, equipped and trained by their foreign sponsors. However the southern army showed little willingness to fight for the government that had been repudiated. The northern army encountered little resistance from the southern forces, and there was no popular opposition to its advance."

Actually, a heavily armored North Korean force of more than 154,000, with 242 Soviet-made T-34 tanks, 1900 heavy weapons and 211 military planes, attacked by surprise the force of South Korea (numbering 100,000 at the start of the war but only recently expanded from a 25,000-man constabulary) and equipped with no tanks, 20 armored cars, 700 guns and 22 light planes. Not surprisingly, the lightly armed South Korean constabulary was no match for the North Korean armored force and fell back clear to the Pusan perimeter before it could regroup.

Although the United Nations repeatedly branded the later intervention by 300,000 Chinese Communists as "aggression," this invasion from China is dismissed by Burchill as a response to U.N. actions, proven by the fact that the Chinese forces were promptly withdrawn after the cease fire.

The beginning of the Korean War may be obscure to Mr. Burchill, but to competent historians there was no obscurity. Fairbank, Reischauer and Craig, in their *East Asia: The Modern Transformation*, say of the start of the war: "The North Korean surprise attack on June 25, 1950, was at once condemned by the United Nations Security Council . . . under the well-prepared North Korean assault, the outnumbered Korean-American forces initially were forced back southeast of the Naktong River." Writing in *Foreign Affairs* in October, 1950, John K. Fairbank said: "Our military resistance to Communist aggression in Korea has been entirely necessary and unavoidable . . ."

It is the privilege and duty of those who wish to dissent politically to try to change the history of the future; but their efforts to change the history of the past in order to absolve the Chinese Communists of the odium of previous aggression will not deceive or mislead any informed person in the West. Fairbank estimates the Chinese had 900,000 casualties in the Korean War. They were not engaged in peaceful demonstrations at the time.

The Study Group on China Policy says it was formed for the purpose of "raising the level in Canada of knowledge and debate on China." The circulation of a farago of fiction and nonsense such as this will hardly accomplish that purpose. And the American Friends Service Committee, by disseminating such a distorted version of the past casts doubt upon its view of the present.

[From the Washington Evening Star,
May 23, 1966]

POINT OF VIEW: VIET RIOTS GROW IN THE
TELLING

(By Crosby S. Noyes, foreign affairs editor of
the Star)

SAIGON.—Developments here today and news filtering back from Washington suggest that this is an excellent time to declare a moratorium on sweeping statements about the future of the American involvement in Viet Nam.

Once again an outbreak of inspired anti-American rioting is leading the news from Saigon. And once again the result is likely to be a goodly amount of wattle shaking and table pounding among the more impressionable members of the World's greatest deliberative body in Washington.

Given an admittedly messy situation in Viet Nam, there is of course a great temptation to sound off in a pox on both your houses tone.

But those who succumb to it should realize quite clearly that they are in fact encouraging the rioters and doing precisely what the Communists in this country hope they will do.

It is also possible to form a completely distorted impression of what's really going on here.

News stories are accurate enough. Americans in Saigon have been shouted at, spat on, chased around, and occasionally roughed up.

The distortion, however, is the question of focus.

News stories are zeroed in on what happens at a particular place and at a particular time.

What happens the rest of the time or in the city as a whole is not exactly the stuff headlines are made of.

The impression that Saigon today—or at any time—is a seething cauldron of violence is entirely fanciful.

The riots that have occurred are calculated to produce the reports that have been written and the reaction in the U.S. which follows with Pavlovian predictability.

The rioters know exactly what they are doing and why. These anti-American demonstrations are about as spontaneous as demonstrations at the Republican National Convention—and just about as indicative of real public sentiment.

They can be turned on and off again like a garden hose. The same American who might get lynched at the Vien Hoa Dao pagoda today might be received with impeccable courtesy a couple of days or even a couple of hours later.

The same gang of young hoodlums who chased Americans around a few weeks ago burning cars and generally raising hell eagerly received this reporter at their headquarters a few days ago to smoke his cigarettes and discuss their future plans.

This sort of tactical anti-Americanism is not really expected to intimidate Americans in Saigon.

Its first purpose is to bring pressure on the American mission to stop the crackdown on dissident Buddhist elements in the north.

And beyond that it is designed to get the U.S. government and public so fed up with the whole problem of Viet Nam that a general handwashing impulse will become irresistible.

It is hard to exaggerate the limited scope of these disturbances up to now.

The truly remarkable—indeed almost unaccountable—fact about Saigon today is the utter impunity with which Americans wander around the city night and day.

Unless he's deliberately looking for trouble—as reporters sometimes must—an American could be completely unaware of any of the unpleasantness that he might expect to find in almost any other town.

He might get his pockets picked. He might possibly be held up in a dark alley. He might even, if he happened to be very unlucky, get himself blown up in Viet Cong operation or zapped by friendly American bullets.

But the chances of this are almost as remote as the chances of being run down by a car while crossing Connecticut Avenue at tea time.

The mysterious fact is that in a city presumably swarming with dyed in the wool Viet Cong, almost none of these extremely vulnerable Americans here gets hurt.

No one is very sure why this is so. One common and plausible theory is that the Viet Cong make a very good thing out of Americans in Saigon financially.

The Viet Cong, it is widely believed, have the controlling interest in the aspects of Saigon's cultural life recently mentioned by Sen. J. W. FULBRIGHT.

And if through indiscriminate rough stuff these establishments were shut down or put off limits to any American servicemen, the one who would be really put out would be Victor Charlie, the Viet Cong sympathizer, himself.

It may be that what seems like a sort of conspiracy of security may not last forever. For the time being, however, Americans here sleep a little bit better at night because of it.

And their dreams are not very much disturbed by staged convulsions at the other end of town.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, if there be no further morning business, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be terminated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE ADMINISTRATION ON VIETNAM

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Webster's dictionary defines the word credibility as "the quality or state of being believed." Increasingly of late the Johnson administration has been drawing critical fire for its lack of credibility, and the phrase "credibility gap" has come into an extensive use.

In part, this can be attributed to the normal functioning of partisan politics intensified by the competition of an election year. Thus, charges about the existence of a credibility gap are frequently raised by the administration's partisan opponents. But although the working of political partisanship has intensified the debate, it is not the basic source of the criticism. Increasing numbers of prominent spokesmen within the President's own party openly deplore the gap between words and deeds. Indeed, in several areas, it is Democratic criticism which has been the sharpest. In addition, a growing number of newspaper editors and columnists have registered concern over the fact that the administration's official words of the moment and its subsequent actions are all too often strangers.

Mr. President, the credibility of those who hold in their hands the power to affect the lives of all Americans and millions of people around the world is a precious and fragile thing. The task of constructing and maintaining it is difficult, demanding, and never ending.

A government's credibility cannot be assured by simple and frequent incantations of "believe us."

It is born not of a single deed but comes into being out of a long series of matched words and actions. Likewise, the erosion of a government's credibility occurs slowly and after a long series of mismatched words and deeds, of nuclear goals, and confusing and contradictory methods.

Mr. President, the borderline between public faith and public distrust is not clearly marked. But once it is crossed, the capacity of the government, however worthy or honorable its intentions, to govern effectively may be permanently damaged.

In a democratic and diverse society no administration can design a set of policies acceptable to all, and political disagreement is inevitable. But loss of faith in a government's credibility involves much more than differences of political opinion. The erosion of credibility not only intensifies the criticism of those who are politically opposed to its policies but erodes the stabilizing support of those who would otherwise agree. Thus, a policy, or a set of policies, may be emasculated, not because they are wrong or because too many people oppose the objective sought but because too many examples of lack of candor on the part of the Government generate disillusionment and public enthusiasm is replaced by public apathy.

The concept of policymaking by consensus has been widely attributed to the President, and has now become a household word. If this is another term for majority rule then it is nothing more

than a truism. The practice of consensus politics is the essence of democracy.

But in a democracy, the manner in which consensus is achieved is as important as the consensus itself. And in achieving consensus there is no better standard than the President's own oft-stated principle, "let us reason together." But the enunciation of a principle does not make it a reality. Taking the record of the past 2½ years as a whole the administration has more often than not sought to build consensus by public confusion, rather than public reasoning. This political strategy has often been successful in securing enactment of the administration's program. But the total effect of this strategy has also served to dilute the prestige of the Presidential office and to erode the public's faith in the credibility of the administration.

This strategy of consensus by confusion is most despised by the administration's partisan opponents. Whatever else may be said of the President, all recognize him as a masterful political tactician. Mr. Johnson is a past master of throwing his potential opponents off balance so as to better pave the way for the acceptance of his proposals, and he has practiced this strategy with supreme skill.

But, Mr. President, there is a difference between political shrewdness and political cynicism. There is a thin line between legitimate rough and tumble partisan politics and illegitimate public deception. And there is a growing impression that the line has been crossed too often.

During the past 2½ years there has been a growing number of episodes which serve to raise doubts as to the credibility of the Johnson administration's conduct in domestic affairs. Without question, however, the credibility gap charge has been applied most often and most tellingly to the administration's handling of its Vietnam policy.

In recent weeks attention has been focused on whether or not our forces in Vietnam are suffering from shortages of war materials. Mr. President, if we know anything about past military build-ups of the type that have occurred in Vietnam we know that certain shortages will almost inevitably occur. The American people recognize this and if the shortages which occur do not reflect gross and inept mismanagement this would be accepted as one of the harsh facts of war, which at best is organized confusion.

But what has been the administration's response to disclosures first by the public press and then by congressional investigating committees, that shortages have in fact developed in Vietnam? Typically the administration's first reaction was to categorically deny that any shortages whatsoever existed. The Secretary of Defense branded any suggestion of shortages as pure "baloney." Whether or not these shortages have seriously hampered our military effort there or caused a greater loss of life among American troops than would otherwise be the case is not yet clear and may never be clear.

However, Mr. President, the most revealing and disturbing aspect of this episode has been the administration's over-

reaction to its critics. The administration, assuming a posture that admits to no mistakes, has dogmatically and militantly denied the existence of shortages and has tried to discredit those who reported their existence. This type of intolerant and bellicose reaction only serves to further alienate the critics and to raise new doubts among the administration's supporters as to its overall credibility.

The episode of military shortages is only one of the more recent examples of confusion surrounding this country's involvement in Vietnam. But as it comes after a long series of inconsistent and contradictory statements about our policy in Vietnam, it has taken on added significance.

During the past 2 years the American public, in response to the questions of opinion pollsters, has given overwhelming support to the President. However, in the past few months public opinion polls have registered a growing sense of frustration and agony over Vietnam. And within the past few weeks several polls indicate that less than a majority of the people express satisfaction with the administration's handling of the Vietnam situation.

The record shows that the American people genuinely want to support the President. But it also shows that the public is finding it increasingly difficult to do so. The cause of this erosion of support is a growing confusion as to why we are in Vietnam, what are our objectives there, and what methods are to be used in achieving those objectives.

Mr. President, the administration says that there is no basis for this confusion, and argues that if there is confusion, it is due to the ill-founded and ill-tempered blusterings of a few articulate but misguided critics. But the matter cannot be dismissed this easily. Widespread public confusion does exist, and it is due to the actions of the administration itself.

In this respect a recent statement by Carl T. Rowan, a former official of the Johnson administration, is significant and revealing. He stated:

I left the government five months ago thinking I knew what United States' policy in Vietnam was. Today I haven't the remotest idea.

Mr. Rowan made this statement in a column in which he was trying to decipher the meaning of a flurry of official and unofficial statements by administration spokesmen in response to the suggestion by the able and distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] that the United States might consider negotiating with the Vietcong. The administration was variously reported as being in agreement with Senator KENNEDY, in complete disagreement, and "very close" to Senator KENNEDY's proposals. This display of an administration frantically trying to cover all bets serves as a vivid illustration of the fact that if we do have a clear and consistent policy in Vietnam, one cannot discover it by listening to the words of the administration purporting to describe and explaining it.

Mr. President, in regard to its development and handling of the Vietnam policy

the administration has been afflicted by three weaknesses. First, the administration is unhealthily obsessed with a notion that it is always right and never wrong, or at least that it should so try to present itself as to appear to be beyond error. But this type of strategy inevitably breeds distrust, because no man and no government is immune from the human frailty of miscalculation and misadjustment.

The mark of a great leader is not that he never makes mistakes but that when he does he is strong enough to recognize these mistakes and, therefore, adjust his actions accordingly. This is particularly vital in the conduct of foreign policy, for much more is at stake than the personal reputation of one man or one administration.

A second weakness in the handling of the Vietnam policy is the administration's overpowering urge to be "all things to all people at all times." Thus, the administration is often more concerned with saying and doing those things which will nullify domestic and international criticism of its policy rather than conducting that policy in the way that it believes it is best designed to achieve the objectives sought. But in a long drawn out and complex situation such as Vietnam this continual effort to be all things to all people ultimately presents the danger that the word of the administration will have little meaning or value to anyone.

The third basic weakness is the administration's aversion to long-range planning and its predisposition to "playing things by ear." Now it may be that somewhere within the bowels of Government there exists a long-range plan complete with contingency programs to take account of unexpected events. But if such a plan exists, it has been carefully concealed.

Thus, Mr. President, while it is easy to determine where we have been in Vietnam it has always been virtually impossible to guess where we might be in the future. This vagueness of direction creates the impression that we are simply reacting to events in Vietnam rather than controlling those events. Daily the impression grows that we are helpless victims of a situation that we cannot control; that we, the most powerful nation in the world, cannot determine our own destiny.

The administration continually proclaims that its Vietnam policy is clear, consistent, and well defined and that those who do not understand it are simply ignorant of the record. But although the administration says that confusion should not exist and desperately wishes that it would not exist, confusion grows both at home and abroad.

It is a confusion born of inconsistent and contradictory explanations, of vaguely expressed goals and unclear means, and of sweeping proclamations pregnant with glittering generalities but empty of concrete meaning. After a prolonged exposure to this type of record, the American public and the world at large find it ever more difficult to believe what the administration says at

any given time and are increasingly uneasy about what the administration may say and do at any given time in the future.

Mr. President, the erosion of the administration's credibility began long before the military shortages episode or the contorted reactions to recent proposals that the United States consider negotiating with the Vietcong. Indeed the seeds of doubt and confusion can be found even in the administration's explanation of why we are in Vietnam.

The reason we are there is really quite simple. The administration is convinced that the Vietcong constitute a form of aggressive, expansionist communism, which if left unchecked might mean that all of southeast Asia and possibly the entire Asian community will come under a Communist rule directed and controlled from Peking. Thus, our commitment in Vietnam can be seen as a logical extension of a nearly two decades old foreign policy principle which aims at the containment of totalitarian communism.

Mr. President, much of the questioning of our Vietnam policy comes from those who doubt that this is a genuine example of expansionist communism. Criticism is also registered by those who may accept the argument that this is an example of expansionist communism but who disagree with the strategy we are employing to halt its spread. Most of these critics accept the containment principle but argue either that it is unnecessary to invoke it in this particular situation or that we are employing the wrong techniques to achieve it. There are also a few critics who suggest that the containment principle, used so effectively in Europe and the Middle East, simply cannot be applied to Asia.

But the exploration of these arguments is not the purpose of these remarks. For the purpose of this discussion, I accept that the Vietcong movement in South Vietnam is an example of expansionist communism and that it is in our national interest to take reasonable steps to prevent its growth. If this be true, there is no question that the majority of the American people would support our effort in Vietnam.

But how, in fact, does the administration explain our position in Vietnam? Unfortunately, it almost never uses the simple and clear language of the containment policy and the defense of our national interest. Instead, it talks in grandiose generalities which seem to have little relationship to the reality of the situation in southeast Asia. For example, it talks about defending freedom and democracy. These are admirable objectives to be sure, but who among us now believes that there is any meaningful freedom and democracy in southeast Asia to be defended.

The administration talks about honoring commitments. It often implies that we are bound by the SEATO Treaty. But if that be so, then none of the other members of the organization seem to believe it to be the case. Apparently, the administration does not either, as is evident by the fact that it has never really consulted with the members of the organization in regard to our Vietnam policy.

Mr. President, the administration talks most often about a commitment to the nation of South Vietnam as if we had entered into some solemn and binding agreement with the Government and the people. In this respect, President Johnson frequently implies that whether we like it or not President Eisenhower made a commitment to Vietnam which we are honorbound to observe. In point of fact, the so-called Eisenhower commitment is nothing more than a letter to the Diem government offering economic aid and technical assistance with the conditional provision that the Diem government begin to institute extensive social, economic, and political reforms.

Being fully aware of the niceties of diplomacy and the necessities of politics, one can appreciate why the administration cannot always simply and directly say that we are in Vietnam because we believe it to be in our national interest. But continual harping on the notion of honoring commitments no one understands, ultimately destroys public confidence in our position there.

Too often the administration justifies our position in terms of narrow legalisms. This not only obscures our basic reasons for being there, but also raises doubts that the administration itself is convinced that we are, in fact, fighting a form of expansionist, imperialistic communism.

Mr. President, reduced to its simplest and most meaningful terms our objective is to prevent the spread of totalitarian communism to South Vietnam and into the rest of southeast Asia. Prior to 1965, this objective was sought primarily by the use of technical advice and economic aid aimed at the internal strengthening of South Vietnam so that it could better prevent a Communist takeover. Increasingly of late, however, we have committed vast military forces in an effort to achieve that objective.

The administration says that our objectives are limited; to guarantee an independent and peaceful South Vietnam. And, I believe that our objectives are, in fact, really limited. But simple declarations do not prove it or convince our adversaries or our potential allies. If we are really willing, as I believe we are, to settle for a truly independent South Vietnam, one that is neither controlled nor dependent upon the United States or Hanoi, Moscow, or Peking, we must do more than simply mouth the words. Our adversaries and those around the world who are inherently suspicious of our intentions need more than vague verbal declarations.

The administration has declared our objectives to be limited but its words and actions have given rise to considerable doubt and suspicion as to the precise limits of those objectives. The picture has been particularly confused by the administration's words and actions regarding a settlement that would satisfy those objectives.

The administration has said that we would be willing to negotiate anywhere at any time without prior reservations or conditions. But at the same time that we issue such unconditional statements, we

also assert that we will not negotiate directly with the Vietcong. Now it may be that there are sound reasons for refusing to negotiate with the Vietcong. Certainly it would be foolhardy for the United States to agree to negotiate only with the Vietcong as Hanoi and Peking continually demand.

But the tragic thing, Mr. President, is that if our position is really sound it has been lost to world opinion by the inevitable loss of faith in the credibility of a government which loudly proclaims with one mouth that it will negotiate without prior reservations and then quietly asserts with another mouth that it will actually negotiate only under prespecified conditions.

Moreover, the practice of escalating our military commitment in Vietnam at the very same time we announce anew our desire for a settlement only serves to increase doubts among friend and foe alike as to the precise nature of our intentions, even though those intentions may in fact be entirely honorable and our objectives truly limited.

The credibility of the administration was further weakened by the disclosure that we may have rejected several "peace feelers" from the Communists. It might well have been the case that these feelers were not worthy of serious consideration, that they did not provide a reasonable basis for negotiation. But again, as so often in the past, the administration was discredited in the eyes of many not necessarily because its position was unsound, but because it acknowledged those contacts only after documentation in the public press made it impossible to deny their existence.

Against the background of ringing declarations to explore all possible avenues for a peaceful settlement the disclosure that the administration had rejected these feelers added fuel to the growing doubts and criticism about our Vietnam policy.

Mr. President, when our changed position in Vietnam became evident in late 1964 and early 1965, it brought forth the first serious public questioning and debate of our policy. The administration sought not to clarify that debate but to prevent it. Ultimately the questioning and criticism could not be prevented. The administration then adopted a strategy of attempting to nullify each fresh wave of criticism by seeming to agree with the demands of the critics. But this only served to bring confusion and more questioning of the Government's credibility.

Two recent examples are illustrative. As doubts, at home and abroad, as to the sincerity of our desire for a peaceful settlement continued to grow in late 1965 the administration staged a massive peace offensive during January of 1966. The bombing of North Vietnam was temporarily halted and top administration officials and ambassadors were sent scurrying around the world, all proclaiming that the United States really did want a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. Ambassador Harriman went to Poland, Yugoslavia, and India. McGeorge Bundy went to Ottawa. Arthur Goldberg visited the Vatican,

Rome, Paris, and London. Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY made a country-hopping tour in the Far East. Ambassador Kohler conferred with the Soviet officials in Moscow. G. Mennen Williams talked to leaders of several African nations, and Thomas C. Mann did the same in Mexico City.

It was indeed a Texas-sized peace offensive. And while the administration was obviously sincere in hoping that this display might actually serve as a catalyst for the beginnings of realistic negotiations, it was generally apparent that this was a staged affair, a political display aimed more at nullifying the mounting criticism challenging the sincerity of our offer for negotiation rather than a careful calculated effort to secure a peaceful settlement.

If in fact, Mr. President, we had been making the proper efforts in exploring all possible diplomatic channels, then such a spectacular display was unnecessary. If we had not been doing these things, then this display of jet diplomacy would convince no one, friend or foe.

Another example of this type of administration strategy was the calling of the recent Honolulu conference. The peace offensive had failed, the bombing in North Vietnam had been resumed, and the internal political situation in South Vietnam showed no improvement. Increasingly, criticism was being directed at the failure of the United States to bring about any of the desperately needed economic, social, and political reforms in South Vietnam which all observers, including our top military leadership, recognize as being absolutely necessary to any genuine solution in South Vietnam. Thus, the President and an impressive number of top Government officials flew off to a hastily convened conference in Honolulu with Premier Ky and other members of his government. After a few hectic days at the conference table, the Honolulu declaration was issued with great fanfare.

The administration has hailed the Honolulu declaration as a historic document and has bitterly complained that the public press and congressional critics had failed to give it the recognition and praise that it deserves. In point of fact, American public and world reaction to the conference was precisely what it deserved. Again, while no one would argue that the goals announced by the conference were not genuinely desirable, all recognized that the impetus for the conference was the growing criticism of the administration's conduct in Vietnam rather than a logical extension of its long-range policy. There is depressingly little evidence that we are ready or capable, even at this late date, of instituting the programs of aid and reform that would be needed to achieve the goals so proudly proclaimed.

Mr. President, it is no wonder, then, that the American people and the world in general are confused about our policy in Vietnam. Our basic reasons for being in Vietnam have never been adequately explained. The objectives we seek there have never been clearly delineated. And the administration's zigzagging and contorted efforts to answer every critic

simultaneously have beclouded our entire involvement.

But none of these has so eroded the American public's faith in the administration's credibility as has the yawning gap between what we have said would be necessary to achieve our objectives there and what we have actually done there. It is here that we find the essence of the credibility gap.

The most glowing example of the lack of credibility is to be found in the depressing record of the administration from time to time telling the American people that we would not perform a certain act, but then later initiating that very act. And in so doing on each occasion the administration has proclaimed that the performance of that particular action would solve the situation in Vietnam. But, in reality, as the American people have seen, the situation remains the same or grows worse. And as the administration's promises for a solution continue to flow, the public's faith that a solution will really be achieved continues to wane.

In 1964 President Johnson frequently and fervently proclaimed that our objectives in Vietnam would be achieved without the commitment of major American military forces and loss of American lives. Millions of American people voted for Mr. Johnson in November 1964, because they agreed with this declaration of policy. But our position in Vietnam today bears no resemblance to that of 1964 or to the President's declaration of what it would be. President Johnson said we would not commit American lives, and that we would not extend the war to North Vietnam, and that the major effort against the Communists in South Vietnam would have to be carried by the South Vietnamese themselves. But today we bomb North Vietnam around the clock and in recent weeks more Americans have died on the battlefield than South Vietnamese.

Our military commitment and effort in Vietnam has been increased in a series of graduated moves. Each step of the escalation has occurred after the administration had proclaimed that such steps would be unnecessary and undesirable. However, when the administration felt that conditions forced it to abandon its former position, it has stated, or at least implied, that each additional extension in the military commitment would solve the problem. The decision to bomb North Vietnam was at least implicitly justified on the basis that cutting supply lines would isolate the Vietcong and allow the South Vietnamese Army to defeat its adversary. But today more men and more equipment flow from North Vietnam into the south than ever before.

If the administration knew that the act they denied would take place would be performed, then it is an act of misrepresentation to the American people and a display of callous cynicism. If the administration thought that the performance of that given action would solve the problem in South Vietnam then the record can only show that the administration has continued to compound misjudgment with misjudgment.

Likewise, on the political scene each change in the Saigon government has been heralded by the administration as the one which would at last bring true stability to South Vietnam. But none of this has come to pass. And the present Government to which the President has given his personal endorsement has not only failed to achieve stability but has so acted to increase internal tensions and conflicts among the South Vietnamese. Mr. McNamara's statement that the present conflict between the Buddhists and the Ky regime is a healthy sign, is naive and ridiculous and an example of the fantastic contortions which the administration has had to go through to try to justify and explain the internal situation in Vietnam, which cannot be anything else but a severe indictment of our lack of vision and leadership in that troubled land.

In September of 1964 President Johnson proclaimed:

We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys . . . I want to be very cautious and careful and use it as a last resort when I start dropping bombs around that are likely to involve American boys in a war in Asia with 700 million Chinese . . . so we are not going north and we are not going south; we are going to continue to try to get them (the South Vietnamese) to save their own freedom with their own men.

Mr. President, the American people are mature and wise enough to recognize that in a complex situation like Vietnam things do not always happen as we would like them to, or as we expect them to. But constant repetition of proclamations to the effect that a particular action will not take place, followed by ringing declarations, when this very act occurs, that this, finally, is the action that will provide the solution is destroying the public faith and is feeding the growing belief that this administration neither knows what it wants in Vietnam nor how to achieve it.

The record of the past can only create anxiety and fear of the future.

Mr. President, one hears a great deal about the agony of Vietnam, and it is indeed America's most agonizingly difficult and complex foreign involvement of the 20th century.

One of the greatest tragedies of this experience is that although America's intentions there are basically honorable and our objectives truly limited, we have conducted ourselves in such a way that ever larger numbers of people, both at home and abroad, find it impossible to believe the sincerity of our actions there.

Throughout the non-Communist world there is a great reservoir of support for this country's dedicated opposition to the expansion of communism. Thus, although internal political conditions may make it impossible for many foreign leaders, particularly in Asia, to openly identify with the United States, most of them at least share in the general objective of containing communism in Asia.

At home the overwhelming majority of the American people support the containment policy, and most believe that a takeover by the Communists in South Vietnam would be a discouraging defeat for the United States and against the

long-range interests of the free world. Thus, the American people, at heart, genuinely want to support the administration's policy in Vietnam.

Mr. President, no one of the numerous examples of mismatched words and deeds, which have been reviewed here, has been enough to destroy faith in the credibility of the administration's Vietnam policy. But the ever accumulating list of inconsistencies, contradictions, vague explanations, and persistent refusal to acknowledge even minor mistakes inevitably sows the seeds of doubt, disillusionment, and apathy. The result is that eventually even candid statements and forthright explanations become suspect.

Thus, Mr. President, even though the administration's basic intentions and goals may be sound and worthy, the policy which it pursues may fail, not because it is basically wrong, but because its conduct of that policy has been so shoddy that even those who believe in its ultimate rightness refuse the administration their positive and energetic support out of disillusionment and despair.

RECESS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 10 o'clock and 43 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 12:39 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HART in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 13712) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 13712) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is a matter of regret to me that my duties as chairman of the mediation panel in the airline machinist dispute have occupied me all morning and have prevented my being here earlier to speak.

I very much appreciate the indulgence of the Senate and the Senate staff which enables me to speak at this time on several matters, which I am able to do through arrangement with the leadership of the Senate.

The leadership very graciously agreed to this course of action because it recognized, as one of a minority in the Senate who opposes the policies of the Johnson administration in respect to the matter I shall discuss, that the minority was entitled to present this point of view prior to the long weekend we are about to take.

I appreciate very much, as I always do, the courtesy the leadership always extends to me.

I would not have asked for this rather extraordinary procedure today if the Senate had convened at 12 o'clock noon, as I had anticipated, but it was my fault because of my duties downtown as Chairman of the Emergency Board that I did not know of the leadership's plan to convene at 10 o'clock this morning.

Mr. President, as a matter of fact, my work as Chairman of the President's Emergency Board seeking to find a fair and amicable solution to the threatened national airlines strike has kept me away from the Foreign Relations Committee markup sessions on the foreign aid bill, which I also regret, because I would like to be there to uphold the arm of Chairman FULBRIGHT as he leads the committee in a badly needed reshaping of the aid program. But my vote has been cast by proxy for most of the changes made so far, many of which I have been struggling to bring about for some time, and I hope to be present next week to offer some more amendments on my own.

I am not at all moved by the charge already being leveled that these changes in the aid program discriminate against African countries. The changes will prove eventually to be in the interest of the African countries, for we are trying to correct the mistakes of past aid commitments that have brought disaster to South Vietnam and encouraged and made possible armed conflict among others. We are trying to apply to Africa, and to future aid everywhere, the lessons learned from the failures of the past, which include the arming of military juntas in Latin America, the giving of huge amounts of aid for political purposes that did nothing for the good of the people, and eventual American armed intervention in countries where we thought our face had to be saved because we were so heavily committed to a certain local faction through the aid program.

Aside from that, the first obligation of the committee, of Congress, and of the administration is not to any foreign country or bloc of countries. Our first obligation is to the American people and the good of the United States, and I hope that obligation will remain first in the consideration of this legislation.

A second subject that I want to mention briefly is the resolution expanding the Senate oversight committee of the Central Intelligence Agency. This issue is expected to be taken up in the Senate next week, and I want these observations to appear in the RECORD now.

NEED FOR EXPANDED CIA OVERSIGHT

In all the discussion about the form a Senate oversight of CIA should take, we have largely lost sight of the real

issue. The issue is not whether CIA makes foreign policy. The issue is not whether it is controlled in its decision-making by the President and the Department of State and by a civilian group appointed by President Kennedy—and in my opinion it is.

The issue is whether it is sufficiently concerned and involved in international affairs to warrant the addition of Foreign Relations Committee representation in its oversight. It seems to be inconceivable that it is so involved.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee emphasizes that CIA does not make foreign policy. Yet I am sure he would agree that CIA does not make military policy, either. Does this mean the Armed Services Committee oversight should be abolished as unnecessary? That is the conclusion one would draw from the argument of the Senator from Georgia.

If anything, the Central Intelligence Agency is much more an operating arm of American foreign policy than it is of American military policy. It is on that basis that all logic should have put the Foreign Relations Committees of the House and Senate in charge of its surveillance in the first place, and not the Armed Service Committee. The Department of Defense has its own intelligence. The Department of State has its own intelligence. The CIA is separate from both, but it remains deeply involved in intelligence activities that are vital even more to foreign policy formulation than to military policy formulation. Moreover, its operations are almost entirely political. How can it be said that its activities which are operations rather than information-gathering are more military than diplomatic or political?

In 1954, CIA plotted and carried out the overthrow of the government of Guatemala. Was that a military operation or a foreign policy operation? In 1961, CIA organized the Cuban refugees and masterminded the Bay of Pigs. Was that a foreign policy program or a military program?

As I have said on many occasions in the Senate, in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and as chairman of the committee that conducted executive hearings by way of investigation of the CIA vis-a-vis the Bay of Pigs, the Bay of Pigs situation would not have occurred except for the foreign policy intervention of the CIA. Not even Congress was aware of what the CIA was up to, and certainly the American people were not aware of what the CIA was up to.

I repeat again: the CIA is a police state institution. We must see to it that every agency of the Federal Government is constantly under the surveillance of the representatives of the people of this country.

The fact that there are those in the Senate and in the executive departments who do not want the Foreign Relations Committee to be represented in the surveillance of the CIA, in connection with the CIA intervention in foreign policy, ought to be a warning signal to the people of the country.

The American people are entitled to have the Senate see to it that the Foreign Relations Committee is in a position of surveillance over the CIA.

In 1958, CIA helped organize opposition to Sukarno in Indonesia. Was that a foreign policy operation or a Defense Department operation? Throughout the fifties, CIA helped supply Nationalist Chinese within Burma. Was that a foreign policy program of the United States, or a Defense Department operation?

In 1956, the CIA did much through its broadcast facilities to encourage the Hungarian uprising, though when it came, we made no American military effort to help. Was that a foreign policy or a military policy effort on the part of the United States?

I think that in all these instances which have been described in books and articles, the CIA has carried out foreign policies rather than military policies for the U.S. Government. In none of the instances I have mentioned did the American Military Establishment involve itself directly. Only where events have become uncontrolled by other means, such as in the Dominican Republic and in Vietnam, has the Department of Defense taken an active role.

I do not think it is at all relevant to this resolution to argue whether CIA makes the decisions on the merits of these operations. The issue of the degree of Presidential control does not concern us here. What does concern us is whether the committees of Congress whose subject matter is most affected by the Central Intelligence Agency are part of the surveillance, and at the present time they are not.

Both the intelligence-gathering and the operation functions of CIA are at least as relevant to foreign policy formulation and execution as they are to military postures and activities. In most cases, they are much more relevant to foreign policy.

The present arrangement whereby the Armed Services Committee shares in this oversight and the Foreign Relations Committee does not is a gross intrusion of the Armed Services Committee into the subject matter of foreign policy.

We see that intrusion showing its head in another form in the movement within the Senate to have military aid separated from the foreign aid program and consigned to the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. President, the evidence is undeniable that military aid is constantly used by the Pentagon to meddle in foreign policy. In my opinion, the military aid that we are furnishing to many countries in the world constitutes one of the greatest threats to world peace. The Pentagon Building has much to answer for in connection with the military aid program.

I have said before, and repeat in this address today, that in my judgment, the military aid program of the Department of Defense, as represented by the Secretary of Defense, by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and by other top-ranking military officers of our country, has created more Communists in the last 10 years than has any other one cause existing on the face of the earth.

It would be more appropriate to confine the CIA oversight role entirely to the Appropriations Committee than to extend the oversight of the Armed Services Committee over so important an ingredient of foreign policy as intelligence services.

I am not at all impressed with the argument made on the floor of the Senate that some of our colleagues do not want the Foreign Relations Committee to have jurisdiction over a subject matter that deals with foreign relations because they wish to cast reflections upon the members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Such arguments are not befitting a U.S. Senator. I served on the Armed Services Committee for many years prior to going on the Foreign Relations Committee. I have served now on the Foreign Relations Committee since 1955.

There is not a scrap of evidence or justification in support of the reflections that some members of the Armed Services are casting indirectly, and sometimes not too indirectly, and frequently by innuendoes, upon the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

As a member of those two committees during my period of service in the Senate, I have never seen a partisan vote cast in either committee. It has been my observation that Senators do not sit on the Foreign Relations Committee as Democrats or Republicans. Nor do they sit on the Armed Services Committee as Democrats or Republicans. They sit on those committees as U.S. Senators.

When differences of opinion develop on the committees, those differences are shown by the votes. The split is not reflected by Republican votes against Democratic votes. The split is a split of sincere men, Democrats and Republicans on one side, and Democrats and Republicans on the other side, of men who have come to an honest difference of opinion in regard to what the decision of the committee should be.

The argument that a larger committee would endanger secrets is a wholly false issue and it is to be regretted that it has been even mentioned on the floor of the Senate by the opposition of the McCarthy-Fulbright resolution. We are taking about three members from the Foreign Relations Committee. I am only sorry it is not possible to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the number of employees of CIA—who number in the thousands—the number of persons in the Budget Bureau, the number of persons on the White House staff, the number of persons in the House of Representatives, the number of persons in the State and Defense Departments, the number of persons in other Cabinet jobs who are part of the National Security Council, and the number of persons from private life who are not even in the Government, much less elected, all of whom have much knowledge and information about the activities of the CIA.

Apparently many of those people who oppose the McCarthy-Fulbright resolution think it is perfectly all right to have those hundreds of governmental personnel that never have faced a vote, as far as qualifications for office are concerned,

have information which some colleagues of mine in the Senate think should be denied to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate or the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House.

There are hundreds, and probably thousands, of foreigners in foreign governments who are well advised of CIA activities in their areas, and who presently know more than the Foreign Relations Committee knows about these matters.

I am especially intrigued by the argument against the resolution which holds that the appointment of a supervisory council of private citizens is a reasonable and presumably "secure" check on CIA but three Members of the U.S. Senate would not be. The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], mentions the group President Kennedy appointed after the Bay of Pigs to review CIA organization and activities. Who is on that board? James Killian, president of MIT, was one of the original members. He is an educator, and an outstanding citizen. I have great confidence in him, but no more than I have in 100 U.S. Senators, including the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Another private citizen on the intelligence consulting group is Clark Clifford. He is another fine and trustworthy man, but no more trustworthy than the 100 men and women elected to the Senate.

Another member of this group is Dr. Edwin Land, an inventor with the Polaroid Corp. Are Senators prepared to say he is worthy of being privy to CIA secrets, but Senators are not? Professor William Langer is a historian of great renown in the academic world. Is he more worthy of confidence than Senators? I do not believe so.

Others in the consulting group are William Baker—about whom I have no information—Maxwell Taylor, Admiral Sides, and former high civilians in the Defense Department, Gordon Gray and Frank Pace.

All are presumed to be private citizens at the present time. Some of them have outstanding qualifications. But do they have better qualifications than U.S. Senators, or at least better than some Senators but not others?

I am amazed that anyone would point to these private citizens and contend that they are entitled to supervise the Central Intelligence Agency, but that three Members of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee are not.

If Congress is anxious to divest itself of more and more of its duties, and to invest more and more of them in the executive branch, the way to do it is to turn over CIA supervision to a group of private citizens appointed by the President and responsible only to him, and to deny all supervision to the Senate's committee in charge of foreign policy matters.

I believe it is time that the Senate began to restore, to a very modest and moderate extent, at least, the normal role this body was intended to play in foreign policy. Least of all do I see anything desirable in turning over foreign policy supervision to the Armed Services

Committee, as we do with the present system.

For 21 years, in this body, I have pleaded against the trend toward the development of Government by executive supremacy and secrecy; but I am deeply alarmed—yes, frightened—for the welfare of my country, to see the galloping speed with which the Johnson administration has sought to vest more and more unchecked power in the executive branch of this Government. I want to warn the American people that in my judgment, the Johnson administration must be checked, and checked now, if we are to retain our system of three coordinate and coequal branches of Government.

We cannot continue, Mr. President—under the various flag-waving slogans that are being used these days to whip up the people of this country into a war hysteria—granting more and more unchecked power into the hands of the President of the United States and his executive Cabinet members and their associates. A basic issue faces the American people, in my judgment—basic, when you can have, as we are having at the very hour that I now speak, Mr. President, American boys dying in South Vietnam in a Presidential war that has not even been declared by the Congress of the United States.

VIETNAM WAR

Oh, I know all the advice that I have received from dear friends here in the Senate, that I should not commit political suicide, that I should not burn my political bridges. Mr. President, it is more important that political bridges be burned in the United States in these critical hours than that steel bridges be bombed in North Vietnam.

It is more important that increasing numbers in the Senate and the House of Representatives be willing to commit political suicide—if that is the price one must pay to plead for peace in the world, and to bring to an end an immoral and shocking war that cannot be reconciled with Article I, section 8 of the Constitution—than that Members of Congress think only of their political hides.

Mr. President, it is a small sacrifice for any Member of Congress to pay—if that is the sacrifice he has to pay in order to try to bring this shocking war to a halt—to lose his office, in comparison with the supreme sacrifice, for which Members of Congress must bear the historic responsibility, because they have not stopped the President from conducting this immoral and shocking war.

I say it is a small sacrifice to pay for any Member of Congress to lose his position, if it comes to that, in comparison with the loss of American life in South Vietnam, in a war that never has been justified from the beginning.

As we approach Memorial Day, that we had better think of the great difference between the sacrifice that American soldiers have made during our glorious past, in justifiable wars, and the responsibility of the Johnson administration and of this Congress for causing now, already, more than 3,200 American boys to be killed in South Vietnam, and over

15,000 to be wounded, in a war we had no right to enter in the first place. The responsibility rests not only on the President, but also on the Members of Congress who have been supporting that war.

I know also, Mr. President, that when one votes as I vote, and as I shall continue to vote, short of a declaration of war—in opposition to all funds sought to be appropriated for this war—that the charge is to be expected that those of us who so vote are letting down the boys from South Vietnam. Well, let the record be clear again: Those who are letting down the boys in South Vietnam are those who are voting the funds to escalate this war and send them forward into more and more battlefields to die in increasing numbers.

They are the ones who are letting the boys down in South Vietnam, because they are walking out; they are abdicating a trust that they owe the American people, that our Founding Fathers wrote into the Constitution; namely, the check of the purse strings. If this Congress would stop voting President Johnson the funds to kill American boys in increasing numbers in South Vietnam, he would have to fall back on the sound advice of General Ridgway, of General Gavin, of George Kennan, and of the others, Mr. President, who are pointing out that we should stop escalating this war.

We should proceed to take our position at those points in South Vietnam that we can defend, without escalating the war, and that will stop the advance of the enemy, but will not involve our own advance. Then, let us put it squarely up to the other nations of the world: Do you want to assume your responsibilities to keep the peace? Do you other nations of the world want to decide, as you should have decided long ago, that there must be a cease-fire in Vietnam, and decree it?

We should then serve notice on all combatants that they must stop their fighting and pledge themselves as signatories to the United Nations Charter that they will send over whatever number of divisions of men are necessary to enforce a peace, as the United Nations has done in the Congo, is doing in the Gaza Strip, and Cyprus, and did in stopping the war between India and Pakistan.

My faith is such that in the due course of time the American people will come to understand the facts and realize that all the sacrifices we are making in American blood, plus the shocking killing of Asians, will win for us the hatred of Asians for years to come.

Mr. President, I make these remarks today in part because I think they are most appropriate before a Memorial Day. On a Memorial Day we ought to bow our heads as Americans, not only in tribute to our courageous soldiers that we have sent to South Vietnam—who are carrying out the orders of their Commander in Chief, which is their responsibility and duty—but we should bow our heads also with feelings of shame that as a people—may I say to the American people sitting in our places of security—we are not over there doing the dying. We ought to bow our heads in shame that

as free men and women we have permitted this situation to develop to the shocking point at which we now find it.

Young American draftees, 18, 19, 20, and 21 years of age, are being sent into South Vietnam, increasing percentages of them to die in a war to which we should be no party whatsoever.

I hope that on this Memorial Day the voters of this Republic, as they bow their heads in tribute to those we have lost in the past in justifiable wars, and those we are losing in Vietnam in an immoral and sinful war, will come to a better realization of their responsibility to exercise their power as free men and women to check this administration.

Sometimes, as I meditate on this matter, I ask myself the question, What is happening to us as a people? As a religious man, I speak respectfully of the churches, but would raise in this speech, to the clergy of America, the question: What has happened to you? As Mark Twain warned—and I shall use his great statement before I finish this speech—as war hysteria starts to sweep the country, soon the clergy will begin to preach sermons about God being on our side.

Already those sermons are coming forth, when what should be happening is that the church bells of America should be tolling in grief, on behalf of the religious men and women across this land, that our Government should be following such an irreligious course of action.

Already the old, superpatriotic slogans are being dusted off. We are reading them in the daily press. "My country, right or wrong."

Oh, that is the way of a country to go into oblivion, when patriotic Americans should be saying "When I find my country to be wrong, I intend to insist upon its righting its course."

What is needed in America, during these dark hours, is for the Government to right its wrong course and stop its international outlawry and return not only to the framework of the Constitution, the framework of its treaty obligations, but also return to the framework of its spiritual beliefs and obligations.

If only the pews in the churches of America could speak out against the hypocrisy of the people who occupy them by the millions each Sunday.

If only the clergy of America would live up to its responsibilities of spiritual leadership.

If only the men who speak from the pulpits of America would have the courage of the Great Master whom the Christian faith worships, or the belief in the one God whom the Jewish faith worships, or the dedication to the existence of an Almighty that all religious men and women say they believe in.

That is what is needed this Memorial Day weekend.

OREGON ELECTION AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. President, much attention has been focused in the last few days on the primary election in Oregon and its bearing on public attitudes toward the war in Vietnam.

For myself, I am heartened by the results because I think they show that the American people are deeply suspicious of administration policy there, and I think

they show that candidates who have nothing to offer except the administration's war policy are not going to be elected in November in very large numbers.

Democratic voters in Oregon nominated two "peace candidates" for Congress, Malcolm Cross in the First Congressional District, and Charles Porter in the Fourth District being vacated by Mr. DUNCAN. Both overcame primary opponents who were running on the administration war policy.

In the Senate race, Howard Morgan polled well over a third of the Democratic vote, his percentage being between 35 and 40 percent.

Those of us who know where Howard Morgan started from when he announced his candidacy in March on the war or peace issue, cannot feel anything but confidence that this issue is the dominant one with the people of my State and the Nation. We take confidence only in the wisdom of the voters in judging where the interests of the Nation lie as the issue becomes clear to them.

This will not be done overnight, and it was not done overnight in Oregon among Democratic voters, who were being asked to curb a President of their own party.

Nonetheless, more than a third of them did respond. I think a major reason they did is that they know a war candidate will have tough sledding this fall against Governor Hatfield. Governor Hatfield has long been identified as one of only two or three Governors who have not rubberstamped the administration's Vietnam policy. He has continued to urge a United Nations jurisdiction over the Vietnam issue. The Republican primary voters had a chance to repudiate him for that stance if they wanted to, but instead they nominated him for U.S. Senate by nearly 4 to 1, the one being the combined vote of three rivals.

Mr. President, in spite of the downgrading of his opponent by the press that wants to misinterpret and misrepresent what happened in Oregon, Governor Hatfield's opponent, who happens to be a very respectable and well-financed businessman in Oregon, ran on the war issue. The administration supporters of the war in Vietnam can add these Oregon results in any way they like, and they will never spell victory for Democratic candidates for Congress this fall.

That is why many of us are taking this issue into Democratic primaries. Our party has reneged on its campaign promises of 1964 in the field of foreign policy.

Millions upon millions of Republicans voted for Lyndon Johnson in 1964 because they believed he meant it when, in that campaign, he made it perfectly clear he held to the view that an Asian war was for Asian boys to fight and not American boys. They believed that he meant it when he made clear in that campaign that he would follow a course of action opposite to the proposals of a Barry Goldwater.

I, too, thought he meant it.

I shall never be able to understand why we have not had a single word of

explanation from the President, and why almost immediately after that election he proceeded to follow the Goldwater line.

There is growing across this country a wave of disillusionment in the President. That is why I believe that more Democrats in Congress than political dopesters, writing for the administration, want to admit will be defeated in November, and should be—will be defeated in November, Mr. President, and should be.

As a Democrat, I wish to say that one of the great needs of my party is to have cleaned up the foreign policy of this country. The way to clean up that foreign policy is to clean out those who are supporting the immoral course of action that we are following in South Vietnam.

I have made it clear that if the Governor of my State continues to stand for the foreign policy that he has enunciated, I shall vote for him. I shall not be campaigning for him. I shall be campaigning across America for Democratic candidates to Congress who are seeking to change my party's foreign policy vis-a-vis the war in Asia.

Furthermore, I hope I am enough of a "pro" in American politics to know that, as a Democrat, I should not involve myself in the Republican campaign in my State. I have no right, in my judgment, to inject myself into that campaign. That is the Governor's responsibility. It is a campaign for him to run. As a Democrat, however, I have the responsibility to my party, as I see my trust, to come to the assistance of Democratic candidates in other States who will run in opposition to the foreign policy programs of the Johnson administration. I shall do what I can to help elect peace candidates as against war candidates. That means those both in and out of Congress.

The faith and confidence of the American people in the Democratic Party as the one best able to maintain peace must be restored if we are to win elective office in 1966. May I say that goes for 1968, too.

That is why I think the White House is making a grievous mistake in cranking up its public relations machinery to try to rally support for a bigger war in Vietnam. I do not doubt that between now and November, the avenue between Capitol Hill and the White House will be heavily traveled. But the traffic will not be for the purpose of seeking congressional advice: it will be for the purpose of telling Congress, not asking Congress.

FAILURE OF THE WAR POLICY

A leading congressional Democrat has begun the process by repeating what many of us have recognized as administration policy for a long time.

He said in the East Room of the White House that the United States is not going to get out of Vietnam, no matter what. The discussion of what to do if a government came to power that sought negotiations or asked us to leave is wholly unreal, because no such contingency will be allowed to happen. The American Armed Forces will not leave under any circumstances, according to present administration policy, because we have put

too much emphasis upon saving our face and using southeast Asia as the testing ground for American containment of China.

I want to say to the Johnson administration that it had better start putting emphasis on saving lives of American boys, not face—saving the lives of the young draftees that we are sending over there to die, while we, safely at home, talk about face.

These justifications of the American presence in Vietnam do not leave any room for a South Vietnamese Government that does not lend itself to this American cause.

The evidence of the American takeover was highlighted by the reaction of American military commanders during the recent disturbances in Da Nang, when even General Ky's air force was warned that any more mistakes on their part that endangered American planes would bring retaliation. A Marine Corps spokesman announced that 40,000 U.S. marines in the northern part of South Vietnam were preparing to fight without any help at all from the South Vietnamese Army. The United States is making it clear to Vietnam and to the world that we will fight anyone in Vietnam who opposes the United States.

This policy can avoid no other interpretation than that our administration is on its way to taking over the war when the Vietnamese fight among themselves. What the President should have done at the first outbreak of the disturbances at Da Nang and Hue was order a cease-fire and notify the South Vietnamese that we are not going to kill American boys while they fight among themselves; that the theory of our administration has been that we are there to aid them in their war, not ours—I repeat, in their war, not ours.

In my judgment, the undeniable fact is that we are taking over the war and apparently we are going to fight in one part of Vietnam with 40,000 U.S. marines without any Vietnamese soldiers joining them.

When the American people come to understand those trends the American people will answer the administration's bullets in Vietnam with ballots in the United States.

If this is not making South Vietnam an American colony, what is? If this is not a territorial design upon Vietnam, what is? There can no longer be a pretense that we are in Vietnam at the invitation of a legitimate government. Of course, it never was legitimate. It was born out of the womb of illegality.

In open violation of the Geneva accord, the United States turned the 17th parallel from a military demarcation line into a political demarcation line. It was the United States, in open violation of the Geneva accord, that decided on two Vietnams. We created an illegal government in South Vietnam. Read the accords. I have read them on the floor of the Senate time and time again during the past 3 years. The 17th parallel was drawn as a military demarcation line, and the accords so indicate.

There was no provision for two separate governments. The French mili-

tary forces—and there were thousands of French troops in Vietnam at the time—were to go to the south of the line. The Viet Minh, who had won a victory over the French, were to stay to the north.

During the next 2 years, under the direction of an international control commission composed of India, Canada, and Poland, negotiations and procedures were to be set up leading to a united Vietnam based upon elections. We stopped those elections, although we Americans talked a good hypocritical line about self-determination. But we prohibited self-determination in Vietnam in 1956.

It will take more time for the American people to come to a realization that the statements of spokesmen for the U.S. Government that our government made a commitment to South Vietnam is itself completely fallacious.

They involved themselves in a civil war, and they should be allowed to settle their civil war without dictation from the United States. I think that history will prove me correct in my belief that the struggle within Vietnam will continue no matter how much we maintain our presence there over the decades, until at long last there will be one country and one government, and there should be.

The U.S. Government has been able to sell to the American people the false assumption that we are justified in insisting on two Vietnams—of our own illegal creation.

AMERICAN COURSE OF EMPIRE IN ASIA

Mr. President, the world will not overlook the contrast between our use of a weak, disorganized Asian country as an American battlefield, and our policy toward France and NATO.

It is generous to call what we are doing to Vietnam "arrogance of power." We are ruthlessly occupying South Vietnam to serve American security interests as we see them. More than that, we are building yet another huge air base in northeast Thailand, which will serve first to step up American air attacks upon Laos and North Vietnam, and which will serve secondly to enlarge the battlefield to include Thailand.

In Europe, we recognize and deal with De Gaulle as an equal. When he tells us to leave, we begin making plans to depart, despite our conviction that French soil is vital to our security.

But in a small Asiatic country we appoint a new set of national leaders when the existing ones do not do our bidding and do it effectively. General Ky is now doing what the American Embassy told him to do, and is putting down all opposition by force of the arms we gave him.

That will not end the opposition. Using arms against people who are without arms will not win them over to our side, but will cause them to dig deeper into their hate and to resolve more firmly that, no matter how many decades it takes, the white man will be thrown out of Vietnam and all of Asia.

That is why we are building a great race war. The color line is becoming an important factor in American foreign policy in Asia because it is unilateral American foreign policy. We do not pursue a strictly unilateral policy toward

industrial nations, which are largely white, only toward backward ones which are largely nonwhite.

Today, General Ky is traveling around Vietnam in a U.S. military jet in an effort to consolidate his military forces and is killing his own people.

The Buddhist religion is an interesting religion. Those who are directing American foreign policy could well afford to spend some time analyzing the philosophy of the Buddhist religion, because, in my judgment, force will not conquer a Buddhist. I believe that we are creating a spirit of hatred and revenge against Americans that will rise to plague us for decades to come.

Many people do not like to face one facet of the war in Vietnam. But it must be discussed. South Vietnam has many of the overtones and undertones of a religious war between Buddhists and Christians, with the Christians in a small minority. But eventually, Mr. President, we shall learn, after we have expended untold quantities of American blood, that the Buddhists will prevail.

They will not prevail on the battlefield, but they will prevail with long-time public support.

Administration spokesmen have tried to ascribe racist motives to those of us who oppose the war. They suppose the world does not see that we respect France, Britain, Germany, and other white NATO countries—yes, Portugal, too—as equals, while we jerk General Ky and his fellow generals of Vietnam around like puppets on a string.

What the world does see is that the United States respects only power and regards weakness as a power vacuum that must be filled by the United States wherever any of the worldwide security interests of this country are thought to be affected.

The great innovation and contribution of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] has been to try to help the United States break away from the pattern of power that has seen all the empires of the world dissolve because they thought their material wealth and power could accomplish things it could not in fact accomplish. If he can succeed in modifying even to a small degree that dismal pattern of history, then he will have made a remarkable addition to human affairs.

He has to be a born optimist even to make the effort. Many more people believe that the United States can only go down the same fatal path that all other empires have trod before us, seeing everything they did not control as a potential threat, constructing outposts of empire, then lifelines of empire, then outposts to guard the lifelines, fighting wars to protect the outposts that guard the lifelines, setting up and subsidizing governments from which to wage the wars, through military and economic aid, ad infinitum, until the structure collapsed of its tremendous weight.

I do not want to leave that legacy to future generations of American boys and girls. What my Government does and what the people of this country do in the months immediately ahead will determine the destiny of this Republic from

the standpoint of answering the question, "Will it survive?"

In my judgment, my country has no hope of surviving in history if it leads mankind into a massive war, as it is presently doing in Asia, only to end up in a third world war.

The colonial empires of Western Europe were centuries in the building and only decades in the collapse. Others, like Imperial Japan and Nazi Germany, were years in the building and only months in the collapse.

We are engaged in a major war in Vietnam today for these very same purposes of empire. We upset the Geneva agreements of 1954 because we feared that if we did not control South Vietnam, someone else would, and a hostile power might some day use it to threaten our "lifeline" through the Malacca Straits to the Indian Ocean. That is the reason for the present war, and all the window dressing about fighting for freedom and democracy is becoming more and more of a hollow mockery not only to the world, but also to the American people themselves.

Our trouble is that there is hardly a corner of the globe that we do not now regard as vital to our security. Our "lifelines" are everywhere; every continent is an outpost for some American security interest.

We maintain more troops on foreign soil than any other nation, and we maintain more military bases abroad than any other nation.

It is the United States that has become the great military occupier of many parts of the world and is frightening increasing millions of people, including many in France. We cannot eliminate from the NATO crisis in France the determination of many Frenchmen to see to it that the American military presence is taken out of France. And if I were a Frenchman, I would insist on it, too.

Why do we think that we can maintain these security interests by force of arms when no one has been able to do it before us? Why do we think we can occupy and use South Vietnam to serve American security interests without eternal war?

The fighting among the Buddhists and the government factions does not differ much from all the other disorders that have beset colonies or occupied territories in the last century and a half. The American forces and the South Vietnamese Army which has become little different from what it was under the French can continue to suppress revolts and uprisings throughout the portions of Vietnam we still control. But they will not end; they will not stop.

We may suppress the organized armies of the Vietcong, but it was not an organized army that dislodged all the other colonial powers from Africa and Asia. It was continuing, unceasing resistance that largely took the form of terrorism that finally caused them to give up these territories. The U.S. Government has decided its national security requires us to control South Vietnam. For home consumption, we said we were fighting for freedom, and when that became untrue on the face of it, we said we were

fighting to save face because Americans have never backed down anywhere.

How many lives will it take to save our face? If we are lucky, North Vietnam at some point will not pour in more of her own forces, though we probably are far from that point as yet. But even if the opposition army does not grow, we have only a future of terrorism in South Vietnam.

CONTAINMENT IN ASIA

That is not the containment of communism which I have supported and voted for in the past. The Greek-Turkish issue was not one of Greeks and Turks against an American army of occupation and a puppet government of the United States. The Korean war was not fought to maintain South Korea as an American outpost—it was fought by the United Nations to repel an intrusion of one government against another. The Marshall plan was designed to help local governments rebuild their internal economies, not to buy American entree and occupation of the kind we have imposed upon South Vietnam.

How well do I remember the day of the enunciation of the Truman doctrine. When I returned from that historic joint session, I took the floor of the Senate on the other side of the aisle that afternoon, and I was the only Senator who did. I pledged my support to President Truman in support of the Truman doctrine. But the Truman doctrine has no analogous relationship whatsoever with South Vietnam.

The obsession with the concept of containment has led us into a frightening abuse of the concept in Vietnam. Containment must mean firm local governments, enjoying the confidence and support of their people. Where those conditions do not exist today, the United States cannot create them. Where we substitute ourselves for local forces, as we have in Vietnam, we create not containment, but a hemorrhage of proportions over which the other side and not the United States has control.

I would like to see us return to an effective and workable containment in Asia. I would like to see us recognize that an obsession with "winning" everything, everywhere to which someone once committed us 10 years ago is not containment, but paranoia. I say respectfully that in my judgment, I think our Government is suffering from paranoia in its foreign policy. Successful containment must recognize that where a local people cannot or will not help themselves, the United States jeopardizes itself and does not serve itself when we substitute American bodies for Asian bodies.

South Vietnam is becoming a hemorrhage of the American military, financial, and spiritual body. When we make the statements that have been coming out of the White House recently to the effect that because we have never backed down anywhere we will never back down in Vietnam, we are giving complete control over our hemorrhage to the Communists.

It is the administration, and the White House, who are sacrificing flexibility in Vietnam policy. It is they who have

hardened the American position to one of not leaving no matter what happens in South Vietnam. By so doing, they have eliminated local responsibility for the war, for everyone in South Vietnam is put on notice that Americans will stay and take over whether South Vietnamese want to continue fighting or not.

If we shift the containment policy of the past, which originally featured viable local governments, into a containment around the fringes of China and Russia by American arms and American fighting men, we can expect only to be drawn into more and more of these conflicts.

This is not an issue of asking others to do our fighting for us. It is a question of whether Americans can do all the fighting for everyone in the world. Of course, we think we can now. We think we can keep over 300,000 men in Europe while Europeans decline to fulfill their subscriptions to NATO. We think we can send over 260,000 men into Vietnam, 15,000 into Thailand, and tens of thousands more into nearby areas of southeast Asia, plus thousands of others into the Dominican Republic, and keep all these balls in the air at one and the same time with little or no help.

This is not containment. It is not another case of "Munich" in Vietnam, when the foreign soldiers who have come from 8,000 miles away are ours.

The escalation and widening of the war by the United States has resulted only in similar measures by the other side. With each new step, we were assured that this was the one that would end the war, and each time our officials have been wrong. It is time to adopt a new approach. Therefore I recommend to the President again today that he study the offerings of General Gavin, General Ridgway, George Kennan, and the others who are urging that we stop escalating the war, that we call upon the other nations of the world for a cease-fire order, and that we make it perfectly clear that if the other nations of the world are not willing to enforce a peace in Vietnam, we then will get out. But we must stop making ourselves the unilateral policeman of the world, based upon our draftings of the law, our proposals, irrespective of who shares our views.

Militarily, the tactics advocated by Generals Gavin and Ridgway are sound, if adopted along with political steps I have mentioned. Those tactics call for maintaining the positions we now have, from which we cannot be dislodged by the Vietcong. Politically, I would have the President go not to Honolulu to meet with the military flunkies we put in charge in South Vietnam, but go to the United Nations and ask that body to exercise in South Vietnam its peace-keeping duties. He should ask the Security Council to order a cease-fire and to send into South Vietnam whatever U.N. troops are needed to enforce it. If that appeal is vetoed by some Security Council member, he should ask the General Assembly to take the action. The U.N. has done this effectively in the Middle East, in Cyprus, in the Congo, and more recently it obtained a cease-fire between India and Pakistan. A prevailing view at the U.N. now is that it

cannot act against the United States without our good faith cooperation because we are too big and too powerful. A vast number of U.N. members take it for granted that when we enlarged the war to include North Vietnam we were not acting like a nation that wanted to end the war or to get the U.N. to help us end it.

South Vietnam is not ours, to decide her fate as we please. The United Nations is the only agency that has that right. We should turn the problem over to it in good faith. Other U.N. members should realize, too, that if they fail to discharge their peacekeeping duty, the U.N. will be destroyed, for it will not hold the confidence of anyone if it fails to act on the greatest threat to world peace since Korea.

Mr. President, as I close, I shall read from two letters, and then a brief quotation from Mark Twain. I wish to read portions of two letters from a very important and responsible newspaper correspondent, whose name I shall not reveal, but whose letters speak for themselves; and I shall read all parts of the letters that do not disclose his identity:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am an American foreign correspondent who has covered South Vietnam continuously for several years.

He then describes his duties since he has been there:

I have lived here longer than any other American correspondent and longer than nearly any other American.

I have not always agreed with your views over the years, but somehow I find myself increasingly drawn to your point of view with respect to the American involvement in this country. You have consistently shown the courage, furthermore, to keep fighting against enormous odds, for beliefs that deserve to be heard.

The tragedy of Viet Nam, it seems to me, has been not so much the basic political defeat the United States has suffered here, but rather the reasons for that defeat. There have been many dedicated young Americans working in this country over the years for things they believed would match the challenge of Asian communism. They have been thwarted, I believe, by the kind of thinking that motivates the Pentagon, and by all those who find the police-state solution the most practical approach to foreign policy.

Perhaps, after all, Americans as a nationality lack the political wisdom to be able to cope with the great issues of Asia. If that is true, Asia is surely best left to itself to decide its own fate.

But apart from that, it seems that sometimes the entire Congress has been cowed by the Directorate. In recent votes, your voice has been one of the very few retaining the courage of dissent.

Thank God there is still WAYNE MORSE in the Senate.

Thereafter, I wrote to him to ask permission to use the letter. I received permission to use it in full, but I am not using it in full, Mr. President. Although I respect his courage, nevertheless I shall use it only to the extent that I am using it today.

I received a reply to my letter from this great correspondent, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Warm thanks for your very thoughtful letter of April 14. Of course, you may use my letter to you in any way you see fit. I would only ask that you not suggest that my views in any way reflect those—

And then I paraphrase, of his previous employees.

I speak only for myself. Indeed, my views probably are not shared even by a majority of the press corps in Saigon.

I feel the press corps in general must be shielded from the continuous charges of bias and malice and such that come from such of our critics as Senators. Privately, newsmen in Viet Nam are at bitter odds with each other and have strong views on every aspect of this problem. Most of them, I'm happy to say, discipline their personal feelings to such a degree that their news copy remains undistorted.

But there are those who feel the press should be uniform in its support for official policy, and that its reporting should conform to this idea. There are those who delight in watching reporters beaten up, maligned and restricted. There are even those who take some pleasure in the fact that ten of us have been killed and about 30 wounded covering this war. Today we were treated once again to the spectacle of Vietnamese police assaulting foreign newsmen, and somehow I had the sensation that nothing changes here; that since 1963 there has not been the slightest vestige of progress, despite the billions of dollars and all the lives.

Against this background, there are some of us who feel the survival of a free press is in grave danger. My own deepest hope is that I will not live to see the day when either our nation's Congress or its news media become obsolete.

Respectfully,

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there be printed in the RECORD certain newspaper articles, telegrams, and correspondence which I have received dealing with the subject matter of my speech today.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, I spoke earlier in my speech today about Memorial Day. I suggested that on Memorial Day we should not only bow our heads in reverence to the brave soldiers of our country who have died in war under the direction of various Commanders in Chief, but that we should also pray that we bring to an end what I consider to be a war that constitutes a sin against humanity in Vietnam; that we stop killing American boys in South Vietnam in a war I consider to be immoral, unconstitutional, and unconscionable. I expressed the hope that on Memorial Day, from their pulpits, the clergy of America would give serious thought, as spiritual leaders, to the question: "Have I, as an individual and minister of God carried out my spiritual responsibility in connection with this war?"

I spoke earlier today about those of us who take the position that this issue is more important than politics; that this issue leaves no room for any consideration of partisan politics, for it pales all other issues into insignificance.

Those of us who take that position must expect that in a period of war hysteria, so-called superpatriotic, jingoistic forces in this country are going to urge that we be silenced; and certainly are going to misrepresent our position, as they have been doing now for quite some time.

But so long as we are in an undeclared war I shall continue to do what I can to urge the American people to defeat candidates for office who are supporting the war, because that is the only answer left to the free people to make the constitutional check that is their right as free men and women. That is why I have said we must stop this administration's bullets in Vietnam with ballots in the United States.

I close my speech today with this great quotation from Mark Twain in a great writing of his "The Mysterious Stranger," which I think is so apropos:

There has never been a just one, never an honorable one—on the part of the instigator of the war. I can see a million years ahead, and this rule will never change in so many as half a dozen instances. The loud little handful—as usual—will shout for the war. The pulpit will—warily and cautiously—object—at first; the great, big, dull bulk of the nation will rub its sleepy eyes and try to make out why there should be a war, and will say, earnestly and indignantly, "It is unjust and dishonorable, and there is no necessity for it." Then the handful will shout louder. A few fair men on the other side will argue and reason against the war with speech and pen, and at first will have a hearing and be applauded; but it will not last long; those others will outshout them, and presently the anti-war audiences will thin out and lose popularity. Before long you will see this curious thing: the speakers stoned from the platform, and free speech strangled by hordes of furious men who in their secret hearts are still at one with those stoned speakers—as earlier—but do not dare to say so. And now the whole nation—pulpit and all—will take up the war-cry, and shout itself hoarse, and mob any honest man who ventures to open his mouth; and presently such mouths will cease to open. Next the statesmen will invent cheap lies, putting the blame upon the nation that is attacked, and every man will be glad of those conscience-soothing fables, and will diligently study them, and refuse to examine any refutations of them; and thus he will by and by convince himself that the war is just, and will thank God for the better sleep he enjoys after this process of grotesque self-deception.

As we bow our heads in prayer this Memorial Day in the veterans' cemeteries across the country, it would be well if we also contemplate this great analysis of a war psychology that came from the pen of Mark Twain.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, May 6, 1966]

EXPERT SAYS NATURE OF THE VIETNAM WAR IS MISUNDERSTOOD

(By Marvin Tims)

American chances for a clear-cut military victory in Vietnam are "virtually nil," a distinguished author and award-winning journalist declared in Eugene Thursday.

Bernard Fall, professor of international relations at Howard University, who has had broad experience in southeast Asia, said in an interview that there is not "the slightest shred of evidence" that the war will be won next year or in the near future.

Winner of the 1966 George A. Polk Award for "outstanding interpretive journalism on Vietnam," Fall, 40, said the American public has been "overly optimistic" about the possibility of a quick military victory.

"This attitude is based largely on a misunderstanding of how a revolutionary movement operates" said Fall, considered to be one of the few experts on Vietnam in the United States.

"Many so-called experts are calling for the bombing of such North Vietnam targets as Haiphong, an industrial center. It is really almost meaningless to bomb these economic targets. . . . A guerrilla combat force doesn't use oil and petrol. It uses guns and rice. Sure, a lack of oil might slow up a few trucks inside North Vietnam, but it won't hamper the Viet Cong in South Vietnam."

Fall is an authority on guerrilla warfare. At the age of 15½ he was serving with the French underground, helping blow up German-held installations inside his native land. And from 1944 until 1946, he served in the infantry and pack artillery of the 4th Moroccan Mountain Division. A Fulbright scholar, he was in Indochina at the time French forces were losing their struggle with Communist forces.

A handsome man who keeps in fighting trim because he keeps going back to the battlefield to do "field studies" for books and magazine articles on Vietnam, Fall left his Howard University (Washington, D.C.) classroom at 4 p.m., Wednesday, boarded a jet and arrived in Eugene at 9 a.m., Thursday. After visiting the rhododendron gardens in Hendricks Park an hour later, he talked with students and faculty members at the University of Oregon Thursday afternoon.

He spoke at a university assembly Thursday evening—his purpose for coming to Eugene. He received a loud and lengthy ovation from an audience of about 250 persons after his 90-minute talk on "Vietnam—Background of War."

An hour later, about 10, p.m., he boarded another airplane which took him back to Howard University in time for a Friday afternoon lecture.

"I try not to miss any of my classes. I feel my main obligation is to my undergraduate students," he said.

A recipient of a 1966 Guggenheim Fellowship to do a sociopolitical field study of the Viet Cong (he didn't want to talk about this subject during the interview), Fall feels a major fault of America's Vietnam policy is that United States officials don't want to discuss possible negotiations with the Viet Cong.

"In all other similar wars where there were guerrillas and out-of-country backers (such as Red China), success lay in talking to both the outside backers and the guerrillas."

"The road to any successful stabilization of the Vietnam situation can only lie with a direct confrontation with the Viet Cong," the journalist said.

During the past year, the Viet Cong has matched the build up, man for man, of American military forces in South Vietnam, Fall said. "The Viet Cong recruited more than 160,000 men inside South Vietnam since last summer. . . . This means we (America) are still fighting mostly a South Vietnam Viet Cong force."

Fall said he isn't "peddling a far left or far right line" in opposing some of America's policies in South Vietnam. "Why, I'm an advisor to the Department of Defense."

He also told students Thursday evening that no one should be afraid of questioning government policies. "Without questions, there will be no answers or free discussion. Democracy withers from disuse—like muscles."

Commenting on the possibility of national elections in South Vietnam, the author said they will be meaningless and "add another layer of illusion" to the political situation unless the people have a wide choice of candidates and issues.

"I don't feel any good can come from the promised elections. The choices for the voter will be too narrow."

Fall said, too, that in South Vietnam "neutrality" is punishable with a sentence of up to five years in jail.

"If this law remains on the books at the time of the elections, the only choices will

be to either keep the war going (for the liberals) or to bomb Peking (for the conservatives)," he said.

Here are some of the major contentions Fall made in his address:

The French said 16 years ago they would win the war in Vietnam by training an army, promoting effective native government, and winning over the peasants. "It is frightening that after 16 years of fighting no one has come up yet with a recipe that works."

Many village chiefs in the late 1950's were killed, primarily because they were not popular with the people. "If they had been popular, they would have been warned before the Viet Cong arrived."

Since January of this year, conditions within the areas already controlled by the American forces have worsened. The only area where headway has been made is in the Mekong Delta region near Saigon. The Viet Cong has lost ground in this area because the territory is controlled by the Buddhists. "This is the only area where there is a competitive ideology."

North Vietnamese leaders in Hanoi do not completely control the Viet Cong forces in the south. "The Viet Cong can not be turned off like water from a faucet—not even by Hanoi."

[From the Columbus (Ohio) State Lantern, May 23, 1966]

BRINKLEY CALLS WAR "POINTLESS, ENDLESS"
(By Phillip Long)

The war in Vietnam is an "endless, pointless, futureless exercise where we are not going to achieve anything substantial," David Brinkley, of the NBC Huntley-Brinkley news team, said yesterday.

Brinkley told about 800 persons at Mershon Auditorium it would be "no disaster" if the United States were to withdraw from Vietnam.

He said we have stuck to a commitment as long as we can.

"You can't support a government if there is no government to support," he said. "There are so many opposing factions fighting each other in Vietnam that they don't seem primarily concerned about fighting the enemy. And the United States is in the middle of it trying to fight a war where there is no front, no line of demarcation between friend and foe."

WAR IS INTERFERING

The war in Vietnam is interfering with everything else America is trying to do, he said.

"The war has become a leaden ball and chain interfering with the purpose of this country both here and abroad," Brinkley said. "It is clogging political communications between America and the Communist nations. The United States cannot get into a discussion with any Communist country without winding up in a conflict over each other's involvement in Vietnam," Brinkley said.

If the United States withdrew from Vietnam, Brinkley said he didn't think it would destroy the prestige of the western world.

"If I might add a word of optimism without being picketed or stoned," he said, "I would say the Communists are experiencing internal difficulties far greater than most people know."

He said Russia must buy wheat because its agricultural system doesn't work. It pays for the wheat with gold, he said, which is worth \$35 an ounce. But it costs Russia \$65 an ounce to mine the gold because of inefficiency, he said.

MAO EXPRESSES CONCERN

He said Mao Tse-tung expressed concern to a reporter that Chinese youth do not have their father's revolutionary zeal for conquering the world.

"They are thinking more about their own personal welfare," Brinkley said. "They even go so far as to hope they might own a car someday and a bicycle until that time."

"Capitalism has its faults but it works. Communism has its faults but it doesn't work."

He said the war is imposing some economic hardships on Americans. However, he said 90 per cent of all money being spent on the military is going to areas other than Vietnam.

DIVIDING THE COUNTRY

Most importantly, Brinkley said, the war is "dividing our country on a foreign policy issue like I have never seen it divided before. We should try to wind up the war and get out from under a tragic and costly burden."

He commented on the possibility of free elections in South Vietnam.

"Vietnam is disintegrating," he said. "Before a country can have free elections there must be order, stability and unity. In Vietnam there is none of this."

HANG ON BY FORCE

"We could hang on by sheer military force, not trying to win but just holding the Communists back. But Americans do not want to support the kind of a war that is costing \$15 billion per year for nothing."

In the question period following his talk, Brinkley was asked if he agreed with a statement made recently by Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that the U.S. might be involved in the war for 10 years.

"I suspect not," Brinkley replied. "No one will say this publicly, but the people who are in real authority doubt that the military can do what it originally said it could do in Vietnam."

'DOMINO EFFECT'

Brinkley was asked to comment on the "domino effect" and how he thought withdrawing from Vietnam would affect other countries of Southeast Asia. He said that retreating would not mean that we would go all the way back to San Francisco. He suggested that we retreat to a friendly country such as Thailand and maintain forces there and see what happens.

Another reason he said he felt getting out of Vietnam would be no disaster was because other countries such as Rhodesia and Indonesia have thrown out the Communists of their own volition, without the help of the United States.

[From Newsweek, May 30, 1966]

A VIEW OF VIETNAM

(By Emmet John Hughes)

I had been in Saigon but a few hours when an American friend told me a trivial incident shared a day earlier with an American officer. The two men had been idly strolling a quiet street near the city's center when the restless eye of the officer caught half-sight of a flashing arm, a few yards off to his side, and then an ominous missile hurtling toward them. He spun swiftly and poised his hands to try to catch the grenade and throw it a safe distance. It flew past him, softly struck a wall, and neatly bounced back to the Vietnamese youth who had thrown it. It was a dirty but innocent rubber ball. As the youth snared it, he smiled with knowing bemusement, then skipped down the street whistling softly, glancing back, and grinning enigmatically. And the Americans were left to blink in wonder over the meaning of his mirth: was he a carefree youth harmlessly laughing at the American's alarm, or a sullen Saigonese spitefully tricking them into panic? They would never know. And when I left Vietnam a week later to continue a journey through Asia and Europe, I could not help feeling that this most unhistoric incident somehow captured—more eloquently than all the military briefings and

embassy conferences—the troubled spirit of the American presence, for all its awesome armor . . . its hazy elusiveness of purpose and its uneasy vision of the future.

I never left Vietnam, in the political sense, on all my travel around the world, for the conflict in Southeast Asia excites the concern of all capitals and foreign offices, from Manila and Singapore to Paris and London. And with absolute unanimity, all ministers and diplomats—Asian or European leftist or rightist—privately voiced a few unvarying sentiments. All regretted the extent of U.S. involvement in Vietnam. All spoke, however, with no hint of conventional anti-Americanism: they simply voiced grave sorrow over the American dilemma. All yearned for diplomatic negotiation and U.S. withdrawal, or politically decent terms. All insisted that such terms would have to accept a major Communist role in South Vietnam's politics. And all deeply feared that both Hanoi and Peking would spurn any negotiation for the foreseeable future. As one of the highest officials in the British Foreign Office stated the matter: "To the cool eye of Peking, you have been led to commit 300,000 men to a struggle that costs China exactly nothing. If you were Peking, why would you negotiate?"

Through Southeast Asia, there await ready retorts to an American's common question: why is not the grim continuance of the war blamed more upon Communist obstinacy than American militancy? In the first place, there recurs a refusal to equate the military interventions of Hanoi and of Washington. As one quite pro-Western statesman insisted to me: "The two actions look to us very different. They are not just Asian: they are Vietnamese. And you cannot contend that the military behavior of one half of a small country toward its other half resembles closely the intervention, from 10,000 miles away, of the world's greatest military power." And in the second place, there prevails a general skepticism about U.S. promises to accept a neutralist Vietnam. As one Foreign Minister argued: "Your ambassadors and your generals keep saying that you are waging war in the holy name of 'anti-Communism.' Yet Washington keeps saying it will gladly negotiate with the Communists and accept their popular election to a Saigon government. It is hard to understand how you can sincerely hold both views. In fact, it is hard to know just what your government imagines is going to be won out of all this."

It is no easier to know the answer after an intensive look at the Vietnam scene itself.

It is a scene of almost stunning disproportions and incongruities. "Your military expansion in a country of less than 15 million," a Saigon editor wryly remarked to me, "may mean that we have witnessed right here, this last year, the most sudden population explosion in the world." The size of U.S. forces is no more striking, moreover, than their élan: from the gifted Gen. William Westmoreland down, they display poise and verve. And yet this, too, seems to have its anomalous aspect. During a full day of helicopter-hopping with Westmoreland to a string of isolated Special Forces outposts near the Cambodian border, I found one memorable instant singularly sad. It came in the form of the happy retort of the local commanding officer in the green beret after Westmoreland had asked for any proof of Viet Cong weakness in the area: "Oh, yes, sir. In recent months, we had one villager inform on Viet Cong movements. And we welcomed one deserter: a 17-year-old girl. Sir, these are encouraging signs."

It is a scene clouded, too, with all the contradictions and confusions of judgment that often have baffled the U.S. public. In Saigon, the private forecasts of U.S. diplomats and U.S. generals concur perfectly on only one point: the public forecasts in Vietnam by Washington have been absurdly optimistic.

But the authoritative witnesses agree on very little else. There is no more informed U.S. diplomat in Saigon than the man who assured me one day: "We have taken the military bounce out of the Viet Cong, and one more year will dramatically reduce our casualty lists." But there is no more informed U.S. general in Saigon than the realist who warned me the next day: "There is no significant turning in sight. Probably, the planned rate of Vietnam recruitment will have to be cut back: we have asked too much of them. Certainly, the American casualty rate will stay near the same ratio for a long time: the larger the forces, the more the casualties." And all informed guesses as to when a kind of success might crown the vast American effort fall in a sweeping time span: somewhere between five years and one generation hence.

And it is a scene that quickly betrays some critical deceptions attempted by some U.S. policymakers and their propagandists. To be specific . . .

It is not possible to respect a regime under Premier Nguyen Cao Ky as concerned with democracy or competent to govern. The Premier is immature and shallow, vastly pretentious and wildly mercurial. I found him thus, throughout one of his three-hour monologues, and any responsible American in Saigon knows him to be thus. Asked to contemplate a negotiated peace with Hanoi—at any time, or on any terms—he has a flat and final way of scorning the notion: "I would rather go out and shoot myself." As for political enemies within his own borders, he views them with a giddy contempt, and he enjoys intoning a rather lethal kind of litany: "If I wish, I could destroy them all." As for U.S. politicians and U.S. publicists who have hailed Ky as a serious hope for Vietnam's future—after the tinsel drama of the Honolulu conference—they have much to answer for.

It is no more believable for the U.S. to pretend that its Vietnam policy faithfully follows the free will of the people than to pretend that its Communist foes are mere "bandits" surviving solely by "terror." Despite their public pieties, the U.S. Embassy and the U.S. military privately dread the prospect of national elections. The fear is not quixotic: who can guess how a people so scarred by war, and so impoverished in leadership, will practice sovereignty? Throughout this spring's political crisis, therefore, the U.S. pressed Ky hard to put down the Buddhists and to put off the elections. Now the next American hope rests on a grudging constitutional formula: an assembly indirectly elected, only the President chosen by popular vote and the President empowered to rule in any crisis by emergency decree.

It is utterly untrue to blame the country's political ferment on the cryptic politics or ambitions of a cabal of Buddhist monks. As falsehood always begets falsehood, this fiction is essentially the invention of those U.S. propagandists who must explain away their earlier fabrication, namely: a South Vietnam that had "turned the corner" in military security and political progress. The Buddhist protesters did not wantonly wreck this political Camelot; it never existed. And the agitations of Buddhists or students or workers are most plainly symptoms, not causes, of a half-nation in half-agony. Nor are the causes mysterious or malevolent. There has to be some war fatigue in the people. There has to be some resentment of the economic shocks caused by a foreign army of a quarter-million men. And there has to be a nagging awareness and a wearying regret—among the urban educated as well as the rural illiterate—that their present war and their future destiny no longer seem theirs for the waging or the winning. As one Saigon professor gently asked me: "Do you realize how long it has been since we made a major decision about war or peace? And if

I just meekly ask you where you are taking us—can you tell me?"

I could not.

The riddle must bring at least some anguish to all caught in it. And it seems rooted in a strange anomaly. For sometimes a great modern nation has been chastised for allowing its undaring politicians to disparage or to deter the power of its undaunted military: so it was said of France in its own Vietnam struggle. But it has remained for the United States to contrive the contrary blunder: to credit its military power with a gift for the most elaborate political achievement—the making of a new and free nation.

This stays—as it has always appeared—the fatal flaw. It is a debatable theory that the Vietnam conflict has perilously overextended U.S. power militarily, for some U.S. presence presumably could stay impregnable for decades. But it is a demonstrable fact that U.S. policy has overextended itself with reckless extravagance politically. This involvement is wholly without precedent in American policy. It bears no analogy at all to the defense of Germany or Korea or Greece. For the American undertaking here—and here alone—implies an intent profoundly different from defending free nationhood and repelling aggression. Behind the military shield, it means educating a whole people to govern themselves when they have never done so. It means discovering a corps of democratic leaders where it has never existed. It means writings laws and combating poverty. It means inventing new political institutions and fostering new political parties. And far from the simple defense of free nationhood, it means arousing a sturdy sense of nationality in a people who have never been a nation.

Such a nearly delirious design would require, among many remarkable things, one luxury above all: a vast amount of time. But time is running out in Vietnam. The five years—or the generation—coveted by U.S. planners cannot be wrested from the turbulent politics or the tired people. The people's clamor, always confused and often querulous, yet carries a simple appeal: if not pacification, at least participation. But the harshly ironic truth is that the self-government of Vietnam, so revered in official American oratory, only carries menace to official American policy. For must not the deepest impulses of any Vietnamese civilian assembly soon prove to be a collective desire to show independence of the Americans and a competitive desire to appear the man or the faction most ingenious in talking the foe toward peace? Just two days before Premier Ky agreed to hold elections, I asked this question of a most authoritative spokesman for U.S. policy in Saigon. And he answered bluntly: "If any elected assembly sits in Saigon, it will be on the phone negotiating with Hanoi within one week."

The choices that now are left to the United States would appear almost tormenting.

They suggest, both politically and militarily, a set of self-locking dilemmas. If national elections are stifled, the U.S. presence must shelter behind a succession of sometimes servile, sometimes surly, military regimes. If national elections are free, the U.S. presence—while by no means sure to be instantly denounced—nonetheless instantly becomes the creature of the vagaries of Saigonese politics. If U.S. military progress stalls, Hanoi or Peking need only relax and rejoice. If U.S. military progress quickens, Hanoi or Peking need only hint a desire to negotiate with Saigon or Washington—with the sure knowledge that the hint would suffice to set each capital at odds with itself and with the other.

All the bleak choices rather inexorably dissolve, however, toward one. As a wise and sympathetic statesman of Southeast Asia stated to me: "You are going to leave Vietnam. You are not going to be routed. And if

humiliated: your armadas and your bombers make you the greatest power in the South Pacific. But you are going to leave because the earth-bound politics of Vietnam cannot be solved by the airborne cavalry of America.

"You now have probably a last decision to make. You may try to smother all forces in Vietnam seeking compromise and peace—thus pitting them all against you. Or you may try to work *with* the best of these forces in their confused attempts at negotiation, so that the very imperfect end of it all still will allow you to leave with dignity. Your last choice, then, is clear: either you will one day withdraw because you shrewdly appear to *want* to—or because it plainly appears you *have* to. Is this really so hard a choice?"

It may not seem a hard choice in abstract logic, but it is a stern choice in American politics. It would require of Washington almost a convulsion of candor and a revolution in courage. This means the courage to concede, after all, that the present hope of history for Vietnam has never been more, in truth, than a nation dueling with Peking much as Poland duels with Moscow. It means the resolve to ignore all zealots who still shout their preposterous prescription that a little more military medicine can cure political sickness. And it means the wisdom to sense that American repute in Asia is not dignified but diminished by untrusting war for the unattainable victory . . . and American honor is not tarnished but brightened when so great a power can say, with quiet assurance: we have judged poorly, fought splendidly, and survived confidently.

I can think of no other way that the leaders of the United States might match the courage of the soldiers they have dispatched.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, May 12, 1966]

CHOICE IN VIETNAM

Washington decisions on the course of the war in Viet Nam are now in the making, and we earnestly hope the recommendations Ambassador Lodge and Administration leaders are preparing for President Johnson will lead to rational action. To this end the alternatives will have to be set forth realistically.

It was reported last Sunday by Marquis W. Childs that the Capital sees Mr. Johnson as facing a crisis of decision—basically between deploying 500,000 to 600,000 American troops in South Viet Nam, and directing the bombing of Hanoi and Halphong and the access routes involving Laos, Cambodia and the China-North Viet Nam border, each course being risky and uncertain.

If these should be the alternatives (and we do not believe they are) the decision has been made to escalate the war and Mr. Johnson has to decide only how it should be done. In this view Mr. Johnson is depicted as choosing not between the hawks and the doves, but between two groups of hawks. The doves are not in the picture at all.

The argument is made that the President feels his critics should support his course of "moderation" to strengthen his hand against those who want an all-out war. There is something to this, but we would hold it more valid if Mr. Johnson took steps to strengthen his own hand. He knows something about the marshaling of public opinion, yet he has done little or nothing to bring public pressure against the hawks. Quite the contrary.

It is false and dangerous to see the choice as lying among various forms of escalation. The choice is clearly between escalation and a holding action leading to a negotiated peace. It is simply unthinkable that the mightiest nation has no control over its destiny. It may be true that, as Arthur Schlesinger Jr. suggests, the President lacks self-confidence in dealing with his foreign-policy advisers.

Yet there is a great deal that he could do to alter the terms of the decision-making process. He could send Mr. Lodge back to Saigon with instructions to make a vigorous and publicized effort to assure free Viet Name elections promptly. He could sincerely, and repeatedly, commend such men as Senators FULBRIGHT, MORSE, GRUENING and MANSFIELD for trying to inform the American people of what really is at stake in Indochina and what the real alternatives are. He could encourage others to speak out.

If Mr. Johnson would do this, and we are confident he knows how to do it, we think he could bring about a change in atmosphere that would greatly fortify his position against the hawks, and greatly strengthen him in the pursuit of the objectives he enunciates but does not seek in practice.

He had a fine opportunity in the speech he delivered at Princeton University Wednesday. But he did not take advantage of it. He defended his Viet Name policy as one of restraint, not arrogance, and in effect stated that his critics were guided by emotionalism and a lack of knowledge of the realities the President must deal with.

We do not see any vague intellectualism or fuzzy concepts in the views of Mr. FULBRIGHT, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. They are as practical as Arkansas from whence he comes. The policies he advocates would bring sanity to the whole Viet Nam situation; those the Administration is following lead toward disaster.

This is the real framework of the alternatives open to Mr. Johnson.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, May 9, 1966]

KY TIPS HIS HAND

If the United States has any hope of creating a stable government in South Viet Nam it ought to be mounting a strong offensive in behalf of free elections to choose a civilian regime. If anything is being done in this direction we do not know what it is. On the contrary, our man in Saigon, Premier Ky, is boasting he will stay in power another year, at least.

Premier Ky has become a dreadful liability and the United States ought to be helping the Viet Name get rid of him. The press conference he held at Can Tho on Saturday was like a scene from Batman. He was wearing a bright yellow flying suit and swigging bourbon whisky out of a paper cup. It is incredible that the United States has embraced this person.

But that is not the worst of Premier Ky. When the Viet Name dissidents had him on the ropes a few weeks ago he issued a decree promising national elections for within three to five months from last April 14; the general expectation was that the date would be in mid-August.

Now Ky says the time has been moved back to a period between Sept. 15 and Oct. 1 for balloting to choose an assembly charged with drafting a constitution. Then there will have to be another vote to elect a legislative assembly, which will appoint a civilian government, he asserts. And all this will take a year, during which Premier Ky will remain "in power."

Ky's statement produced the ludicrous spectacle of the Saigon government censoring his remarks to prevent the people from finding out what he said, and the American Secretary of State claiming he did not say it.

Whether the Buddhists and other opponents of the United States-backed military junta will consider this a breach of faith, remains to be seen. But what is worse is that Ky reveals he has no conception of what the election is all about. If the elected government is Communist or neutralist "I and my friends will fight it," he says.

This juvenile arrogance was displayed in the presence of the acting United States Am-

bassador, William J. Porter, who must have been embarrassed. It rang particularly false in that Ky's government is actually dead; the shell survives only because Ky was forced to agree to elections. And now he says he won't abide by the results if he doesn't like them.

"I expect to stay in power for at least another year, there is no doubt about that," Ky says. We believe he is a profound optimist. We do not think the Viet Name will wait another year. The Americans cannot very well dump him but they can devote a great deal more energy to preparing for a vote. Isn't that part of the democracy we are supposed to be bringing to Viet Nam?

Let the voters take care of Gen. Ky—and soon.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, May 9, 1966]

LESS ARROGANCE, LESS AGONY

President Johnson's estrangement from the intellectual community is not likely to be repaired by his address at Princeton University. It was among other things an appeal for sympathy with those who, like himself, must exercise power in the world. But sympathy has never been lacking. The President's critics in intellectual circles fully understand the agony of decision and all that; they do not question his motives. They do question some of the assumptions of our Government's foreign policy, some of the purposes for which our admittedly inescapable power are used, the growing divergence between what we do and what we say we are doing.

It was interesting that the President indirectly chided his academic critics for "strident emotionalism . . . disguised in the language of wisdom." Intellectuals, it should be agreed, sometimes get carried away by their feelings, like anybody else. When they depart from the path of reason, they deserve rebuke. Yet we know of no more conspicuous example of strident emotionalism than the President's own tendency, in common with Dean Rusk, to identify American intervention in an anti-colonial Asian revolution with the defense of Europe against Hitler's aggressions. This is bringing a "purist approach to a highly impure problem" with a veneer.

Mr. Johnson appears to have persuaded himself that those who advocate a new policy in Asia somehow do not cherish freedom there as they cherish it in Europe. What will history say, he asks, if we shirk the "obligations of power" that have been thrust upon us now as they were in the '30s? Those who oppose an endlessly expanding war in Asia love freedom as much as he does. They just do not agree that it is freedom we are fighting for when we employ massive power, first economic and then military, for the purpose of destroying an internationally sanctioned settlement of an anti-colonial war.

They do not agree that we liberate South Viet Nam when under the sanctions of war we invite the people to "choose" any government so long as it is an anti-Communist government. Nor do they agree that it is a limited objective to establish an open-ended military position on the Asian mainland under the guise of protecting a "nation" of our own invention, which cannot survive except under permanent military protection from permanent bases we keep saying we do not want. As the thin crescent of the new moon looks quite different from the full moon, so it is possible to depict the Viet Nam war as a response to "aggression" by confining attention to the recent period of Hanoi's intervention. History will insist upon looking at the whole record—at the full moon instead of its minor phases. From that perspective the United States will be seen not as heroically rescuing a "small, striving nation" but as interposing its own power in a civil war

for the purpose of the military containment of China. Hanoi's intervention will be seen as a response to ours, and the people of South Viet Nam as the tragic victims of alien national conflict.

If there were a true parallel between Viet Nam and the war against Hitler, the "aggression" against which the President summons us to war would be clearly defined as such by the court of world opinion, as it was in Europe 30 years ago. No such international verdict can be obtained, and it is an arrogance of power indeed to substitute our own *ex parte* judgment for the world's. The international community does not support the war we say we are fighting in its behalf; it would, however, support with unreserved enthusiasm an American decision to adopt new Asian objectives which would make a political settlement in Viet Nam possible. And so, we believe, would the American people.

Those new objectives would not represent a withdrawal of strength, which the President at Princeton indicated to be the only alternative to his present course. Rather they would represent a change in the way we exert our strength. Instead of seeking a national military lodgment on the mainland, we would seek a militarily neutral Southeast Asia as contemplated by the Geneva agreements. Instead of trying to contain China with our own military power at the end of a long supply line, we would rely on strengthening the indigenous forces of Asian nationalism. Instead of waging an ideological crusade against Communism, we would accept the necessity to live in a diverse world with Communism of all varieties. Instead of expending blood and treasure to establish mainland bases for a future war with China, we would renounce the very thought of such a war, relying for defense on our massive nuclear power and the panoply of positions which make the Pacific an American lake.

In such a policy, we would find not only less arrogance of power, but less agony.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, May 22, 1966]

JOHNSON BLASTS 'NERVOUS NELLIES'

In his latest call to the American people to unite behind the Administration for the prosecution of the Vietnam war, President Johnson's apparent motive is to isolate and muffle criticism and thus to build a consensus of faith and trust in his leadership.

He asks people to ask themselves if every candidate in the elections now coming up "is helping the cause of his country" or his own cause. "Is he trying to draw us together and unite our land, or is he trying to pull us apart to promote himself?"

On its face, this is not a direct attack on Senators FULBRIGHT, MORSE, CHURCH, CLARK, and numerous other critics in the Senate who have been outspoken in their concern over the trend of Vietnam policy. But it leaves no other inference than that he meant to include these men among the "nervous Nellies" who, he says, are failing to put their country first.

Any who call in question the direction we are going, who raise doubts about the integrity of the South Vietnamese regime, who express concern about the pace at which we are stepping up air attacks on North Vietnam are, by the President's implication, turning on "their own leaders, their own country and their own fighting men."

By putting the crisis in these either/or terms, the President is, to say the least, asking for a great deal of loyal belief in his infallibility.

The same day Mr. Johnson was speaking in Chicago the Secretary of State stated in Washington that the situation in South Vietnam was causing "restiveness" among the American people (this mild word can only be called an understatement). Reading on in the day's news from Saigon, one learns that

in the view of a U.S. official there we are "really hanging on the edge of a precipice" and that what Premier Ky has already done "may be irreparable" and that if it is, we are witnessing "the greatest possible disaster—a complete disintegration."

In the face of events of this magnitude, one could hope for a more candid and pragmatic discussion of where we are and where we may be headed than one finds in the optimistic appeal of President Johnson to join hands and trust ourselves to God's hands.

It isn't that he is to blame for the political brink of disaster to which all have been carried by the clique of headstrong generals who run Vietnam. It isn't that one doubts his earnest wish to get the job over with at the least cost in lives. President Johnson has a terrible and unsharable burden. But we do not think Senator FULBRIGHT or anyone else can justly be requested, in the national interest, to mute his criticism.

Every day's accounts of the Vietnam crisis cry out for the kind of debate and discussion they are getting in the Senate, if not in the White House. The President's disparagement of criticism and of the patriotism of those from whom it comes is utterly out of place.

[From the Kansas City Star, May 17, 1966]

UNITED STATES FINDS ITSELF BOXED INTO VIETNAM CRISIS

The helplessness of the United States either to guide or influence the course of events in South Vietnam once more has been demonstrated. The volatile Premier Nguyen Cao Ky apparently took his American associates entirely by surprise in ordering 2,500 of his best troops into action against dissident—but basically non-Communist—Buddhist elements in the central highlands district.

Ky struck at a time when the chief U.S. representative in Saigon, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, was in Washington for consultations. Allowing for oversimplification, it was a case of the tough guy-premier taking matters unto himself when he figured that he was most likely to get away with it. Considering the resourcefulness of his Buddhist opponents, however, Ky may have overplayed his hand. A plunge into actual civil war between non-Communist Vietnamese is not inconceivable.

The strongman premier has the tanks, planes and weapons—all courtesy of his American supporters—to slaughter rebels in his own army and the civilians affiliated with them. But the Buddhists are capable of employing self-immolation and street agitation to bring down a regime even more firmly entrenched than Ky's. The political priests proved that by toppling the Diem government in the fall of 1963.

U.S. officials had hoped the disorder and bloodshed that accompanied Diem's downfall could be avoided during a scheduled transition from military to civilian rule. Until Ky's smash into the coastal city of Da Nang last weekend, a peaceful change of power appeared at least possible. Now it seems all but certain that Ky's power play will generate further violence and turmoil.

The explanation that a state of anarchy in the Da Nang-Hue area had to be suppressed is not convincing. But it is the official line of the 10-man Saigon junta which Ky serves as the trigger finger. Now Ky's crackdown on the country's second largest city may have thrown into disarray a timetable for shifting to popular rule. The schedule was to have produced a constituent assembly in September, followed by the drafting of a constitution and then a second election for a legislative assembly.

This latest in the long procession of Vietnamese crises is extremely unfortunate for several reasons. Ky himself has been generally effective as a national leader. His administration has permitted the greatest de-

gree of free expression that Vietnam has known in modern times. Moreover, definite progress was observable both in fighting the enemy and in strengthening the nation's economy and social structure.

But now the hopes for advancing toward a measure of national unity have been severely diminished. The heightened unrest will likely undercut the over-all authority of the Saigon government. And the Communists will feed on the confusion, as they have done previously amid turbulence. For the United States there is the sharpened anguish from deep involvement of American interests and prestige but with virtually no direction over the tumult of large events in South Vietnam.

[From the Manchester Guardian, Apr. 28, 1966]

AMERICANS EDUCATE THEIR GOVERNMENT ON VIETNAM

North Vietnamese leaders have frequently been accused of overestimating the effectiveness of opposition in the United States to the American commitment in the war in Vietnam—and with justice, if we may believe the accounts of visitors to Hanoi like Mr. James Cameron. The latest Gallup poll suggests that 54 per cent of Americans still approve of the way in which President Johnson is handling the situation. But a more significant figure is that over 30 per cent disapprove, and the views of these dissenters can no longer, as they once could, be written off as politically insignificant among the numerous factors that go to mould American policy. The dissenters have gained a new respectability; it is no longer unpatriotic to oppose the war. Congressmen, during visits to their home territory over the Easter recess, are said to have been impressed by the lack of enthusiasm among those who they hope will be voting them back in November, although many doubters, it is true, want the war to be ended by still more vigorous prosecution of it.

Perhaps it is not surprising that the war should be the more opposed the better it becomes known. With nearly a quarter of a million American troops involved it can no longer be overlooked among other preoccupations; nor can its continual failure to run its course according to the plans of the Administration. If President Johnson, Mr. McNamara, and Mr. Rusk are always being shown by events to have got things wrong, it is inevitable that more attention will be paid to the analysis of their critics. And alongside the education provided by the news headlines day by day, the critics themselves have become more effective. A turning point came with the hearing this year of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee earlier this year, but it is fitting that Senator FULBRIGHT, the hero of those encounters, should have paid tribute last week to those who pioneered the struggle when nobody else was interested. "It is only when the Congress fails to challenge the executive," he said, "when politicians join in a spurious consensus behind controversial policies, that the campuses and streets and public squares of America are likely to become the forums of a direct and disorderly democracy."

And these protestors have had their successes—not only in opening up the subject for national debate but also, after all, in direct contributions to American policy. Consider how much has changed in just over a year. At the beginning of 1965 Washington deplored suggestions that it should end the war by negotiations; now it constantly proclaims its desire to do so. Then it made clear its dislike of the Geneva agreements; now it claims to support them. It will accept, it says, the verdict of the elections even if they result in a neutralist Government; it will talk with Vietcong representatives if they form part of a Hanoi delegation; now it even seems to be hinting that it would take part in talks in which

they were independent "essential elements" from South Vietnam.

It is true that at the same time the war has been enlarged to a pitch of horror that was equally inconceivable then; it is true, too, that the United States domestic opposition cannot take sole credit for the more conciliatory language that Administration spokesmen use. This language has been largely dictated by events, partly by the failure of foreign Governments to give the United States the support to which it feels it is entitled. (Partly also by Mr. Wilson's midnight telephone calls?) But the present state of public opinion in the United States does seem to provide fresh evidence that voices crying in the wilderness may eventually be heard, provided that events prove that they have been crying the right things.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, May 19, 1966]

**A PATTERN BEGINS TO EMERGE (AN ANALYSIS):
EVENTS IN VIETNAM CONTINUALLY MOCK
U.S. PREDICTIONS**

(By William S. Ryan)

How accurate have United States leaders been in assessing developments and prospects in embattled, tumultuous South Vietnam?

A recapitulation of some of their less lucky statements about a frustrating war in a frustrating country suggests that a pattern has been repeating itself over and over with deadly regularity.

Events mock the assessments, the predictions and the sometimes guarded optimism of harassed United States Administration leaders.

Absence of an ambassador from his post in Saigon can be almost a signal for some new and shocking development. A United States strategy conference in Honolulu can be transformed into an omen of Saigon turmoil to come.

Time after time Washington expresses surprise at a sudden stormy development in Saigon's politics. Now, once again, Washington is surprised as it looks at a new crisis, this one evoking echoes of the 1963 turmoil which brought down the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem.

Only a week ago, Secretary of State Dean Rusk remarked to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that "some interpretations may have been overdrawn" in the reporting of a statement by Premier Nguyen Cao Ky.

Ky, discussing prospective South Vietnam elections, said it would take at least a year to prepare orderly transition to civilian rule and he expected to remain in power that long. Rusk said Ky was "not going to try to stand in the way of the constitutional and electoral process."

A few days later Ky himself left little room for misinterpretation. Washington received another in a long series of Vietnam jolts when Ky sent Government troops into Da Nang to seize that strategic port city from his political foes.

Ky's action immediately ignited the anger of the politically powerful Buddhists—the same Buddhists who brought down the Diem regime in November, 1963. Fears were expressed of civil war in a nation already tormented by a frustrating war with Communist guerrillas.

The current upheaval came while Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge was in Washington for consultations. This pattern is familiar, too.

In the summer of 1963, the fateful Buddhist crisis built up during the vacation of Ambassador Frederick Nolting.

The crisis was at a high temperature when he returned. Before his departure, with Lodge about to succeed him, Nolting made a prediction:

"Victory over the Viet Cong in my judgment is well on its way in Vietnam, provided only that unity of purpose and per-

severance in action are not weakened by internal dissension."

The internal dissension was already there and burning furiously.

In his one year as ambassador, July 1964 to June 1965, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor left Saigon for Washington four times. During three of those absences there were political upheavals in Saigon. Only once did Taylor return to find in office the same men who were there when he left.

Administration figures, such as Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and Rusk have been frequently unlucky with assessments and predictions regarding the Vietnam war. United States military men, too, frequently were confounded by the frustrating way events developed in Vietnam.

In 1962, military men in Vietnam were expressing the opinion that the way to win the war was to kill more and more Viet Cong. But they found that the more Viet Cong were killed, the more there were.

In 1962, the hard-core main force of guerrillas was estimated at 20,000. The main force is now estimated at 60,000 and overall Viet Cong strength at 203,000, exclusive of 30,000 North Vietnam regulars said to have poured into the South since early 1965. And there still is a big pool in the North.

Perhaps the least lucky with predictions and assessments has been McNamara.

In September, 1963, McNamara and Taylor visited Vietnam. They reported to President John F. Kennedy "their judgment that the major part of the United States military task can be completed by the end of 1965" and that the need for major United States involvement would end then.

Two months later a military coup brought down the Diem regime.

Rusk and McNamara went to Honolulu for a crisis conference, and total support was expressed for the new top man, Maj. Gen. Duong Van Minh.

At the end of 1963, McNamara expressed optimism about prospects for 1964, noting that the rate of Communist attacks had "declined dramatically." On Jan. 27, 1964, he noted that Minh's government "has considerably more popular support than its predecessor and the military revolutionary committee is beginning to take action to intensify military operations and improve civil administration."

Three days later, Minh was evicted by a coup and Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh was in. Minh had been going downhill all along.

And the fact of 1964 was that Communist attacks, rather than declining, increased in intensity.

A few days later McNamara said he and President Johnson were delighted with General Khanh's plans to step up the war. On Feb. 18 he said, "The United States will pull out most troops by 1965, even if the anti-Communist drive falters" in Vietnam. Keeping all American troops in South Vietnam, he said, "would be a waste of our personnel." What if the South Vietnamese effort should cease in?

"I don't believe that pouring in hundreds of thousands of troops is the solution," said McNamara. He said the Administration had no plans to do so.

Today there are 255,000 United States troops in Vietnam.

After a visit to Saigon in March, 1964, McNamara remarked: "I think General Khanh has got it now. I was most impressed with their pacification program and now all we have to do is help administer it." The pacification program had difficulty getting off the ground.

McNamara, who had made many public demonstrations of support for Khanh in South Vietnam, was back there again in May, 1964, with Taylor, and the two reported "excellent progress."

The Secretary did say, however, it might be necessary to send more United States

troops on training missions and to reconsider plans for withdrawal of most of the 15,000-man force by the end of 1965. Now he said it would be a "long, hard war." In less than three months, a major United States buildup was in progress.

In June, 1964, Administration representatives consulted in Honolulu on the Vietnam situation. Lodge left Saigon to campaign in Presidential primaries and Taylor took his place. And a storm was brewing.

Suddenly Khanh, under heavy political pressure, announced he was stepping out as premier. A civilian became premier, and Saigon floundered for a while under civilian rule sponsored by the military. Khanh remained in the background, feuding, incidentally, with Taylor.

This—August, 1964—was the month of "escalation." Communist gunboats attacked United States warships in the Tonkin Gulf, and the Americans retaliated with air strikes against the gunboats' bases in North Vietnam.

In July, 1965, McNamara was back in South Vietnam, now under Ky's rule after a bewildering series of coups and political maneuvers. He noted a deterioration in the situation since he had last been there 14 months before. But in November, 1965, ending yet another visit, he said his most dramatic impression was that "We have stopped losing the war."

Last week, McNamara conceded that political turmoil in South Vietnam cut United States military effectiveness, but he predicted "that will terminate shortly."

Then South Vietnam blew up again. Early this year President Johnson traveled to Honolulu and gave his personal endorsement to Ky and the chief of state, Lieut. Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu, as young leaders determined that a social revolution should not wait until the guns went silent. He said, "The leaders of both governments are determined that we shall move forward."

There are some who say now that the Honolulu meeting was a mistake, indeed a political blunder. It foretold new political trouble in South Vietnam.

Some commentators pointed out that the display of United States patronage for Ky offended feelings of national sovereignty and dignity in South Vietnam. And Ky appeared to be emboldened by the meeting to take a firm stand against a military rival in the 1st Corps area—the scene of the latest big explosion.

[From Diplomat, June 1966]

OUR VIETNAMESE COMMITMENT

(By Henry Steele Commager)

As the war in Vietnam has escalated, so too has the American commitment. The term commitment, almost unknown in earlier discussions or statements, emerged only with this administration, and it has swiftly taken on an almost mystical character. President Johnson has asserted that our commitment is a moral one, which deeply involves our "national honor," and Secretary Rusk has given us authoritative assurance that it is a binding legal commitment as well. Interestingly, "commitment" has escalated not only forwards but backwards. Though the term was not used during the Eisenhower administration, President Johnson has conferred upon it retroactive authority. "Our commitment," he said, "is just the same as the commitment made by President Eisenhower in 1954."

Let us then consider the nature and the obligation of this commitment. It is not a doctrinaire or an academic consideration, any more than questions of due process are doctrinaire in the search for justice. Furthermore, it is an issue which may determine the attitude of our seven associates in the SEATO Defense Treaty and far more

important, of the uncommitted members of the United Nations.

Now the odd thing about this commitment in South Vietnam is its elusiveness: it has a quicksilver character about it. Those who insist upon it are quite dogmatic, but one is never quite sure what it is. And no wonder, for it never seems to stay the same from one crisis to another—scarcely even from one speech to another. Originally it was President Eisenhower's letter to Diem of October 25, 1954; then it was Paragraph 2 of Chapter IV of the SEATO Defense Treaty; then it was the Tonkin Gulf Resolution of 1964. Most recently, under prodding from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Secretary Rusk has gone back to the SEATO Treaty, but has now jettisoned Paragraph 2, and substituted for it Paragraph 1—for all the world as if we had always relied upon that particular provision. It is worth noting during all this discussion of obligation and commitment that no one—no one in the State Department anyway—seems to have given any consideration to our obligations and commitments under the U.N. Charter.

Let us take a close look at some of these "commitments."

First, then, the Eisenhower letter of October 1954—the commitment upon which President Johnson so confidently relied in his speech of June 2, 1964. . . . What did it say? It said four things. First, that "we have been exploring ways and means to permit our aid to Vietnam to be more effective . . . I am instructing the American Ambassador . . . to examine . . . hold an intelligent program of American aid . . . can serve to assist." Second, it said that "the purpose of this offer is to assist the government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." Third, it pointed out that "the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms." And fourth, it hoped that "such aid . . . will contribute effectively towards an independent Vietnam endowed with a strong government."

Clearly this is not a commitment at all. It is a proposal for an "inquiry," for a "critical examination," into the possibilities of aid, and this only on certain conditions—conditions which, it is proper to add, were not met.

President Eisenhower himself did not regard his letter to Diem as a commitment. He did not permit the United States to get involved militarily with South Vietnam. Even his aid program was predominantly non-military, and as for military aid, the total American corps of "advisers"—and they were really advisers—was less than 1,000 when he left office. To this day Mr. Eisenhower refuses to admit that he made any "commitment" to send fighting forces to Vietnam, and it is out of respect for his position that the State Department has now decided to abandon this much-abused letter as the primary sanction for our current commitment.

It is proper to add here a marginal comment. Even had President Eisenhower intended his letter to be a kind of commitment, it would have had no binding force; the President cannot, by private letter, commit the United States to war or quasi-war.

The second basis for our commitment is the SEATO Defense Treaty of 1954. This, indeed, has now emerged as the preferred legal authority upon which Secretary Rusk is prepared to rest his case. It is a shaky authority.

What does it say?

Note that it begins by "reiterating . . . faith in the purposes and principles set

forth in the Charter of the United Nations." And it adds that:

The parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means . . . and to refrain, in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

But now we come to the heart of the matter, only to discover that there are two hearts and that they are, apparently, interchangeable. They are the two parts of Article IV. The first paragraph asserts that "aggression" against any of the parties to the treaty or against any territory which the parties designate, would endanger peace, and pledges the signatories "to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes." It also provides that whatever measures are taken "shall be immediately reported to the Security Council." The second paragraph addresses itself to the problem of "subversion." If the integrity of the territory which we undertake to protect "is threatened in any way other than by armed attack or is affected or threatened by any fact or situation which might endanger the peace" of the area, then the signatories of the treaty shall "consult" and agree on measures for the common defense.

Until recently, we have, in fact, sought to justify our intervention in Vietnam under this paragraph which deals with subversion rather than aggression. The difficulty here is that Paragraph 2 calls specifically for collective consultation, and that this was clearly understood at the time the treaty was adopted. So said Secretary Dulles, who ought to have known, as he drew it up. In reply to a question from Senator Green about the nature of the American obligation to put down subversion or insurrection, the Secretary explained that "if there is a revolutionary movement in Vietnam or Thailand, we (the SEATO members) would consult together as to what to do about it, because . . . a subversive movement that was in fact propagated by Communism would be a very great threat to us. But we have no understanding to put it down; all we have is an undertaking to consult together as to what to do about it." Senator George of the Foreign Relations Committee asserted succinctly that "The treaty does not call for automatic action; it calls for consultation. I cannot emphasize too strongly that we have no obligation . . . to take positive measures of any kind. All that we are obligated to do is consult together." The requirement of collective action was then slightly modified two years ago to permit one party to act if there was no dissenting vote. But, at the last two meetings of the SEATO Council, France threatened to veto any action by the United States, so we have not brought the matter up at all.

Now, however, Secretary Rusk has shifted his, and our, position to the first paragraph of the much disputed Article IV. It is asserted, we face not subversion but overt aggression, and are therefore authorized to act unilaterally. But this paragraph, too, is fraught with difficulties. There is first the problem of "aggression." As Vietnam is one nation, not two—that is specifically provided for in the Geneva Agreements and validated by eight hundred years of history—it is by no means clear that "infiltration" of anywhere from 20,000 to 30,000 Vietnamese into the South constitutes "aggression." This point was made by George Kennan in his testimony on our Vietnamese involvement to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate:

I think the use of the word "aggression" with what we are facing today in Vietnam is confusing . . . The border between North and South Vietnam is of a curious quality. It was not meant originally to be the bor-

der between states. This is, of course, in part, the invasion of one country, if one wants to describe it that way, by forces of another country, although all of these things involve stretching of terms. But it is also a civil conflict within South Vietnam . . . I do not think we can afford to delude ourselves that the Viet Cong are simply an external force . . .

Furthermore, there are seven other signatories to the SEATO Treaty. If what we face is clearly a case of aggression, why is it that of the seven signatories, only Australia has responded in any way, and that by what is merely a token force? If our "honor" is involved, as President Johnson and Secretary Rusk assert, why is not the honor of the other SEATO nations equally involved? The answer, of course, is that these other signatories do not, in fact, recognize the "aggression."

But we are not yet through with the SEATO Treaty, for it contains two other articles that are relevant to our inquiry. One (Article IV, 1) requires that "measures taken [to repel aggression] shall be immediately reported to the Security Council." This we have conspicuously failed to do; our belated action of January, 1966, is scarcely retroactive and it was, in any event, not a report on our own actions, but a complaint of Vietnamese aggression. A second provision of the treaty (Article VI) reads:

This treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of any of the parties under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

It is the term "obligations" that commands our attention. The American Bar Association has now asserted that Article 52 of the United Nations Charter, which recognizes "regional agreements," authorizes our Vietnam intervention. Article 52 does indeed authorize "regional agreements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action." But there are two important qualifications. The first is that such activities be "consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations." The second, and more important, is set forth in Article 53. "The Security Council shall utilize such regional arrangements for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council." [Emphasis added.]

There is one more string to Secretary Rusk's bow: the Tonkin Gulf Resolution of August 10, 1964. This is another of those things which have escalated rapidly in the past two years; indeed this resolution has grown to such dimensions that some of its Congressional parents no longer recognize it.

The Tonkin Gulf Resolution was passed without debate, as a gesture of support to President Johnson, after the North Vietnamese had fired torpedoes (without effect) at two United States destroyers escorting South Vietnamese ships in the Tonkin Gulf. It pledged support to the President, as Commander-in-Chief, to "take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States, and to prevent further aggression."

Here, according to Secretary Rusk and his supporters, is the crux of the matter. By firing at our destroyers in the Tonkin Gulf, the North Vietnamese committed an act of aggression. But was it in fact an act of aggression? Were our destroyers in "international waters"? They were, apparently, within eleven miles of the shore, and Vietnam—like other nations—claimed that her waters extended twelve miles into the seas.

Was the fact that the American destroyers were escorting South Vietnamese ships which had engaged in shelling North Vietnamese islands immaterial? A colloquy between Senator GAYLORD NELSON of Wisconsin and Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas on this matter is relevant:

Senator FULBRIGHT: It was testified that they went in at least eleven miles in order to show that we do not recognize a twelve-mile limit which I believe North Vietnam has asserted.

Senator NELSON. *The patrolling was for the purpose of demonstrating to the North Vietnamese that we did not recognize a twelve-mile limit?*

Senator FULBRIGHT. *That was one reason given. . . .*

Senator NELSON. *It would be mighty risky if Cuban PT boats were firing on Florida, for Russian armed ships or destroyers to be patrolling between us and Cuba, eleven miles out.*

The act of aggression was, in any event, determined to be such unilaterally by the United States, though when, a few months earlier, Britain had "retallated" against Yemen by firing on a fort at Harib, Ambassador Stevenson had denounced the action and the General Assembly had passed a resolution condemning "reprisals as incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

One might conclude that whatever "aggression" occurred in the Tonkin Gulf was mutual, and that to invoke that act of aggression against our destroyers as the legal basis for sending over 200,000 men to Vietnam and flying 300 sorties a day, is stretching things pretty far.

It is relevant, too, that when the Russians moved into Cuba with their missiles, we chose to regard that as an act of aggression and prepared to retaliate. Learned international lawyers such as Eustace Seligman have defended our position. But if Russian missile installations constituted, in themselves, and without any overt act, an act of aggression, what is to be said of the American intervention in Vietnam even before the Tonkin Gulf incident—the presence of the Seventh Fleet, the 20,000 combat troops, the massive military aid to the South Vietnamese? Aggression for aggression, surely a disinterested observer might conclude that the North Vietnamese had as strong a case against the United States as the United States had against North Vietnam.

Support for this view comes from the report of the International Control Commission of June 2, 1962—two full years before Tonkin Gulf. The report, which condemned North Vietnamese aggression against the South, condemned, at the same time, United States intervention in Vietnam:

Taking all the facts into consideration [said the commission] and basing itself on its own observation and authorized statements made in the United States of America and the Republic of Vietnam, the committee concludes that the Republic of Vietnam has violated Articles 16 and 17 of the Geneva Agreement in receiving the increased military aid from the United States. . . . The commission is also of the view that though there may not be any formal military alliance between the governments of the United States and the Republic of Vietnam, the establishment of a U.S. Military Assistance Command in South Vietnam as well as the introduction of military personnel beyond the stated strength of the Military Assistance Advisory Group, amounts to a factual military alliance which is prohibited under Article 19 of the Geneva Agreement.

Note that this was not a Communist-inspired report, and that it was signed by the representatives of two "free" nations, Canada and India.

We are not quite through with the Tonkin Gulf Resolution: it is, after all, the "hawks" who force it on our attention. Section 2 of that resolution provided that: *Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations, and in accordance with the obligations under the SEATO Treaty, the United States is prepared . . . to take all necessary steps.*

If the Tonkin Gulf affair was a clear case of aggression, why is it that the other members of SEATO have not rallied to our support, as is required by the treaty? If it was a clear case of aggression, why is it that we did not choose to follow the procedure laid down by the charter and submit it to the United Nations?

"We must honor our commitments," said President Johnson, and that sentiment has been echoed and re-echoed in the debate over Vietnam. But we have commitments to the United Nations, commitments which legally and morally take precedence over any we may have to Vietnam. Let us contemplate these commitments.

First, the charter obligates the United States, and all signatories, "to settle their international disputes by peaceful means." "Parties to any dispute," so reads Article 33, "shall first of all seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies, or any other peaceful means." That is, to be sure, what we are trying to do now, two years later. Second, the charter provides that "all members shall refrain, in their international relations, from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations." And Article 39 provides that "the Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken . . . to maintain or restore international peace and security."

These words are simple and unambiguous. If their meaning needs to be clarified, we cannot do better than to recall President Eisenhower's denunciation of the military action taken against Egypt by Britain, France, and Israel at the time of the Suez crisis. Granted, said Eisenhower, that the provocations were "grave and repeated," nevertheless "the use of military force to solve international disputes could not be reconciled with the principles of the United Nations to which we had all subscribed." And Secretary Dulles in rejecting a Soviet proposal for a joint peace-keeping force in the Middle East as "unthinkable" pointed out that:

Any intervention by the United States or any other action except by a duly constituted United Nations peace force, would be counter to everything the . . . United Nations were charged by the charter to do. And President Eisenhower added, even more categorically, that "The United Nations is alone charged with the responsibility of securing the peace in the Middle East and throughout the world."

It is unnecessary to belabor the point that the Charter of the United Nations—like all treaties made under the authority of the United States—is the law of the land. Every President, every Congressman, is bound to observe that law. No President can set it aside by a letter; no Congress can set it aside by a joint resolution; and it will not be alleged that it was set aside by that SEATO treaty which explicitly recognizes its own subordination to the charter.

What, then, is our commitment to Vietnam?

We do not appear to be committed either by the Eisenhower letter of 1954, or by the

SEATO Treaty, or by the Tonkin Gulf Resolution. Our commitment seems to consist of two things: first, there are repeated and ever more emphatic assertions by the President, and the Secretaries of State and Defense, assertions which have in themselves no binding authority. Second, there is the factual commitment. We are there, whether we like it or not, whether we should be there or not. This is not the kind of argument that can be entertained in a court of law, or in an international tribunal. If President Johnson, Secretary Rusk, and their supporters want to vindicate our presence in Vietnam on the ground of power, they are of course free to do so. But that has not been our position in the past.

[From the Auburn (Wash.) Citizen, Jan. 19, 1966]

AUBURN MAN TERMS VIETNAM WAR ORGANIZED MADNESS

(By Robert Johnson)

This past week a young Auburn man has returned from the fighting in Vietnam, bringing with him a tale that contradicts much of the official publicity and political pronouncements about our fighting there.

Perhaps no "war" in American history is fraught with so many contradictions as this one, which is still not a legally declared war, since the president is acting without the legal sanctions of Congress in sending 200,000 American men into action there.

"It's like organized madness," said Dave St. Pierre, 24, a returned Auburn man who drove a truck there for the U.S. Army. "There's so much politics involved over there, you just don't know what to believe."

Drafted in 1964, St. Pierre was stationed at Qui Nhon for five months, trucking supplies from where the landing barges dumped them on the beach to as much as 150 miles into the interior to the fighting areas.

The day St. Pierre arrived at Qui Nhon, three Vietnamese, perhaps from the North, perhaps from the South, were hanging from a tree where he was stationed. No one really knew who they were, for they were only suspects turned over to the South Vietnamese soldiers for execution without a trial. They were turned over to this fate by the American military authorities, perhaps as an exercise in Democratic justice.

Among the contradictions that St. Pierre noted were the following:

1) President Lyndon Johnson and Robert McNamara have set themselves up as dictators in Vietnam.

2) Puppet premier Nguyen Ky is regarded by American soldiers and the Vietnamese as "some kind of joke."

3) Though there is much talk about ending the war, authorities in Washington, D.C. have just released estimates that the war is going to cost American taxpayers \$10.5 billion dollars in 1966, a considerable rise over the \$4.7 billion spent the past year in Vietnam.

4) Though the reasons advanced for our fighting 6,000 miles from home where we have no territorial claims is that we are fighting Communism in Asia, the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that it is legal to be a Communist at home.

5) American forces there are regarded by the South Vietnamese "as a meal ticket" doled out by corrupt functionaries in the South Vietnamese government.

"Why hasn't the United Nations come in and set up a board?" St. Pierre asked, "I don't know whether our President has this power. He's set himself up as a dictator over there. Never before in our history has a President sent 200,000 men to war without declaring war legally. I don't know that he has the right to send us over there."

"Over there the men ask themselves why they should have to fight these people, if only one man, like the President, decides we do

without legally declaring war. It's all between President Johnson, McNamara and a few other people. They have too much control.

"The men don't know what they're doing over there. They tried to convince us that it was right and honorable, but I'm not convinced. They aren't accomplishing what they set out to do. They'd have done it by now if they knew what they were doing."

St. Pierre entered the Army January 6, 1964, and was discharged January 1, 1966. A graduate of Auburn High School, he comes from a well known Auburn family, being the son of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur St. Pierre, 1831 E. Main St., Auburn.

At Qui Nhon, the largest harbor in Vietnam, he helped transport supplies by truck to the front, if you could call it a front. There really is no front, for the enemy, according to St. Pierre, "Looks no different than any of the others. You can be walking down the street, and he's right amongst you, and you don't know it."

The major purpose and policy behind U.S. Forces being in Vietnam, fighting in an illegal war, is one of St. Pierre's chief beefs.

On the one hand, the men are told officially they are fighting Communism in Asia, but the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that it is not illegal to be a Communist in the United States.

Somewhere in all this political rhetoric lies one of this century's big lies.

"Everybody talks about why we're over there," St. Pierre explains, "and that we have to make a stand against Communism. But we're not defeating them. We're going to have to change our policy over there. Maybe we're stopping them, but we aren't defeating them."

"I saw things and learned things over there I'll never forget. I can say that now, but I didn't think so then. It was just, 'Let me outta here' then."

"You wondered what was going on. The military people told us the Vietnamese had invited us over, but the men doing the fighting didn't believe it. They resented us. I saw enough to know that I don't ever want to go back again."

Among the things St. Pierre saw was "a lot of people are getting rich over this war."

Huge amounts of civilian construction going on, for instance, by American contractors, building, hauling, supplying. For a second or two, St. Pierre thought about going back after his discharge and taking a job there, but he added, "You couldn't get me back there for \$40,000."

Caught in the web of this international struggle for control of Asia, trapped between the contending forces of Communism and Capitalism as represented there, are the common people.

"I wouldn't say a Vietnamese mother doesn't love her child," St. Pierre explained, "but she's more used to losing it than an American mother is. We have to understand that these people are desperate—they're hungry, and they see death and violence all the time. Children wave to you as you drive by, then automatically hold out their hands. We throw them C rations from the trucks. In my mind it's just not clear that this is a right and honorable war."

St. Pierre also scored the news reports about the fighting, most of which he branded as outright misrepresentations and lies.

"When they say in the newspapers you've been hit," he said, "it can be just a shot at your truck. Then they write it up in the paper and make it sound big. Sometimes there've been a lot more guys that got it than was released to the papers, but it is not as bad as the papers've built it up."

Queried about the current state of his relationship to this war, St. Pierre said, "I'm all right now, because I'm out of the Army. I couldn't say anything before. People are

scared to say whether they're against this war. If they don't say so, what're you going to do? Who'll ever know?"

Here at home sentiment against LBJ's administration is growing, and people are asking pointed questions about why, when Lyndon Johnson ran on a peace platform, he now finds himself implementing the platform of Barry Goldwater.

The idea that China will remain quiescent is fading, for China has territorial claims that go back 13 centuries in Vietnam from the turn of this century. With a population of 750,000,000 which is increasing at the rate of 16,000,000 a year, and with Southeast Asia the rice bowl of that continent, it is foolhardy to expect China not to enter the war directly soon.

Most Americans realize that if the Chinese had established in Mexico the kind of occupation we have established in Vietnam, the United States government would be dropping A-bombs. China has the bomb, and to expect this Vietnamese fiasco not to lead to all-out war, involving millions of young Americans like Dave St. Pierre, is to not see the history taking place before our eyes.

NEWBERG, OREG.,
May 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have been glad to observe your courage of conviction re: our policies in Viet Nam. I am at a loss to know what to believe, but if our basic premise for intervention is the invitation of the people, I wish we could be more sure that the current Viet Nameese leadership represents the best interests of the most people. I often think that our Nation has an over-blown evaluation of our international power and responsibility. I do not think that we should resign ourselves to the eventual success of communism, but I fear that the results of our intervention may bring as much suffering to the people of Viet Nam as would the immediate success of the enemy. I once thought that our action there was the best thing to do as Americans, but wrong as Christians. Now I am more inclined to believe that it is not even right for Americans. I will pray for wisdom for our leaders. I thank God for men of strength like you.

Sincerely,

LEROY BENHAM.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
May 16, 1966.

DEAR SIR, We are writing because we feel the Viet-Nam-Thailand situation is becoming increasingly grave and we feel guilty in our ineffectiveness to do anything about the problem in a positive manner. We want you to know we stand behind you 100% in your efforts to stop this senseless war. Senseless in that, except for those who gain a dollar profit from it, everybody on all sides loses ethically, morally and materially.

We would like to know if there is anything we can do or any function we can perform beyond writing President Johnson. We thought that you, in your position, might have some suggestions or advice on how best we could voice our dissent to this war policy of President Johnson.

Most respectfully,

Robert A. Washburn, Mrs. Robert A. Washburn, Mr. Kenneth A. Rutherford, Mr. and Mrs. Garry R. Singer, Mr. and Mrs. Fred DeWolfe, Mr. and Mrs. Roger Tracy, Mr. and Mrs. Helmut Jung, Mr. Douglas Jung, Mr. and Mrs. Ward Searles, Mr. John Moses, Mr. and Mrs. William Clark, Mr. and Mrs. Garry Reuter, Mr. Roger Young.

MAY 6, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God for a representative like you! Keep up the fight for us!

I have a boy, nineteen on March 13, who has a college deferment. Little did I think years ago, that we would have a draft law in 1966. If we did not have this law, then the Administration would have to declare war to get its manpower instead of having these boys available.

The former ambassador to Russia (Mr. Gavin, I believe) who testified before the Senate Foreign Rel. Comm., said in words to this effect, that a great nation could take a position and incur world-wide comment for weakness, but that in six months, this would be forgotten. I say *we are big enough* to pull completely out of Vietnam now—or would that discomfit some persons who are profiting from the war.

I hear now on the news that the elections in Vietnam might be postponed to October. I am ashamed for my country.

Continue to do what you can for our poor boys who are so gallantly trying to do what is expected of them.

Gratefully yours,

Mrs. JAMES M. WOOTEN.

CHESHIRE, OREG.

MEDFORD, OREG.,
May 12, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am behind you all the way. I only wish there were more men like you.

Sincerely,

JAMES J. METZ.

BEND, OREG.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I hope you will continue your efforts to get our men out of South Vietnam.

Sincerely,

KENNETH OAKLEY, M.D.

MEDFORD, OREG.,
April 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your periodic news letter, which is certainly more informative than anything we can gather otherwise.

We wish to commend you on your stand in the situation in Viet Nam. We know it must take a lot of personal perseverance and determination on your part, in the face of so much opposition. Please be assured that your efforts are not being made in vain. Many, many of us are deeply appreciative and would like to know if there is any way to help you.

We are enclosing a copy of a letter which we are sending to President Johnson. We cannot be at all sure that it will reach him personally. Is there any way to insure this?

Can you suggest another person to whom we might send our thoughts on this situation and who might possibly have some influence in changing it?

Sincerely,

NORA BOTTJER
Mrs. Charles Bottjer,
Jo EICHELBERGER
Mrs. Sharon Eichelberger.

MEDFORD, OREG.,
April 22, 1966.

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are two distraught mothers. You might consider us to be the plain ordinary garden variety, like thousands of others in our land.

We have always seen to it that our little ones were well taken care of at any sacrifice. They had proper shoes, periodic physical examinations and inoculations when necessary. Sometimes we took them to the dentist for ordinary care when it was necessary for us and their fathers to postpone our own appointments.

We took them to Sunday school and church regularly when it would have been easier to sleep in. We did not have more children than we could care for. In the case of one of us, we deliberately allowed to conceive and gave birth to a child knowing full well that it may have meant the life of the mother.

Each hour, each day, each week, each month and each year, we gave our children loving care. We guided them into the right ways and taught them the basic verities. When they were ill, we were up night after night to nurse them back to health. We cannot possibly convey to you the costs in so many ways that we have borne to give them proper educations.

We and our husbands have never received help from the rest of society (except in the case of one of us whose child was born in an Army hospital while his father was in another war).

Sometimes it was difficult, but we used our own resources to give them proper nutrition to build strong bodies. In another war, we mothers grew fresh vegetables in city back yards to help to attain this end. Our hands will never be quite the same, but we did help to build strong bodies.

And now we wonder why. If we must send these fine young people to fight a war for we know not what, to be blown to eternity perhaps, what was the use of these years of effort and protection?

You are a father. How could you face each morning if you knew that your children would be sent to slaughter—perhaps by being disembowelled, or by being shot in the head allowing all those good intelligent brains to spew out; or far worse, to be sent home imbeciles or paraplegics?

Barbaric talk? Yes. But war is barbaric, no matter how you pursue it. Is it more civilized to run a bayonet through a young boy who is in battle through no choice of his own, than to bomb women and children? We think not.

The lists of the numbers of boys killed on each side given over the air like football scores sicken us. Perhaps any sacrifice would be worthwhile if we thought it were in positive protection of our own country—but from recent news, it seems that we are not even wanted in these far off lands. As far as we can determine, we are perhaps interfering in civil strife. Why have we not spoken softly and carried a big stick?

Please, Mr. President, could you give us one good reason why parents should go on raising fine children to send into battle whether they want to go or not?

Most sincerely,

NORA BOTTJER
Mrs. Charles Bottjer.
JO EICHELBERGER.
Mrs. Sharon Eichelberger.

PORTLAND, OREG.,
May 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We recently moved to Oregon and for the first time had an opportunity to hear you speak at the recent China and United States Conference at Portland State College.

I appreciated very much the strong stand you are taking relative to our Viet Nam policy. Your position appeals to me strongly and I am writing to give you encouragement

in your position. We trust that more and more people will come to this point of view.
Cordially yours,

MARK RICH,
Director.

WANTAGH, N.Y.,
May 9, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I continue to support you 100% on your position in Vietnam. There are only a few brave men left to struggle against the planned war with China. Congratulations on your efforts.
Sincerely,

NOREEN SHAW.

NORTH MIAMI BEACH, FLA.

DEAR SENATOR: We feel you are one of the few fighting men left in this country. Men like you are becoming extinct.

Keep up your fight. Bring our boys home from Vietnam.

Sincerely,

G. SZIRCS.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE D. MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: This is the first letter that I have written to a politician, but I would feel remiss if I did not drop you a line to commend you for your courageous stand on the Vietnam fiasco, and I wish to say that I agree wholeheartedly with every thing you say.

South Vietnam appears to be torn internally by religious and political dissension and they apparently do not know what they want for us to stay there is waste of money and young men lives. Not to mention the thievery, black marketing and other skulduggery that is going on there. I also feel that the administration's "war on poverty" program could stand a little close scrutiny. Yours for sanity in government.

W. J. FARRELL.

BALTIMORE, MD.,
May 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to let you know that millions of us are behind you. What the Communists are trying to do is to get us to defend nations all over the world, from all sides, to deplete our own man power and defenses here at home, and then strike at us.

We cannot stop communism. We cannot let young men, who have never had a chance to live, to die because of communism somewhere else. In my lifetime I have learned that charity creates beggary. That those whom we help most are usually the ones who crack us across the face. We are being used in black mail markets, used by other nations as a bickering pawn to get more out of us than supposedly can be chiseled from some other country.

We will become the poorest equipped, the weakest, the most vulnerable country in the universe if we go on the way we are doing. The voice of the people no longer counts with men like Johnson. He is doing exactly what he has accused the Chinese of doing: trying to "save face". This is murder of our young men. No humane, happy human being could bear to be the cause of another's death. Truman was an embittered old man, with his Bessie, and war is one means for the impotent outlet of embittered men. If I can help you in any way to carry out your principles and human compassions, I wish you would let me help. I have always wondered why you have never offered yourself for the Presidency. You would have millions behind you. You have clearly demonstrated your courage in speaking what you believe. Your down-to-earth honesty. You wouldn't need any political party behind you. Or any great sum of money. I have been a short story writer and novelist a great many years, and tried to write the speeches of some of the

politicians down here, until I found out they didn't mean a single word they were saying.

President or not, keep up your honest statements. No one wants her son to die. I don't have any sons, but I don't want to see other young men die uselessly. This will not end communism. Or wars. No more than Truman's bomb did. All the luck in the world.

DOROTHY MEYERSBURG.

WESTMONT, ILL.,
May 6, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In an era plagued by unreasoned thought and impulsive action on the part of many men in public office, it is indeed refreshing to realize that there are still men such as yourself and Senators FULBRIGHT, GRUENING, and HARTKE in public office. I fully support your views concerning the war in Viet Nam and want to thank you for representing those of us who would otherwise have no one to present our views to the rest of the American public.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MILDRED DIXON.

BRONX, N.Y.,
May 21, 1966.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: The situation in Viet Nam gets worse every day. It should be obvious, by now, that no matter how much President Johnson increases the forces, fighting there, it is no solution. The only solution is negotiations leading to a US withdrawal and the election that should have been held in 1956.

I certainly approve your efforts in this direction.

Sincerely yours,

ANTONIS L. BROWN.

DALLES, OREG.,
May 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator, Oregon.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wanted very much to hear you speak this evening but I cannot get away from this business. I have only recently opened here in The Dalles and Friday evenings the businesses are open and I have to do the same.

I do want to tell you how much I admire your efforts in trying to bring some light on that very tragic, "trashy" Viet Nam fiasco.

I worked with the Foreign Aid thing there for four and a half years as a Chief Auditor. Now there is nothing that I can do about Viet Nam or Foreign Aid, I have found that out, but I don't have to be a party to it. I am out of it, thank God.

Please don't get discouraged. That disgrace can't stand strong sunlight and you certainly are letting them know that.

There are very few people in this country who will really express the courage of their convictions but thank the good Lord you are a very courageous exception.

One more year of that goofy Viet Nam and this country will be so demoralized that nothing will ever straighten it out.

The AID thing got us into that mess and unless it is stopped it will get us into more of them.

Sincerely,

TOM ECHOLS.

BELLEROSE, N.Y.,
March 22, 1966.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I am the mother of a drafted, heart-broken young boy who is on his way to Viet Nam. He does not know why he is being sent half way around the world to a hot stinking country to be slaughtered or maimed for life.

You are so right in all you say and I have been hanging on to your 'every spoken word' and if you are in the throes of taking on a more aggressive attitude, I am behind you 100%.

This war has been in the hands of war mongers and money hungry capitalists from the beginning and will never be settled until sensible men with good judgment take over the helm.

I am counting on you to keep up your good work in behalf of the little nobody who is always counted by the President as being on his side. You and your fellow constituents are the only ones who can stop these men who have guns and dollar signs reflecting in their eye balls.

Sincerely,

Mrs. W. GEIGER.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.,
May 20, 1966.

DEAR AND HONORED SENATOR MORSE: May God walk at your side in your struggle against evil and corruption.

Washington begins to resemble a scene from Dante's Inferno as the war mania sweeps over our government.

There are millions (tho they are inarticulate) who believe as you do and silently support you & pray for you. God is not dead as the latest moronic slogan claims—He only bids His time—Be on your guard—constantly wary please. Get enough rest and sleep.

Faithfully,

Mrs. RITA TULLY.

CHULA VISTA, CALIF.,
May 22, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to let you know that I, along with many other San Diegans, were in complete accord with the views expressed by you in your talk on May 1st and hope that you can persuade many more of the necessity of a change in policy of the administration in regard to Vietnam.

I hope that you and the other courageous Senators expressing your views will be able to initiate a new policy less detrimental to the United States and the world. You realize that you have to come up with a workable solution now—you and all the brave Senators!

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARTA H. PORTER.

MEDFORD LAKES, N.J.,
May 22, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE: Thank you for sending me a copy of your speech, "Legal Issues of the U.S. Position in Vietnam." I am in agreement with the views expressed in it.

I am grateful to you and to the Committee of American lawyers who did the research and who prepared the letter and memorandum of law.

Our president has been ill-advised and has made a big mistake in sending troops to Vietnam. It is not too late, nor is it a sign of weakness to correct a mistake. I believe we should withdraw our troops now.

Recently I read an article which stated that you were working on a speech entitled, "The Crucifixion of the Teachings of Christ in South Vietnam."

If this speech is completed I would appreciate your sending me a copy of it and I shall be very willing to pay for it if you will let me know the cost.

Again, let me thank you for your bold stand in opposing the killing of American boys in an unconstitutional war.

I wish you also would oppose, on Christian and moral grounds the killing of all men, including the Asians.

On these grounds, the conscription of men for murder and all wars are illegal.

Respectfully yours,

MARIE F. MERHH.

HENDERSONVILLE, N.C.,
May 21, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. SENATOR: Please accept my sincerest thanks for copy of your speech on February 25, 1966, in the Senate of the United States.

I am fully aware under what terrific mental strain you must be in your battle against the sanctimonious head of our government and his henchmen. Not to mention the ignorance and lack of character of so many of our Congressmen and Senators. Given the facts, honestly and impartially, a referendum would definitely be against our involvement in civil war in South Viet Nam of which our government officials were the instigators.

Deep in my heart I wish and hope that you, as well as the very few honest and courageous Senators and Congressmen shall prevail, if not, I shudder to think of the end.

Very truly yours,

CHAS. L. SULZER.

MAY 21, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: Keep up your good work on Viet Nam. Just who is fighting who over there? I am a World War II Veteran and a life long Democrat. The killing of our boys in Viet Nam is the most disgusting thing I have ever known of. I fought for Pres. Johnson in the last election tooth and nail and contributed money to his campaign. Unless he changes his position on Viet Nam I shall campaign just as fiercely against him. I may be a "nervous nelly" as he says, but I am no Communist or war monger. Tell him so for me when you see him.

I do not believe our Gov. wants the Viet Nam war to end.

"Former" Johnson Man,

OSCAR F. NIES.

FLINT, MICH.

GENEVA, N.Y.,
May 20, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. MORSE: In re. Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam!

I believe you have made your point!

Before any comment, my appreciation of your courage in taking your stand . . . usually for the right . . . in matters concerning The Senate and the people of the U.S.A.

It is my opinion, and growing conviction, that we have, not only no legal right to be in Vietnam, but other reasons:

We have no right to send our armed forces to Vietnam because of history. I realize that outside nations did meddle in our "war between the States." I wonder what would have happened if some outside nation had sent 250,000 armed men along with other implements of war into America at that time. Or perhaps had sent armed forces into America to settle our racial problems.

My earlier education and more recent areas of service have brought me into direct association with "orientals" in both their history and psychology. Apparently these whom the President has chosen to advise him know neither.

We are an old-time American family. We were here before the USA. was started. I am an idealist. I still think of what our "founding fathers" tried to accomplish when they founded a community governed by laws and not by men. While I regret the failure of law enforcement in our times, it is good that we respect the rights of all men. This ideal seems to be bypassed when some of us take our stand against the reigning persons. It seems that our newsmen who return after short stays in Vietnam, either do not see, or are intimidated in their report of the real situation.

The last, and best, information in my hands is a recent book by a Frenchman, Jean Lacoutre, "Vietnam: Between Two Truces" (Random House).

Quoting one of my younger and well educated friends (also a democrat): "History, I believe, will show that the USA has made a big mistake in the way we have misunderstood so-called 'communism' without discerning the deeper evils and hopes which are back of the movements among the awakening peoples of our times."

As a Christian and humanitarian, but not a pacifist, I feel for the innocent families and children hurt of any war, and in one which we do not understand.

Most sincerely,

MARSHALL E. BARTHOLOMEW.

HEMET, CALIF.,
May 19, 1965.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This note is to express my deep thanks to you for your courageous and positive stand in regard to the war in Vietnam.

With men like you speaking out against our disastrous policy there, we citizens who love our country but feel she is on the wrong path take new faith and hope. Please stand firm, and let me know if there is anything one concerned citizen can do to help.

Sincerely,

MARION HOWARD,
Mrs. A. H. HOWARD.

EAST ORANGE, N.J.,
May 20, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have previously read the materials contained in legal issues of the United States' position in Vietnam. I agree. I trust you know that in this section of the country you are frequently viewed as a maverick but your identification with Senator FULBRIGHT in this particular position renders it a most respectful hearing.

Unfortunately, the Republican party by its position has made itself an impossible vehicle in which to express distaste for this southeastern venture, so that the thoughtful American who regrets the Vietnamese venture has no recourse other than to write sympathetic letters to gentlemen such as you.

Most respectfully yours,

DONALD H. MINTZ.

GLADWYNE, PA.,
May 19, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The anguish of our people in the mutilation and loss of their loved ones is multiplied by the realization that these sacrifices are being made to coerce a small nation to submit to a Hitler-loving public enemy like Ky.

Nor is their grief assuaged by anti-Communist slogans. They recall that the banner of anti-communism was first unfurled by Hitler, Eichmann, Hydrick, Voerward and others famous for their crimes against humanity.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM A. SHANNON, M.D.

NORTH ANDOVER, MASS.,
May 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Why does Congress go along giving the President billions of our

tax money to slaughter our sons in Vietnam when the people voted against this war—61% of them—in the truest poll of all—the election of 1964?

The Democrats won in 1964 because they promised peace. The Republicans lost overwhelmingly because they promised war.

Do you realize that it is human lives that Congress is destroying—forcing our boys to die—not asking for volunteers? Our volunteers—the Reserves—sit at home while our sons are forced to die in another country's war—a war in which neither they nor their parents have any belief. At least the men in World War II believed in what they were dying for but these helpless pawns do not have even that to sustain them.

We are not stupid. We know that this crazy escalation of the war will surely plunge us into war not only with China but also with Russia.

All Europe watches with horror and disbelief as the country which tells other countries not to fight refuses to take its own advice.

The Democrats have already sent over 28,000 American boys to their deaths in Vietnam. Now our casualty lists top those of the country whose war it is. The South Vietnamese soldiers are deserting by the tens of thousands and the South Vietnamese people, sick of having their homes destroyed and their children killed, wish we'd get out. Can you wonder that people all across this nation are fed-up, angry and revolted?

In the coming elections, Vietnam is the only issue that counts. We are not going to ask a candidate what his party is. That does not matter. We do not want hand-outs—financial, educational or social . . . if our sons are dead. We want these things for our sons . . . not for ourselves. We want a candidate who will get us out of this cruel, senseless unnecessary war—now. Nothing else matters.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARY OGDEN.

CARMICHAEL, CALIF.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your courage and true patriotism. I thoroughly support your committee's investigation into our policy in Viet Nam, and only regret it didn't come much sooner. It seems incredible now that our government could have just drifted into such an impossible situation.

Cold practicality would seem to make it obvious to anyone that we should get out. For those blind souls who couldn't see that before this month, the daily headlines should make it obvious. Then to read tonight that Johnson called those who oppose this senseless slaughter "nervous nellys", was just appalling.

The real "nervous nelly" is the President who will not change his policy for fear of "losing face", and the over-draft-age individual who wants to fight to the last other man in some other country. How cynical, selfish, and hypocritical can a position be?

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARGARET GOODRICH.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
May 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Yesterday we sent the following telegram to President Johnson:

"Military commitment Vietnam equivalent \$500 every Vietnamese. Urge economic and social reforms and withdrawal military."

We are deeply grateful for the courageous stand you are taking, for the constructive

ideas you are putting forth, and for the breadth of your vision. Keep going! We would be proud to have our senators from California join your loyal opposition, and have told them as much.

We are behind you and would like to support you in any way we can.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

MADÉLINE Y. STEPHENSON
E. P. STEPHENSON

Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Stephenson.

WAUWATOSA, WIS.,
May 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I just want you to know how we admire your most difficult stand on foreign affairs etc. etc. ad inf. We as well as millions of Americans (I'M sure) back you.

Keep up the "Good fight."

Respectfully,

ALICE N. WALTERS.

ROCHESTER, MINN.,
May 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Even though the possibility of your succeeding is extremely remote, don't let up in your efforts to knock a little sense into official Washington. There are those of us who applaud your lonely, and surely disheartening, crusade.

More power to you! You are a Voice in the Wilderness.

Sincerely,

ORVIS ROSS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
May 22, 1966.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You may be interested to see the enclosed letter which I have just written to President Johnson.

I have no words in which to express my gratitude to you again for the superb battle you are putting up to save our country from the morass of horror into which the Administration has plunged us. If we are saved it will be in no small measure due to you.

Sincerely yours,

FLORENCE H. LUSCOMB.

DEAR SIR: I am very much interested in the Viet Nam war situation.

My only son (nineteen), enlisted in the Marines in Oct. and already fighting in Viet Nam.

I had the opportunity to watch the Dean Rusk testimony.

I agree with your statements whole heartedly. I give you credit for speaking up for the American people. I would be proud to live in Oregon, to be represented by you. It seems the United States is supporting a dictator. I cannot see my son and others fighting for people who do not want their help. Please bring him back to the people who love him.

Much good luck to you. I have written to the President and received a booklet on the why of Viet Nam. It is no clearer now than before.

I want my son back in a peaceful land for which his father fought four years for.

If you have any information how I can get him home please let me know. I would appreciate it. I haven't had a minutes' peace of mind since he left. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ACKERSON.

MIAMI, FLA.

ROCKVILLE, MD.,
May 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the copy of your address concerning "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Viet Nam". It is distressing that we have so ignored international law as to find ourselves in the position that we now are. Although you are in a minority position, it is good that someone is calling the attention of America to the fact that we are violating international law.

I thank God repeatedly that you, Senator FULBRIGHT, and several others are in our Congress.

Most sincerely yours,

G. CUSTER CROMWELL.

COFFEYVILLE, KANS.,
May 12, 1966.

Mr. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator (Oregon),
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I support your position in reference to Viet Nam 100 per cent. I feel it is illegal, immoral and we should get out of there immediately. Please continue your good work. I can only say I wish we had more men like you and Senator FULBRIGHT (D. Ark.) who can see where we are leading too. Possibly W.W. # 3.

Sincerely yours,

BASIL E. PALMER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
May 22, 1966.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You are constantly asserting that the only reason the United States is in Vietnam is to assure the "freedom" of the Vietnamese people. You have proclaimed this during nine outright dictatorships, kept in power only by billions of American dollars and hundreds of thousands of American soldiers. Events now taking place prove, for all the world to see, that it is not freedom but bloody oppression, hated by the Vietnamese people, that we are maintaining in power. That destroys every excuse for our being there.

Mr. President, get out of Vietnam! Cease all bombing and hostilities in both North and South Vietnam. Negotiate now with the National Liberation Front for (a) honest, free elections, internationally supervised, to enable all the Vietnamese people democratically to select their own preferred government (not the phony, rigged elections which are being proposed, in which only hand picked candidates favorable to our side will be allowed to run), and (b) for the withdrawal, immediately thereafter, of all our military forces and bases, as categorically specified in the Geneva Agreements to which you pay lip service.

The current wholesale uprising against the Ky dictatorship offers you a heaven sent opportunity to end the war without loss of face. You can now be honest in giving the Vietnamese people the freedom which you proclaimed at the very time you were burning alive babies and mothers with napalm, bombing villages, and turning a million peasants into homeless, starving refugees. You can stop adding endless tens of thousands to the 21,748 American boys you have already sent to death, wounds and mutilation in your war.

End the war now!

Sincerely yours,

FLORENCE H. LUSCOMB.

CALIFORNIA.

DEAR SIR: I am not one of your constituents but to me you are a voice calling out in

the wilderness. I agree that Congress is supposed to be the voice of the people but that voice is very silent.

What disturbs me is my own personal feeling. In the 40's I left a good job in the medical field to enlist as a private because my country needed me but to-day I would be a draft dodger.

According to the State Dept. we have 40 commitments throughout the world but I never hear that the American people are included. I think the guys who are running the show have lost perspective and are paranoid about the entire situation. I would like to have an answer to a question—"Why are we there?" Are we still playing Dulles' domino game? I think we should stay home and take care of the store.

You have my utmost admiration. When you see Mr. FULBRIGHT shake his hand for me. I agree whole heartily with you about your remark about Goldwater.

Being Irish I close—God bless.

IRENE HOBSON.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,

May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you on the stand you have taken in regard to the United States' role in Vietnam.

We are proud to have you speak for so many of our citizens who believe this a complete waste of men and money.

Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. IDA WEINSTEIN.

LA HONDA, CALIF.,

May 11, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Just a word to encourage you to keep up the fight against the Johnson Vietnam policy.

If this planet survives it will be due in large part to men, statesmen like yourself who have worked to awaken the citizenry to the danger of "stringing along" with a closed mouth.

I have written my Senators (KUCHEL & MURPHY) so they do know my opinion on the present policy of this administration.

Good health and good luck to you.

Yours truly,

RAYMOND E. ANDERSON.

SANTA PAULA, CALIF.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have written to you before, but again we say thank you for speaking out against our wicked aggression in Viet Nam.

We have now injured 15,000 of our best young men for life, and killed 3,000 besides thousands of Vietnamese. How can we so-called Christians justify this!

I hope you know how many thousands of loyal Americans are supporting you—not just young beatniks—but middle-aged sober minded thinkers who deplore this tragic waste of life in a senseless war!

Speak out loudly and often, dear Mr. Morse!

Sincerely,

DOROTHY J. TOMBLIN.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,

May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I express my long-overdue appreciation for the stand you are taking on our involvement in Viet-Nam?

I am sure you must be getting lots of "anti" mail and lots of scurrilous abuse.

Please believe that there are many who are with you.

Keep up the good fight—I am hopeful that eventually you shall prevail.

Most sincerely,

P. J. BERNHEIM.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,

May 11, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE, As one of the many Americans concerned with, and opposed to our government's policy in Viet Nam, I would like to praise your excellent efforts in bringing the facts to the public.

I am a college student, and I, and many of my contemporaries, both students and non-students, find ourselves in an extremely frustrating position, with regard to our government's foreign policy. Although we are old enough to vote, we find that the voting population has never been asked for an opinion of this war. The only other alternative open to us seems to be social protests, and picketing; but these demonstrations are usually dismissed as either Communist inspired, or consisting only of beatniks and nonconformists. Also the men participating in these demonstrations are labeled as cowards and draft-dodgers. We are not pacifists nor are we pro-Communists, but we do believe that this war is both morally wrong, and unconstitutional.

I myself, would like to thank you for your thoughtful probing into this situation, and for your eloquent voicing of an opinion shared by a great many Americans.

Respectfully Yours,

NORMA KISTER.

HAGERSTOWN, IND.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We wish to let you know that we are with you 100% about the Vietnam war.

Every one who speaks of it are with you. We can not see where L.B.J. gets the idea the people are with him and his program.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. OMER F. SMITH.

EL CERRITO, CALIF.,

May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to add my support to your efforts to correct the mistaken position of our administration and military leaders in Vietnam. I should like to urge your continued inquiry and revelation of the errors associated with this venture.

Sincerely yours,

DEMORTHERES PAPPAGIANIS,

M.D., Ph. D.

SARATOGA, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you—we desperately need your direction and courage to prevent this administration from escalating further. We are outraged by what our boys are asked to do in Vietnam—to murder—to gas—spray poisons—it is too horrible to think our taxes are going to ruin the Nation and people of Vietnam.

Keep it up—we need you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GRACE W. NAMENY.

DETROIT, MICH.,

May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know that both my wife and myself agree with your views on Vietnam.

We believe that our Country is in Vietnam illegally, and that we are morally wrong in this case. Although the terrorism practiced by the VC is certainly to be con-

demned, I don't see where our presence is doing more good than harm.

The Administration has been busy trying to justify participation to the current extent. First, by reading into a letter of ex-President Eisenhower (since refuted), a promise of military help. Second, by freely interpreting the SEATO Treaty; and lastly just this past week, by Dean Rusk who is going to call in "International Lawyers" to prove our being in Vietnam is legal.

There are a lot of us out here across the Nation who are not taken-in by these frantic efforts to cover up the real reason for our presence there. I just can't reconcile the Humanitarian—we are saving them from themselves theory propounded by the Administration. I don't pretend to know what the President's Complete Plan for Victory is. However, from the news reports I suspect the Military Advisors have had a good deal to say about it. The Armed Forces have used this war as a proving ground for many new weapons, techniques of combat, and to season troops whose combat ranks have been thinned since Korea. From this and learning today that U.S. fighters have downed a Chinese plane over mainland China, it is not impossible to surmise that the Military might be trying to provoke China into war.

This downing of Chinese aircraft over China itself is an act of irresponsibility. This is the very action the civilian population fears most. How can we stop these incidents from starting World War III? The only recourse we have is the elected representatives like yourself. You, Senator Morse, must fight for us.

If the people of this great Country of ours would think out the consequences of escalation—a corresponding Nuclear War, first with tactical weapons in Vietnam, then with megatons over here, they would write as I am.

I am a salesman now, but during the Korean conflict was in the Marine Corps—a sergeant, so I can appreciate the military point of view. With twelve years (since Korea) wisdom I can no longer accept the Military point of view.

Stay with the fight. We citizens MUST be told the REAL intentions of this conflict!!

Thank you for being courageous enough to stick up for our rights.

Sincerely,

JAMES W. HARON.

BRONX, N.Y.,

May 12, 1966.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I heard you speak at the Senate hearings on TV yesterday, & began to feel proud that we have a man like you in America. Men like you, Senator MORSE, who love our country, and are trying to help us to get back the respect & honor we once had all over the world. I'm ashamed of what our country is doing in Vietnam & above all our best men are paying with their lives. For what? For whom? in this unholy war. It takes a man like you, Senator, to give me hope for our country when you speak out whether Pres. Johnson likes it or not. If they did this in Germany there wouldn't have been so many thousands of people destroyed. Hitler couldn't have killed all those people by himself, & all those poor souls could have been spared.

God help you to continue for what you are doing.

Yours truly,

MARIA T. HOWARD.

ROLLING HILLS ESTATES, CALIF.,

May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have listened to every session of the Foreign Relations Committee and have tended to agree with you. Today you were the most helpful in alternate

suggestions for another approach to the terrible confusion regarding Viet Nam.

JUDITH METZ.

LAKE CHARLES, LA.,
May 10, 1966.

Senator W. MORSE,
D-Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a patriotic American mother with two (2) sons and a son-in-law in the military service of our great country I just had to write to you. Listening to you on TV in the recent committee reports with great interest, I want you to know I agree with you wholeheartedly.

My husband is a W.W. II veteran and that we understood, but *why* must our boys fight and perhaps die in Viet Nam? They're using us militarily and financially.

Sincerely,

Mrs. K. YANTIS, Jr.

PARMA, OHIO,
May 11, 1966.

DEAR SIR: All glory to you for the stand you have taken on the war, I listen with great interest to your wise and just statements, and am happy when you have the courage and determination to talk down McNamara.

With all my heart, and in behalf of my Grand Children and my Great Grandchildren, "there are ten", I wish you were our President.

You talk as tho you were seeking truth and solutions, and not a place in the sun.

God bless you and keep you in good health so you can fight for the right.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARGARET LILLIE.

JACKSON, MICH.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE D. MORSE,

DEAR SIR: I was so pleased and so proud of you the other night as I watched you on T.V. I am sure there are others who think as you do but who lack courage to speak out. I suppose most of them are too busy playing politics and thinking of the next election to say how they *really* feel about this situation. I pray for you and the few like you that are right even though you may seem to be in the minority. Might doesn't always make right. We at home are counting on you and others like you to get us out of this dirty little political war that certainly is not worth the prime of life of our youth. God bless you and your courageous stand on this issue.

Mrs. F. HASHLEY.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
May 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish I could be more articulate in expressing my thanks to you and the other senators who are making a tremendous effort to create an understanding of goodwill with our neighbors in the Orient.

It will take almost a miracle to bring peace in Vietnam but I do hope it can become a reality—the sooner it happens the sooner my conscience for the United States of America will improve. I love my country. I want to be proud of my country.

With best wishes,

PRESCILLA I. BERBERICH.

OTTAWA, CANADA.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The last time I voted, in the fall of 1962, it was my privilege to vote for you. A black and green (shape of Oregon) button is

on the sunshade of my car. It reminds me that 1962 was the only time that I could vote for a candidate, not merely *against* some fool or knave.

The courage and sanity of all your pronouncements regarding Vietnam are splendid. I admire you, wish you health and strength, and hope you realize that there are many who you spoke for. I have long wanted to write you and tell you that you are doing good work. But I said to myself, "He knows it. He doesn't need your praise, at all." And you don't.

But you probably get many letters from nuts all the time. I have been away from the U.S. for three years and only dimly realize the extent of the pressures against common sense, against decency. They are much.

You know how much easier it is to write a critical letter. I write many, but I cannot remember when I wrote to anyone in a prominent place to say congratulations.

You deserve it.

Yours sincerely,

J. C. CEDERSTROM.

ELK RIVER, MINN.,
May 10, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is the first time we have written to you, but we have watched all of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee meetings on television, have read many of your comments on the Vietnam situation in the newspapers, and have silently applauded your views for many months. Now we want to tell you how deeply we appreciate your struggle to bring to the American people the true facts of this terrible mistake in US foreign policy and to thank you sincerely for your opposition to it.

You may be sure that in the future we will watch and listen to you with growing thankfulness and hope that the voters of your home state will come to the same appreciation and also write and vote to show their gratitude for your greatness in this time of national distress.

With kind personal regards,

Mr. and Mrs. H. H. ANDERSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 15, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator, State of Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have been following the Vietnam War with an alarming interest. I would just like to say, though I do not live in Oregon, that you are doing a splendid job for the American people. I only wish that more people would take note of your warning.

I am only 22, and have a wife and baby. A few years ago I was called up for the draft and refused because of a slight hearing defect, so I do not think that my views are for selfish motivations, since I will never see a uniform or a gun. But I still cannot help thinking that if the present situation is not curtailed very soon, that the war will spread into my backyard.

I have in front of me a word by word copy of the Senate hearings, which you participated in, and you made one statement that I would like to ask you about. This is regarding the very obvious lack of information from the Pentagon. Is there any chance that Defense Secretary McNamara will ever have to answer to us for his actions? It seems to me that the Secretary will go on unchecked if your committee does not call him. His reason for not appearing were, "It would not be in the best interest of national security." Sir, its not in the best interest

of the nation to allow any high government official to have the right of secrecy. If I as a voter do not know what is going on in Washington, how can I be a qualified voter? My own Senators, Msrs. KUCHEL and MURPHY, have yet to speak out on this grave issue. I am very disappointed in Senator KUCHEL, who except for this issue, has served California in the way a Senator should serve his state.

Senator, please continue your valiant fight against this killing and please lead the fight against secrecy in the present administration. May I also add that someone in government must do something about Mr. Thant at the United Nations. I don't like to blame this most wonderful organization for their lack of initiative with the Vietnam affair, but I can't help blaming the leadership for not taking the reins. I could be wrong, but I think we need a new Secretary-General at the United Nations. Thant has already stated that he is not happy in his job, and he shows it. What can I do as a citizen to see that we have more effective leadership in the U.N.?

Sir, if there were 99 more Senators like you, "I would sleep better at night," to paraphrase a corny statement from a corny man.

With greatest respect, I am,

Yours truly,

M. PHILIP GERSTLE.

SAN BERNARDINO, CALIF.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am as angered and embittered over this war as you are. We appear to be at fault, guilty of aggression, guilty of taking sides, and guilty of uncalled for and inhumane bombing attacks.

You have warned the administration consistently. You have spoken well. Many educated Americans have written letters asking our government to reconsider its position. It has reconsidered, but it has done nothing about it.

Has anything been said about a war crimes trial? I believe that one is in order, and I do not believe that the military men should be the ones to stand trial. The only laws that military men understand are the laws of authority and obedience. But Rusk, McNamara, and Johnson should know better.

The questions of aggression and the obliteration of innocent human beings in the name of the American will to win are going to make it necessary for a time of evaluation and judgement before an objective tribunal.

Threat of proceedings should begin immediately. Let us not wait for the end of the war. No one may be around for that anyway. Just because a country or a segment of a country invites us to fight their war for them does not mean we have the moral obligation to obey.

I believe that the precedents for the Nuremberg war trials should be the order of procedure. Perhaps U Thant should be the one to initiate the proceedings. I do not pretend to know how the final verdict will go. But I believe it is time for the proceedings to begin.

I hope that you will get other letters that agree with me in this matter. And I hope that the mighty forces of humane justice will intercede before this international farce proceeds any further.

If my point is correct, then I believe my second point of impeachment to follow on the heels of the war trials is also correct.

These Washington war hawks do not belong in the White House. They belong in the prison house. They have used might to make wrong, even after all the ethical voices spoke. Now it is too late.

I am sorry. The situation is disgraceful, but I will not put my economic energy into

the obliteration of human beings whose only crime was to fight a civil war to determine their own government and to rid their country of a major foreign aggressor.

The Chinese troops have not marched in. The Russians have refrained from joining in.

If North Viet Nam is guilty of aggression, as HUBERT HUMPHREY insisted to me in a two page personal letter I have yet to answer, then Abraham Lincoln was wrong to invade the South. At least they could agree on their own government. That is not true in South Viet Nam, and no election at this time can possibly resolve that situation, Ky or no Ky.

I confess that I do not know enough about legal procedure to know if a war trial can be held at this time, but perhaps it is a time for new precedents if old ones will not suffice.

The least we can do is warn our leaders of the possible consequences of their misdeeds.

Sincerely,

KENTON S. WHITE.

ESCONDIDO, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wrote Senator FULBRIGHT some time back, and thank God we have a man like you in the Senate. I believe both of you will cause other Senators to think hard about the Vietnam war.

I am 71 years old and do not believe in war. I think the good old U.S. should be civilized enough to stop the killing by now. It seems non-students will be called for the war while students will be excused. That is horrible.

I believe communism is in the world to stay and if we make peace, and correct a lot of our ills, they will want to adopt our way of life.

With the weapons we have on both sides a full scale war will kill most of the people.

ELMER G. MOYER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 15, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Let me begin to say, as a former Republican presently dissatisfied with both parties, that I daily look forward to reading the proposals and ideas coming from the sane legislature in Washington of which I consider you a member. I dare say that more and more fellow Democrats and Independents share my feelings and views. It becomes more evident each day that our present administration is courting economic and political catastrophe.

We sane Americans will continue to look forward to your leadership in furthering your efforts to bring about a solution to our present predicament in Vietnam. Many Americans await the day when we will have the choice of selecting our next president from your more enlightened group. I shall personally go out and campaign in your behalf when that day comes.

As a social studies instructor, I have decided that my course of study can only be effective by encouraging my youngsters to investigate and research our present involvement in Vietnam. We have started by reading all old periodicals on the subject and summarizing them. Later we hope to compile this information into a history of our involvement in Asia. We are also making a related study of communism. It is rewarding to see them working eagerly toward a goal that will help them formulate their own convictions and enable them to make objective appraisals of both systems and our position in Vietnam. Hopefully this training will lead them to handle all important issues in a similar manner.

Yours truly,

AUGUSTUS R. CACIOTTI.

CXII—742—Part 9

LINDSBORG, KANS., May 16, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HON. MORSE: I am writing to tell you that we are in full agreement with your policy towards the war in Viet Nam. We think the war should be ended. We should get out, right now! It is stupid for us to continue this waste of human life and money.

Please continue to keep up the great work. We are on your side and hope that you will continue to speak up and do what you can to end this silly war.

When the next election comes around, you can be sure that we will do what we can to defeat the present administration and its dumb policy.

If we can help in any way, and if you need any support, you can be sure that you have it out here.

Thanks for all you have done and keep up what you are doing. We appreciate your doing what you can.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM LINDER.

SCRANTON, PA.,
May 15, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You are a great man and a friend of the people to speak out about the truth in Viet Nam. If there were only more like you!

Why is a matter as important as war left to only a few—the President, Secretary McNamara and Secretary Rusk. It is our sons who are dying needlessly. We the people should be asked how we feel about the commitments our country makes. I surely will cast my vote for men like you.

There is a feeling of disrespect and hatred for our leaders in Washington and for the draft. Why is a stubborn and arrogant man like our President allowed to have so much power, and why does he continue to listen to incompetent advisors like McNamara and Rusk?

WORLD WAR II VETERAN.

BURGESS, VA.,
May 14, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for what you are trying to do for the American people.

I don't know what has happened to us Americans to let a man like Johnson and HUMPHREY take over our country.

My husband and I travel a lot and I meet a lot of people. But I have not found one person that says he voted for Johnson or HUMPHREY. How did they get in office? I wish I could get all of these people that did not vote for him together. I think we could do something about getting him out. Every one says he will not be President again. By the end of the next three years we will not need a President because we will not have a country.

We thought Hitler was a dictator—what else do we have in Johnson?

What we need is a few more men like you and we could have a good old fashioned house cleaning. That is the only way we can save our country.

We surely have a corrupt bunch in Washington, D.C. All of our young boys being killed in Viet Nam, and Johnson has the gall to get up on TV to say he is going to put a stop to all the accidents and deaths on the highways. He should be ashamed to show his face with all the young boys' deaths he has on his conscience. I can't write and I can't spell but I pray to God to come to our rescue. Put the old fighting spirit back in the American and peace loving people. Let us have a victory march on Washington, D.C., and clean house, starting in the attic and going right through to the basement.

Thank you again for what you are and what you are trying to do for us.

May God bless you.

Your Friends,

Mr. and Mrs. FRANCIS SHIRLEY.

HARRISON, N.Y.,
May 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing this letter to express my appreciation to you for your efforts towards informing the United States population about Vietnam and China.

It is my fervent hope that you will succeed in helping to lead the way for our government to be "big enough" to admit the mistakes and to pull out of Vietnam immediately.

It appears to me that Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara are being given much too much power. How can this be stopped?

Furthermore, isn't there some way in which the United States could give the money which we are using in the war to the U.N. to spend on a "Peace Keeping Police Force" to be stationed in Vietnam? If we could implement this, we could hope to come to a settlement in the spirit of the Geneva accords.

I know that you are interested in the youth of the United States. If you have your "ear to the ground," you will hear rumblings of great doubt among them concerning the integrity of our country under these circumstances. It is extremely frightening that our "establishment" doesn't heed these symptoms.

Thanking you very much for your courageous work.

Sincerely,

ELSIE H. JAROS.

DETROIT, MICH.,
May 14, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please carry on the fight. I speak for so many of my friends when I say that yours is the only voice of reason among the babble of outworn cliches. What can we do to help end this insane war?

Very truly yours,

Mrs. PHILIP B. FRANK.

SUNNYVALE, CALIF.

Re the war in Viet Nam.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please continue your continued efforts towards working for a peaceful solution in Viet Nam.

I have three young school boys and I'm deeply concerned with our country's continued military solutions to "all" problems.

It's wonderful to see a man "emotional" over the killing of humans and I'm terribly concerned at the fact that so many of our leaders show no "empathy".

We need your voice desperately. Sir, please continue your efforts.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GRACE JOHNSON.

DALLAS, TEX.,
May 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Chamber,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR MORSE: We hope you will continue to give us the wisdom, leadership, and courage which we need in our foreign affairs. The American public is an ignored entity today. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee investigations now need to be implemented into a full scale open discussion on our aims, involvements, and political directions in every phase of foreign affairs.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. HARRY GARBER.

KNOXVILLE, TENN.,
April 13, 1966.

The HONORABLE WAYNE MORSE,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: First, may I say how disappointed I was that you missed the Student Forum session here at the University of Tennessee. I and many other students were looking forward to your talk. I hope that you can arrange another visit at a later date.

For the last few years your stand on Viet Nam and American participation in the war there has been widely known, discussed, and debated. Even though at the present time I do not agree with you, I admire you for your consistent convictions on the situation. Actually I do not feel competent to voice a debatable opinion; I only know what I feel—that the fighting and dying of our G.I.'s is not in vain. As a young man faced with the responsibility of military service, I feel that the public should be fully informed on pressing questions. With commendable efforts, such as the recent Fulbright hearings, this vital information is being passed on by the Senate. I wish to express my thanks for these discussions and praise the participants. Now, I would like to ask you several questions pertaining to your stand on foreign policy and what it means to you; also I have some questions about a recent statement you made at a dinner in New York recently.

I believe you said that the administration supports an unconstitutional war in Viet Nam, and that it was time for the American people to take action by electing an administration that will end the "terrible war." Do you profess that in 1968 you will support a candidate other than President Johnson if the present policy continues? Also would you consider yourself as a potential candidate for the Democratic nomination on a ticket that favors an isolationist view? In my present political science class, we have just brought up Secretary of State Rusk's outline of the five goals of U.S. foreign policy. As we understand them, they are briefly to develop: 1) security through strength; 2) progress through partnership; 3) revolution of freedom; 4) a world community under international law; 5) peace through perseverance. Do you believe that these are just theoretical goals or that they are truly the aims of our foreign policy? What would you consider the ideal policy and relationship with the world for the United States to pursue?

As the editor of the newspaper and the chairman of the Young Republican Club in high school in Savannah, Tennessee, I requested some information about Senator Goldwater's position on TVA and other pertinent issues. What I received was a form letter and a note of thanks for my concern. Senator Morse, as an interested American *only*, I sincerely request a straightforward reply to as many of my questions as you feel you are at liberty to answer from either you or a member of your staff at your earliest convenience, if I may be so presumptuous to do so. I believe a sincere reply will speak well of your position and the U.S. Senate.

May I offer my congratulations for your past actions enlightening the American public to the pressing situation. Sincere thanks for your participation and concern in various debates and discussions about the Viet Nam crisis. Your time and consideration in acknowledging my letter will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

JOHN EDWARD (ED) FARISS.

MADISON, WIS.,
April 6, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It looks to me as if the floor (of invitation to send troops to S. Vietnam) is collapsing under U.S. policy.

WILLIAM GORHAM RICE.

TIMBERLAKE, N.C.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations again, on your continued stand and work on the opposition of the present policy of the U.S. Government on Vietnam!

Keep up the good work!
Bring our boys home!

Sincerely,

Mrs. W. READE HALL.

SEEKONK, MASS.,
April 9, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I know that Senators do not insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD articles about themselves. I am asking that you insert the enclosed clipping about Senator GRUENING in the RECORD. He is a great man, a tribute to America, and a living proof that statesmanship is not dead.

You too have stood alone in the face of bitter hatred and abuse in opposing the war in Vietnam. God bless you for it. Now the other ninety-eight members of the Senate are seeing that you two were right all along; we are supporting dictatorship! As I have said for many years, we have no business in Vietnam; the *people* do not want our "help" in the form of napalm and bullets. Their military dictators and our puppets do certainly want our billions and our blood, but their people don't. As Eisenhower said a long time before this mess grew to its present levels, eighty per cent of the people want Ho Chi Minh. It is obvious that the people of DaNang, Hue, and even Saigon do not want Hitler-admiring Ky.

I say to President Johnson, "Mr. President, now is your chance to get us out. The people of South Vietnam are going to throw us out, despite their dictators, our Pentagon, and the CIA. Why in God's name don't we get out and throw the entire problem to the United Nations. Mr. President, bring home our boys, not our pine boxes!"

Sincerely,

W. BRUCE DEAN.

AMBLER, PA.,
March 8, 1966.

Senator MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I heard your speech in Philadelphia last Friday night. Today I put my petition in for the 13th Congressional District (Montgomery County) of Pennsylvania.

I hope to live up to your principles.

If you have any suggestion for help—or any information I can use please let me know. Keep working.

FRANK R. ROMANO.

JEFFERSONVILLE, IND.,
March 24, 1966.

DEAR SIR: I followed, with interest, the recent publicized hearings on the Viet Nam war, and was pleased to note that so many of our lawmakers are opposed to the war and are trying to stop it.

Someone recently said that "Ignorance is in high places, and always will be," but I'm glad to see that not *all* in high places are ignorant.

I believe that all right thinking people support you and your colleagues in what you're doing. I feel we need more people in public life who are not afraid to speak out for what they believe to be right.

So please keep up the good work and I hope the war can soon be ended.

Now, although I think the war the most important issue at present, there are other matters that also need the scrutiny of our lawmakers. I will state my beliefs on these on the following pages.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. ZAY ALLEN.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
March 12, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Want you to know that I agree with your position on the recognition of Mainland China.

Respectfully,

H. R. REAVER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 10, 1966.

Mr. SENATOR MORSE: I am following your speeches every day: Please excuse my poor English. You are wonderful, you are a statue that we need as a president. When I came to this country 1936 I was so proud and I love our country and even dare say, that I appreciate it more as a naturalized citizen. My son was in the 82nd Airborne, wounded, but thank God, he came home alive.

But what I try to bring out is, that I feel you are our only salvation, your points of views, your personality and if the others have their way and this included our president, for whom I voted and loved, but is the greatest disappointment to our country and the foreign policy, only you can save our country, can save our reputation and maybe prevent another horrible war! Please forgive me for taking such liberty to write to you, but please write me a little answer note because I like to have the handwriting of such a great man like you and maybe the next president of this great country and I can tell my grandchildren, I told you so, this is and was the man we needed.

Sincerely and fondly,

MARGARET NATHANSON.

PRINCETON, N.J.,
May 18, 1966.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senator of State of Oregon,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: Your outspoken criticisms of the Government politics in the Vietnamese crisis has impressed many people including myself.

America has for many generations been the symbol for Liberty. Men from other countries, being suppressed by their Government's control and restrictions have found the freedom they have been longing for in this country.

Respectfully yours,

CURT ROSENBLAD.

TIJERAS, N. MEX.,
May 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My wife and I have been following your efforts in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee investigations very closely, both on television and in the newspapers.

We sincerely believe that you have good reason, as does Senator FULBRIGHT, to doubt that all is well; that the general public, and indeed the Congress, are being forced along a path that may well lead to self-destruction, by an obstinate leader, who, in our opinion, is displaying shocking dictatorial tendencies of late.

We feel that it is about time some of the responsibility for making or approving policy be returned to the people or, at least, to their delegated representatives in Congress. We find many of our Democrat friends

around us are beginning to think in this same vein. We are getting tired of having things shoved down our throats by the Johnson family and their very select group, who seem to feel that they are the only people in the entire United States who know what is good for the people. It shocks us to feel that President Johnson evidently thinks the "people" are too stupid to govern themselves.

We need more Senators like you, to stand up and ask, "Why and What For!"

We admire the work you and a few other fighters are doing for our country.

Along with the pat on the back, we would like to air one more gripe with you, for we feel you will see our point.

Sincerely,

ELBERT E. GINN, JR.
Mrs. JESSE L. GINN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
May 19, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have read your great speech on Vietnam in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16.

It is my understanding that the U.S. action in Vietnam is motivated by the desire to force a war upon China in order to prevent her dominance in Asia.

Sincerely,

H. ZUCKERMAN.

WEST CHESTER, PA.,
May 19, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: You are one person I like to hear talk and my views are about the same as yours in reference to this Viet Nam war. I am inclosing this article which speaks for itself. Smarty McNamara said they had everything they needed but this write up says not. If Ky and the Buddhists are to fight among themselves instead of the Communists why should our boys continue to suffer and die in combat against Red aggressors. In that speech the other night by Dictator Johnson any one not agreeing with him are not right and he gave it a name that I can't remember. I come from an old Democratic family but I would never vote for Johnson. I hope he will sit down and think along with that awful McNamara of the many boys they have had killed, wounded and taken prisoner. Nothing ever said if these prisoners of war are well treated and the wounded may come back some half a man or no man at all. Hope Senator MORSE, you will not just think of me a fanatic in writing you but it does get me. Just a housewife, one who saw red when Dictator told us what we should buy and should not. I figure my husband earns the money and after the Government takes out taxes for the Great Society we have little enough to spend on the family and don't have to be told to be cautious in buying—we have to be.

Yours Truly,

Mrs. JOHN SHAY.

ROCHESTER, MINN.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senator of Oregon, Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Generally when I write to a legislator it's a letter of disapproval—but I want very much to tell you that I appreciate the stand that you are taking in regards to our foreign policy in Viet Nam, the Dominican Republic, the Near East.

Questioning the direction the U.S. seems to be going is truly important. Thank you for representing me in Washington. I can't vote for you but I praise you at every opportunity.

Will the upcoming changes in the State Department mean a change from the old Dulles missionary approach? Surely hope so. Historical immortality certainly has its negative values too.

Thank you again for waging a good fight.

Sincerely,

JOHN THEYE.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
May 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR FRIEND: We thank you deeply for the many times you speak out and vote for freedom and the truth.

So often, too many in Congress fail toward the sterling ways for which our nation started and followed more faithfully than much of today's government leaders are doing. Keep up your good work, it will & already is bearing some fruit. The proposed plan, for alternation services for our youth, would be a wise & helpful move in the right direction.

To bring our men home from Vietnam is our urgent need.

Sincerely,

M. R. BRIGGS.

BUCYRUS, OHIO,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Bless you for standing up and voicing your sincere and candid opinion in these troubled times. If it were only possible to have many more of your caliber.

We admire you tremendously for your untiring effort for having the courage and fortitude to stand up for what we all would like a voice in. The Senate hearings have given the entire country a better insight into this situation and when we see and hear Congressmen such as Senator MORSE and Senator FULBRIGHT get to the heart of problems by asking the sincere questions which the public really wants to know, rather than the routine, parrot-like questions that oft times seem repetitious and of a non-offensive nature to the one being questioned. May you Senator MORSE be given the continued strength and courage to fight for your beliefs.

It is comforting to know we still have congressmen who maintain their individuality despite their politics.

May the Good Lord bless and keep you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARVIN WALTERS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Here is one who supports your stand in the Vietnam war.

People may complain that your language is sometimes over strong but not I.

I endorse your stand and admire your courage.

Bravo.

Truly Yours,

ROBERT CLAYTON.

AUSTIN, TEX.,
May 18, 1966.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Relations Committee,
United States Senate
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: Thank God for men like you and the Senators on this committee, who have courage to oppose President Johnson's policy and a faith in God to believe in giving Americans the truth during a crisis.

These committee hearings have answered questions and prayers of Americans so with God's Help this committee could be the answer to America's deterioration. I want to

take this opportunity to say we Americans appreciate the truth. Thank you.

Yours very sincerely,

HELEN MACHALICEK.
LORENE MACHU.
PATRICIA ROHLACK.

BEAUMONT, TEX.,
May 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank God for a man of your intelligence, bravery, and candor. My wife and I admire you greatly and wish only the very best for you. I am sick and tired of having the "Pacifists" labeled as sick, sloppy, or uneducated. My father is a successful businessman, I was elected to "Who's Who in American Universities and Colleges," and am past president of my College's Young Democrats. How very disappointed all liberals are that President Johnson has forsaken those who worked the hardest for his election. Our prayers and pride are for you. Thank you Senator.

Respectfully,

LINDLEY ORR.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,
May 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Since I am not a resident of your state I cannot, by voting, demonstrate my support for your courageous position with regard to the Viet Nam issue. I am writing this letter so that you may know that you have respect and admiration from many of us in central Pennsylvania.

I believe that it is harmful to the long run interests of our national security for us to remain in and escalate our commitment to South Viet Nam's military regime in their attempt to end an internal revolution. We are there without the approval of the United Nations and without the support or approval of our allies. We are earning the contempt and fear of all the uncommitted nations of the world. Our military strength elsewhere is being drained.

I am proud that your voice and others have been raised in opposition to the administration's policies. I urge you to stand firm against the President's attempts to brand critics as un-American.

RICHARD ROSENBERG.

PALM BEACH, FLA.,
May 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I received a copy of the Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam sent by your office. I thank you.

It is difficult for me to understand the reason that President Johnson has so little opposition in the Congress for waging a war so far away from the U.S.

In my letter dated April 26, 1966 I gave my view to my Senators and Congressman letting them know that I supported Senator WAYNE MORSE's belief that we had no business to be in S. Vietnam. Their answer were the same that they were supporting our President.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER VUILLEMIN.

GROSSE ISLE, MICH.,
May 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have wanted to write a note to you ever since the administration began its escalation in Vietnam. I want to express my thanks. I agree so thoroughly with your position it is difficult to know why there aren't more senators and concerned people in the Government. When the predictions come true day by day and our involvement increases where can this lead us but more and more war.

I am very grateful to you and wish to thank you.

May God help and bless you in this difficult time.

Mrs. DAVID M. COAKLEY.

BELMONT, MASS.,
May 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am most grateful to you and a few other senators who dare to speak out against the Vietnam hysteria with the voice of reason. Having once fled from Hitler's Germany, I am now dismayed at seeing similar indications of the lust of total power arise in this country. Please keep up the fight.

Respectfully yours,

HELMUT HECKSCHER.

AKRON, OHIO,
May 19, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We received your publication concerning the legal issues involved in the U.S. position in Vietnam, our names being obtained, I believe through the Fellowship of Reconciliation. We support you in your lonely stand for honesty, and moral uprightness in U.S. foreign policy.

Thank God there are a few sane men like you, and FULBRIGHT in our Government. Keep "running the good race."

Now, in the face of civil war in Vietnam, (our newspapers are even calling it that finally) might be an easier time for the U.S. to get out. I think you have a lot of unspoken support and I hope you will hear from more people as more issues are raised.

Sincerely,

KENNETH and LYDIA WILLIAMS.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
May 20, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for sending me a copy of your recent address on the legal issues of the American position in Vietnam.

As important as that is, even more important is the fact that the people whom we are supposed to be defending against communism, are utterly indifferent to the battle which we are waging in their behalf. Instead of fighting the enemy, they are fighting amongst themselves, which makes our effort hopeless.

I hope that you and other senators will succeed in prevailing upon our president and his advisors to re-examine our Vietnam position, and to hasten the recall of American soldiers from that land.

Yours truly,

THEODORE N. LEWIS.

RICHMOND, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations Senator for your remarks about notoriety seeker President Johnson.

NORMAN J. BENTLEY.

THERMAL, CALIF.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your persistence in criticizing American foreign policy in Viet Nam is most gratifying. The United States should never have intervened in South Vietnam and I think now is the time to insist that our government seriously attempt to renew negotiations along the lines of those at Geneva in 1954. Only through negotiations and the eventual withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam can we achieve

a satisfactory agreement to end this war on honorable terms for our country.

Very truly yours,

C. WILLIAM EKHOFF.

SEBASTOPOL, CALIF.,
May 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a line to thank you for the continuous and splendid effort you are making in behalf of a sane policy toward Vietnam. Also, to tell you that you are getting very good coverage on the various radio stations in the S.F. Bay Area. I do not watch T.V., but understand you get good coverage there to. Thanks a million and don't bother to acknowledge this note.

Sincerely,

LYOYD M. ALLEN.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.,
May 19, 1966.

Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I wish to commend you for your honest and forthright statements about our policy in Viet-nam.

It is a very bad situation over there and I also do not wish to see it escalated any further. I lend my support to any effort to bring about a realistic peaceful settlement.

Sincerely yours,

ROLAND KOHLOFF.

ARLETA, CALIF.,
May 23, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We think you are a wonderful person—a real man, courageous and rough thinking!

Please run for President! This is a very unpopular war! We are good citizens but this war is a nasty unnecessary one and we need a good President of U.S.A.

Could write pages but my hand is crippled with arthritis.

We love you.

ELIZABETH DOYLE (Mrs. E.)

MAY 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States, Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Regarding your views on the Viet Nam War Senator, I wish you to know that I, and many of like thought are with you. When the going gets rough and all sides seem to be belaboring you with accusations of disloyalty, being un-American (whatever that is) etc. think of us your supporters—you are speaking for us and we share the darts arrows and blows directed to you—I have 2 sons—one in the service and I have no willingness to lose either one because of Presidential enthusiasm for "Do Goodism."

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. MEDLAND.

MAY 19, 1966.

To the Honorable Senator MORSE: My husband and I wish to convey to you our whole-hearted support of your position on the issue of Vietnam and to thank you for your fortitude and unflinching efforts. Please continue to persevere.

Respectfully yours,

REA KNISBACHER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We're all the way with you—keep fighting for what's right, and we'll keep supporting you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JOEL WEPRIN.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.,
May 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please do all you can to end this war. How can we help Vietnam when they don't seem to know themselves what they want???

Isn't there some way to get the boy's home?????

Thank you for all your hard work in this direction!

MARCIA HOLCOMB.

EAST LANSING, MICH.

Thank you, Hon. WAYNE MORSE for the copy of your speech of 2-25-1966 "Legal Issues of the U.S. Position . . ." Many of us share the belief you voice so well. Please continue. Lust for power may miss the mark.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BERNARD COGGAN,
Supervisor.

MALIBU, CALIF.,
May 10, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your voice against the madness & murder of U.S. actions in S.E. Asia is indispensable in these dark days.

Thank you for your courage—and for all our sakes don't be intimidated or silenced! You are performing a national service of utmost value!

Sincerely yours,

H. ARTHUR KLEIN.

MAY 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Again, may I express my approval of your forthright and courageous statement concerning the Johnson policy, or should I say "fallacy" in Vietnam. I concur with your statement that the most dangerous threat to the peace of the world at this moment happens to be the American military. In my judgment you continue to verbalize the convictions of millions of thoughtful Americans who view with alarm the continued and deeper involvement of American soldiers and resources in this tragic and immoral affair. Would that more power could be generated by men such as you to divert control of our foreign policy in Vietnam from the military. You have our complete respect and encouragement.

I too have been outspoken in the criticism of our involvement in Vietnam—it is my impression that a growing number of people are losing confidence in the Johnson administration.

Sincerely yours,

WM. G. WOOLWORTH.
ALBANY, CALIF.

MAY 20, 1966.

DEAR Mr. MORSE: Thank you Mr. MORSE, keep up the good work. I have two boys and many young friends in the Armed Forces. I don't want them to die.

May God Bless You Always.

Mrs. JOHN B. ARNOLD.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.

FAIRFIELD, CONN.,
May 20, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want to thank you for your forthright and courageous statements in recent weeks in the Foreign Relations Committee and elsewhere. We do not approve of the present American involvement in Viet Nam, the escalation of ground forces, the bombing, the killing or maiming of women and children, by accident, or because they happen to be in some area.

We hope that you will continue to seek a way for negotiations and eventual disengagement of United States' military forces. The situation in Viet Nam seems to have worsened this week, with Premier Ky's military move against the Buddhists.

I am writing Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator RUBINOFF also.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET W. PICKETT.

PASADENA, CALIF.,
May 17, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am sure that the position you have taken over the Vietnam dispute has resulted in your receiving a considerable amount of noisy abuse. I want you to know that there is also a large number of quiet, frustrated Americans who wholeheartedly support you. Among them are myself and many, many of my friends.

Highest regards.

Very truly yours,

Dr. ALBERT R. HIBBS,
Senior Staff Scientist,
Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY,
Manhattan, Kans., May 20, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is not directed only to you; I hope that other officials in our national government, including the President, will become aware of the dissent among the public concerning our present policy in South Viet Nam.

At first, I was in agreement with our economic and military aid to that country. But now, since the recent crises, it is increasingly apparent that the people are more concerned with political rivalry than in fighting a common enemy (Communism), and are leaving this task entirely to the U.S. military forces. Not only that, but the reports of actual attacks and demonstrations against the U.S. by the peoples of South Viet Nam are very disgusting and would seem enough reason for an honorable withdrawal of troops and aid.

Personally, I am not willing that our dollars and lives of our servicemen be wasted on people who, apparently, do not appreciate our aid, do not care for democratic freedom, or are not willing to stop bickering among themselves to fight for it. Moreover, this economic drain is removing necessary federal aid to education, research, the relief of poverty of our own people, as well as causing strain in the budgets of many Americans by inflation and increased taxes.

Please do what you can to get our troops out of that useless, senseless struggle and cease, at least most of our economic aid—use it where it is valued, appreciated and vindicated.

This is one voter who will not support any candidate, from mayor to President, who is in favor of our present Viet Nam policy.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP A. NICKEL.

P.S.—Wish I were home to vote for Howard Morgan for U.S. Senate.

EDWARDSVILLE, ILL.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your tireless work for peace is much appreciated. More than you know.

Just thought I'd bother you with this little note.

Sincerely,

MERRILL HARMIN.

MAY 20, 1966.

OAKLAND, CALIF.,
May 17, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your strong stand against the U.S. position in Viet Nam. I agree with you all the way. We should get our men out, and home as quickly

as possible and make our peace with the Asians and help them build up their economy.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MARGARET HORN.

MAY 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: May I commend you for your courageous stand on the Vietnam crisis. I agree most heartily.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LUCILLE FILBECK.

GLENDALE, CALIF.

LOS ALTOS HILLS, CALIF.,
May 19, 1966.

DEAR SIR: Once again may I respectfully commend you on your position and your frank and courageous statements regarding foreign affairs.

Your understanding, getting behind the chauvinistic superficialities, is refreshing and reassuring.

My respects,

A. A. GOETZ, M.D.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 19, 1966.

Senator MORSE: Please keep up your fight against the stupidity of our Viet-Nameese position.

You are gaining more support every day.

EDDIE ROSENSTIEL.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
May 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations to you for your courage and stand on Vietnam. I only pray for more who share your convictions.

Keep up your good work and efforts.

Sincerely,

EARL G. ROSS.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY,
Stanford, Calif., May 16, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to express the gratitude and support of my family and many of our friends for your long and difficult efforts to rescue the United States from its insane Asian policy. There is no doubt in my mind that, if this country ever adopts a realistic and honorable policy toward China and Southeast Asia, it will be largely due to you and to the recent efforts of Senator FULBRIGHT and a few others.

At times, in the past few years, you must have felt that you were shouting in a desert; but some of us could always hear you, and it seems that more are listening every day. Please keep it up.

Thank you.

With all good wishes,

HUGO MAYNARD, Ph. D.
Research Associate.

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.,
May 17, 1966.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The morning paper printed quite an exhortation by you anent Vietnam and our military, of whom it has been said, wisely, "generals die in bed."

All this recalls so vividly the valiant attempts of "Billy" Mitchell to promote our Air Corps and the unceasing battle he fought to prove his convictions. His death was untimely, but today we have the proof of his arguments.

Keep up your struggle, with Senator FULBRIGHT along, so that, ultimately, these facts may percolate somewhat into public consciousness. I'm sure you know how hurtful

the truth can be. Perseverance in the right is never wasted.

Public opinion may vary but it can be swayed by persistence of the sort and of oral force you are using. Be of stout heart.

Truly yours for peace, however, whenever and wherever it may be achieved to save our boys and "face."

MARY RYDER ERHARD.

P.S.—With one of my family of 23 now in the Air Force "stateside," and another now in the hell-hole of Da Nang, need I say why I feel a frenzy of fear and shame?

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is my humble opinion that all loyal Americans should write to encourage you to continue to stand up and speak out, to help bring this terrible war in Vietnam to an end. You are an example of strength, in what is becoming an apathetic Society! You should propose that we withdraw now, with the valid excuse that we do not belong in the midst of strife and instability that has come to pass in recent weeks. It is obvious, conditions will worsen, with different factions fighting so among themselves, that we will lose any support of the people of Vietnam, that we might have had.

The whole thing is shocking. When we know we've made a mistake, we should try to correct it.

I wish it could be brought to a vote of the people—whether to stay or leave.

Keep on, only hit harder every chance you get, you are winning more and more admirers.

This is the only letter I have ever written to a government official.

Sincerely,

JOYCE WHITE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 17, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: This is just a quick note to again thank you for your continued courageous stand against the Vietnam war.

Respectfully yours,

BERNARD HILBERMAN.

MAY 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Congratulations on being one of the very few men in Washington who have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and be counted on this Viet Nam mess. Would that we had a few more so that we could do that which is the only manly thing to do, get out of it quickly, acknowledge that we made a mistake and act like men. We would earn the respect of the world instead of its scorn for our actions.

Of course, it takes a morally big person to say very frankly, "I made a mistake" and I do not think that our President is that type of a man. It will take some of you in the Senate to get things straightened out again.

Keep up the good work. There is hope for our country yet as long as we have men like yourself willing to fight for what is right instead of for that which is politically expedient.

Sincerely,

ROLAND C. KOEHLER.

MAY 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Although we are not constituents, we have felt the necessity to write to you and say THANKS. We thank you for the courage and integrity you have exemplified in your stand on the Viet Nam situation. We hope by my knowing there are people in the United States who believe in you and honor your stand that this discouragement can be alleviated somewhat.

People throughout the country are now taking a stand on the Viet Nam war and recently in Ann Arbor the Democratic Party passed a resolution stating our position against the present policy in Viet Nam. The Party received much advertised criticism of this stand and because it was passed just before city elections at least one of our candidates personally was hurt by this anti-war stand. We relate this to you in order that you may let others know that people within the party—people who work at the grass roots level are actively opposed to our policy. They should not be categorized as "beatniks" and therefore confidentially ignored.

We have written to the President and other elected officials to protest our policy in Viet Nam and have even suggested some alternatives, but needless to say we have received ambiguous answers.

Again we thank you and hope that your rationality will be listened to soon.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. RICHARD ROBOHM.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.,

May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for the battle you are waging against the U.S. policy in Viet Nam. Please continue the good work. I pray you will never weaken. I agree with what you are saying and doing. If you are wrong the Holy Bible should be discarded. God bless you.

Yours truly,

VICTOR W. HARRISON.

LIVERMORE, CALIF.,

May 12, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Everything you did on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was very, very fine. Let me congratulate you and thank you. I regret your Vietnam opinions appeared to be in a distinct minority. Some of your predictions seem on the verge of being fulfilled—and still the administration presses on toward our destruction.

I also regret that I am not one of your constituents, as I would feel very much better about voting for a man who agrees with my examination of the Vietnam situation than the people we are offered in California.

There seems no way of dissuading the administration from its present folly; but if a way can be found, you, Senator, and Senator FULBRIGHT will find it.

Thank you for being so courageous and trying so hard to advance a saner course than is being pursued currently.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN K. BARDSLEY
Mrs. R. E. Bardsley.

MAY 17, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am one of those to whom a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, covering the legal issues of the United States position in Vietnam was forwarded, for which I thank you.

This gave impetus to my writing to you although every time I have heard you speak I felt that I should. I imagine that your response to this mailing is important so that our feelings are known. I credit you with being one of the few in government today who speak truth.

Adlai Stevenson said, "The real patriots are those who love America as she is, but

who want the beloved to be more lovable. This is not treachery. This as every parent, every teacher, every friend must know, is the truest and noblest affection." Your open criticism about Vietnam certainly indicates that you are a "real Patriot."

The pity in our great country today is that the general public uses only the press and general news media for their information. As a Quaker pacifist I consider it my duty to go further.

Thank you again for the copy. I shall use it well.

Very sincerely,

RUTH VON STEEN
Mrs. Max. von Steen.

BOSTON, MASS.,

May 17, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the copy of your speech on Vietnam that you sent me recently, the more since it gives me the opportunity to tell you how much I appreciate what you and Senator FULBRIGHT and a few others are doing. I only wish I could be sure that you are going to win, for I fear that the welfare of all of us must stand or fall with you.

There is nothing in Gilbert and Sullivan more fantastic than the way we are conducting ourselves. I am often reminded of Santayana's statement that people who think Dickens exaggerated have no eyes. It is all too true.

Yours sincerely,

Professor of English.

PASSAIC, N.J.,

May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was among those privileged to hear your speech for the Passaic annual Bond Dinner on May 10th. I wish to express appreciation for your forthright honesty in regard to so many aspects of our foreign policy. I am in full agreement with your criticism of our military aid program. It seems almost obvious that our military aid has in many instances served the cause of ambitious military tyrants. I am horrified by the daily escalation of the terror in Viet Nam and profoundly disappointed in the attitudes of the administration. I voted for President Johnson because his platform went on record against escalation in Viet Nam.

However, I am puzzled that there are so few voices raised in dissent in our government. I am convinced that the men running our government are reasonable men, and therefore cannot understand why they are pursuing what seems to be an unreasonable policy, a policy headed for disaster. I am tempted to conclude that there are facts unknown to the general public which influence the decisions of the State Department. I hope that I am mistaken.

May you continue your conscientious work as lawmaker and Representative of the people.

Respectfully,

MARCIA FRANK.

MAY 14, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For brevity's sake, just a few opinions:

The administration knows the military value of bombing N. Vietnam is minimal, the cost terrible.

Its main effect has been to increase the unity, fervor and indignation of N. Vietnamese, and lose for the U.S. what little trust and good will we still enjoyed in the world.

I believe it is continued in the hope of provoking an unthinkable "preventive war" with Red China.

It is my personal belief that the administration hopes it will also be a "unifying" war that will make dissent impossible, and, somehow, avoid the day when Americans will assess this war as willful, wanton murder.

A Nuremberg war trial would puncture the aplomb of Rusk, McNamara, Taylor, et al.

I look forward to the time when I can shake the hand of the very busy, very able senior Senator.

MEL BYERS.

JOHNSTOWN, PA.,

May 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Just two days ago I wrote you regarding your courageous fight in the Senate and elsewhere against this illegal and immoral war in Viet Nam. In my letter, I begged you to continue your fight for right, and to stop this man McNamara, who is developing into an American dictator.

The terrible turn of events of the past few days, which you predicted three months ago, and just today in our newscasts & radio & TV news, McNamara is now advocating and recommending two years' service for every young American male, in his dream phrase "Community of Effort." This man is unfit to serve our country in any capacity, in spite of Pres. Johnson's sarcasm of the "Nervous Nellies" who are opposing this ridiculous commitment & obligation in Viet Nam. I beg of you at this date to organize a committee to raise sufficient funds to purchase TV time to advise the American people of our real plight, and of the disaster ahead, unless McNamara is stopped—"and right now." I'll be glad to raise funds, and to organize a force in our State of Pennsylvania to assist you and your committee. It seems apparent to me that no-one at this time is capable of conducting a successful crusade against McNamara but you sir! Won't you please consider my suggestion, I am deeply concerned about our future, and I feel confident that the great majority of our people at this time will join you in this necessary effort to correct this hopeless situation in Viet Nam, and more important, to stop this man who will not admit in any way, that he has made terrible mistakes.

Please sir, I beg of you to carry on!

Respectfully,

D. TOM EVANS.

HOFFMAN ESTATES, ILL.

May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for sending me the portion that you included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 25 entitled, "Legal Issues of the United States Position in Viet Nam."

I also wish to take this opportunity to express my thanks to you for the forthright position you have taken on the Viet Nam question. Other senators have criticized in a mild manner, but your words have been clear and unequivocal. The whole nation is indebted to you for your moral leadership.

Sincerely,

Rabbi HILLEL GAMORAN.

MAY 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It with a heavy heart this morning that I write to you. I am sad for three very important reasons. Number one—My twenty year old son is going into the army on June 6. Number two—Once again our great country finds itself at war. Number three—We are being ruled by a man who cannot ac-

cept even the smallest criticism. He does not even have the humility to wonder if he is wrong, and American lives are what he is playing with. I am tired of the present administration calling such names as "nervous Nellies" and "unpatriotic" anyone who dares disagree with its policies.

Sometime, somewhere in this world all peoples have to learn to live together around the conference table not at gun's point. Why is it mothers and wives know this is the only answer and men are so blind and intent upon war. Humanity must go forward. All our progress is in vain if we continue to have wars. Intelligent people can not have come this far without learning this fact. If man does not progress and grow mentally and emotionally, the world is lost. Wars are leading us to only one thing—total destruction. We must learn to live in peace, perhaps not harmony, but, at least peace. We must talk, not fight. If the present United Nations can not do this, find men who can and want to. Conference not war is the world's only salvation. How can anyone doubt this to be true. My family has been in three wars. I know war does not end war.

And so, as I did with his father and will with his brother, it is with heartbreak that I send my son off to a senseless war that will beget another war, and so on, endlessly.

Thank you Senator MORSE, for your lonely campaign against fighting and destruction. It is difficult to be in your position and takes great courage to speak out before the whole world. If possible, keep on regardless of the relentless criticism. You are to be commended for your stand. Continue your committee hearings on television. The country needs this. I am sorry that the Senators from my own State of Illinois do not share your convictions and am sending them copies of this letter. I hope your colleague, Senator FULBRIGHT, will not waver and fall by the wayside.

Thank you again—
Sincerely,

DORIS K. SWAN.
Mrs. Kenneth.

LIBERTYVILLE, ILL.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HON. WAYNE MORSE: Please accept my appreciation for the receipt of a copy of your speech of February 25, 1966 on "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam." I admire your wisdom, your courage, your intellectual integrity and your marvelous ability to express yourself, as well as your sticktoitiveness in spite of all contrary opinions. Would that we had more like you in our Government! I lose no opportunity to hear you or read what you have to say—and try to spread your message in my very small way.

Respectfully,

EDNA E. DONNELL.

MAY 14, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please keep up your work on Viet Nam. We're behind you 100%.

Thank you.

KENNETH CRANE.

EDMONDS, WASH.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Both you and Senator FULBRIGHT have been doing a wonderful job. Keep up the good work. We need men like you and FULBRIGHT as never before. May God be with the both of you in this fight.

Yours truly,

CHAS. A. STEWART.

AUBURNDALE, FLA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SENATOR: We are 100% with you. We should immediately stop fighting and get out!

Registered Democrat.

CASA BLANCA, LOGAN, N. MEX.

LAFAYETTE, IND.,

May 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE D. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Perhaps this morning I should be—as I have done in the past—gathering signatures of my colleagues who are disturbed or outraged by the latest developments of the war in Viet Nam. Certainly there is a large group of them at Purdue who support your valiant efforts to restrain and humanize the policy of the Administration.

But there have been so many outrageous turns in the past few months and there is so little close political organization here that finally it becomes difficult to show the solid sentiment of opposition to each frightening new development.

Be assured that you have very much more support than is indicated by this single letter over my signature. (Perhaps others on the campus are writing this morning and I will hear about it later in the day.)

We were shocked beyond previous shocks by Ky's treacherous attack on DaNang. It takes very little reading between the lines to make out that it could not have taken place without the very active collusion of the American military. Can 2,500 airlifted troops pass through an American airbase without the knowledge of the commander of that base? Is he not in contact with military headquarters elsewhere in Viet Nam? And in Washington?

But worse than that—and a frightful omen for the future—was the tone of President Johnson's speech in Chicago. Just below the surface of what he said was the threat to turn the emotions of the American military against his critics here at home.

You know the history of France's involvement in recent colonial wars, and you remember that it culminated in the rebellion in Algiers and the near downfall of civilian government in France. Only DeGaulle stood between the generals of France and the Republic.

Are we moving toward a time when American generals will be turned against this Republic? Is what happened in DaNang on Sunday a preview of what may happen to San Francisco in a few years time?

Sincerely,

R. V. CASSILL,
Writer in Residence.

MISHAWAKA PURE MILK CO., INC.,
Mishawaka, Ind., May 19, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: After listening to the Television broadcast of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in their investigation of the Viet Nam War, I admired greatly your courage in standing for your convictions. Please continue in your frank evaluations, and in your criticism.

The Senate and the government has need of someone who will ask searching and pointed questions, and demand an answer, thus forcing some people to think through their opinions and evaluations. Perhaps if a little more thinking were done, we would be withdrawing from the Viet Nam war.

I am inclined to agree with your critical evaluation of our participation in this war,

MAY 17, 1966.

but even if I weren't I would admire your courage to stand for what you believe is right. Please continue.

Sincerely,

Mrs. H. I. RUDDUCK.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
May 17, 1966.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: While I have been very busy in the practice of law and therefore unable to be the citizen that I would like to be regarding the Vietnam situation, I have followed closely your undertakings in this regard and just want to send a brief note to let you know that I appreciate very much having a Senator of your caliber and insight along with the intestinal fortitude that it takes to stand up against the powers now presently active in this country.

I am a retired marine, retired at the age of twenty-two due to wounds received in the Korean situation while with the 7th Marines in the pull out of the Chosin Reservoir area in December, 1950.

While I am a most loyal American, I abhor complete disregard of the law on the part of the present administration in the Vietnam situation (as well as many other places) and, therefore, specifically give you permission to use my name, if it can be helpful in any way, in the battle that you are waging to stop the senseless slaughter and return our government to its rightful place in the world as a great power governed by the wishes of the people, under law.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY W. FELDMAN.

MAY 16, 1966.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I thought it my duty to write to inform you that I appreciate the stand you are taking on the Vietnam "war". You are fulfilling your obligation to the American people by taking this mess to the people. It must be a terrible experience to be a sole voice of dissension among so many "hawks". I feel you must know that a lot of people are with you in your struggle and in my daily conversations with people, more and more people are voicing their sheer resentment of this whole unnecessary mess.

We had to gain our freedom and independence without the aid of any nation and I feel that all people who wish to be free should fight and make their own sacrifices. This is the only way they will come to appreciate their country.

Our sons have the right to enjoy their lives free from the worry of fighting in a foreign land without even a declared war. If there was a declared war, then we could all make the sacrifice necessary to bring an end to this terrible conflict.

Sincerely,

A NERVOUS NELLY.

ANAHEIM, CALIF.

MAY 19, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for being you.

Thank you for helping me think and express my thoughts.

Thank you for giving me a little hope that some solution to war may be found that will let my two sons look forward to life.

Thank you for being in there courageously pitching. If ever we're all stuck in some bomb shelter with debris, we can remember that at least a few people tried to think of another way.

Thank you for bolstering my own religious faith that the way to really protect ourselves is to understand the other fellows as ourselves.

I hope love is like sound waves—if it is I'm sending you some, along with Senators FULBRIGHT, CHURCH, and a few others.

On the other hand, I guess it's the hawks who need it.

Sincerely,

Mrs. J. F. MCKIBBEN.

ATLANTA, GA.

MAY 17, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: History may note that you and Senator FULBRIGHT could have saved our country and the world from calamity had you but raised your voices louder in 1966.

Don't falter; there is still hope.

Sincerely,

SHERMAN LEBO.

SEPULVEDA, CALIF.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,

May 17, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE, U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Our family wishes to thank you for adhering to principle in the Vietnam situation. We agree with your policies all the way. Although we are Republicans our own Representatives in the Congress and Senate are apparently sheep following the war hawks in our Government regardless of the desires of their constituents. We have written them our views and have had replies in plain words that the President is to be followed blindly, right or wrong and the constituents desires did not matter. What do we do in a case like that?

We read all we can on this situation as our son is presently in Saigon, 8 months in the Army and over there already. In this morning's paper I read that you want the people to protest to stop an eventual war with China, for as sure as God made sun and moon this is what is going to happen. We have protested by written letter to the President, our Representatives etc., and all we get are replies as stated. Your voice may be crying in the wilderness but there are many of us "plain rank and file" people who are behind you and encourage you, in the name of God and humanity and the American family, to do what you can to stop this senseless slaughter of our sons. We have only one, his father fought in the last war, "for democracy." If our son is taken for this farce of a war I don't know how we will stand it. We feel this is Vietnam's own civil war, or religious war and they should be left to sink or swim as their people so desire.

God bless you and do what you can, it is sincerely appreciated.

Yours truly,

GEORGE and REBEKKA GOOKIN
and Daughter.

DEERFIELD BEACH, FLA.,

May 20, 1965.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Please accept the thanks of one plain citizen for your courageous stand on the Viet Nam war.

DOROTHY J. BOSTWICK.

LA MESA, CALIF.,

May 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a retail merchant I talk with many customers regarding our unfortunate involvement in Vietnam and find that the big majority are in agreement with your position.

You are certainly to be complimented in having the guts to stand up against the administration.

Having been called a Nervous Nellie by a man who is himself so nervous he won't permit his prospective sons-in-law to get in-

involved in this mess, I'm a little confused: a Confused Nellie.

Stay in there and pitch, Senator.

Respectfully,

J. M. MITCHELL.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Oregon.

How stupid does Washington think the American people are? U.S. knew nothing of Premier's Ky's crackdown on Buddhist Insurgents. For my money it was planned by both together. How could Ky send 2500 Vietnamese troops in U.S. airstrips without our knowledge? Also their tanks, mortars machine guns and rifles? Phooey.

When Ky flew to Da Nang he headed straight for Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt conferring together several times. To me the Buddhists are similar to our Mormons. They represent Honest, Decent, Religious people, well thought of every where. Perhaps if they should take over the government of South Viet Nam there would be less of a blood bath. Every time some one has guts enough to stand up to the crumbly that are running things the crumbs yell Communists. I for one am sick of it.

You might tell Senator FULBRIGHT that a Montreal paper carried quite a story of where Premier Ky's explained his plan to have, shall we say "Fun Houses" for the boys returning from the front. How the girls would be examined by physicians and etc. I also think the Herald Tribune referred to it in a few words. Couldn't carry that story in the U.S. papers.

Johnson is really to blame for most of this when he embraces Ky in public in Honolulu. Ky became his blood brother according to Asian standard. Ky now has delusions of grandeur. He expects to become to Asia, what Johnson has forced onto the people of the United States. I am not saying anything against it. But all this education the country is getting is causing the young to think. Even the most stupid will begin to think for them selves when they rub shoulders with the bright students. They are more easily led.

I am not exactly stupid myself. My father a Government official died young, and the man he worked with took over my education. He hated dope and I cut my eye teeth on the criminal element. Mike Collins a one time Custom agent at headquarters in New York recommended me to the Fogarty Detective Agency on Beekman Street in New York City for a case and I worked over a year for them. Now I am tied up here in the North Country. My husband has hardening of the arteries and needs care; after all it's up to me to give it to him. He is member of the 16th Engineers of Detroit. We will be at their reunion over Labor Day I expect. I have been president of the S.P.C.A. and the Auxiliary of World War I here.

Mrs. Moberly, mother of I think, Senator or Congressman Moberly of Montana, comes East winters and with her sister here lives in one of my apartments. We have quite a few bull sessions. She has now returned to Sweet Grass, Montana her home for the summer.

Why not take Rusk, McNamara, HUMPHREY, and Johnson and send them up to the front lines in Viet Nam, especially when the U.S. is using Napalm Gas. If I was as good a liar as some people are instead of being comfortable I would have millions like say Johnson. By the way when is the U.S. going bankrupt? Can any country stand the spending we are doing. Of course Johnson has to take care of his friends and he hasn't an enemy in the World. We all know if this fighting would stop, the money would stop rolling into the ammunition, aeroplane and such factories. So our poor young men must shed their blood in far off Asia, where we have no business to be. I wonder that some of these

people can sleep at night. I guess some don't they drink and dance or wiggle till morning nights. Nice example to set the coming generation.

Will Johnson fiddle while we burn as Caesar did when Rome was destroyed? Sorry to write a book, but I get carried away at times.

BETTY BENYOUL.

[From the Montreal Gazette, May 16, 1966]

CRISIS FLARES AFRESH

SAIGON.—A government military crackdown on Buddhist insurgents in South Viet Nam's defiant north has brought on a fresh civil crisis and new calls for a national uprising against Premier Nguyen Cao Ky's military regime.

Saigon braced for trouble in the streets and a possible general strike that could cut electrical power and water supplies.

In a special broadcast Lt. Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu, the chief of state, described the seizure by government troops of key installations in Da Nang as a move against Buddhist dissident groups infiltrated by Communists.

He called on "every citizen to be aware of the danger to the nation."

The war in the field fell into a lull.

Officials in Da Nang had been defying Ky's rule since March. In April, Ky declared the coastal city, 380 miles northeast of Saigon, in rebellion and in the hands of Communist elements. Da Nang officials denied his charges.

REBEL FORCES REGROUP

Ky sent 2,500 Vietnamese marines and airborne troops into Da Nang just after dawn. They had flown to the air base outside the city from Saigon and Quang Ngai, about 75 miles southeast of Da Nang.

Their tanks, mortars, machine-guns and rifles sent insurgents fleeing from city hall, the radio station, the docks and other strategic points. But rebel forces were reported regrouped in the central market and a Buddhist pagoda. Rebel pockets still held out at nightfall.

Huge U.S. marine and air force installations on Da Nang's outskirts were not involved. But Lt.-Gen. Lewis W. Walt, U.S. marine commander in Viet Nam, spent the day in the city and conferred several times with Ky, who flew to Da Nang at noon to order his troops to smash the dissidents and bring the northern dissidents back to Saigon's control.

But in Hue, the Buddhist center and old imperial capital north of Da Nang, Buddhist Radio broadcasts appealed "to all religions" to take to the streets. Rebellious troops were reported gathering there possibly to launch a campaign of armed resistance. There were unconfirmed reports that Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, whose ouster as commander of the Northern Zone in March led to political unrest, was in Hue organizing a rebel force.

ARE WE BECOMING A NATION OF PUPPETS?

(By Maggie Grant)

Thanks to the kindly old government, I'll be beating the family wash on a stone.

Very nice of the government, deciding that since we're too stupid to control our own spending, it will do it for us, via the income tax route. I'm sure we all feel very grateful for this fatherly concern. As for me, here are running accounts of my 1966 extravagances, and from such as these I will be saved in future.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,

May 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for having sent to me your speech on "Legal Issues of U.S. Policy in Vietnam." I have read it with interest, and am grateful that there are cou-

rageous men, like yourself, who take a strong stand against our continued involvement in S.E. Asia.

To many of us, our real position there, is to have a beach-head, a military springboard against China. Of course this reason cannot be publicized. It is a real danger that may trigger a larger war.

That American families are again faced with the loss of young men for whom they hoped better life than to die on battle fields, or have their whole moral concepts warped by war experiences is the source of much anguish to me, a minister. May men like you, and Senator FULBRIGHT continue to labor to get our land extricated from its dangerous position.

Hopefully,

ELMER H. HOEFER.

WOODSIDE, CALIF.,
May 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I feel that TV coverage of the Foreign Relations Committee debates on Viet Nam should be available to all Americans. If this country can afford to spend millions in Viet Nam, surely we can afford to pay for the broadcasting of discussions concerning this subject in order to inform the American people of the issues.

Thank you for caring enough about American lives and consciences to speak out when it has been so unpopular to do so.

Sincerely,

CAROL H. ROSE.

May 20, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are residents of the state of Missouri and therefore cannot support you at the polls but we would like to let you know that we appreciate what you are trying to do for us as part of the country. The war in Vietnam seems like an impossible nightmare and it makes people who formerly believed that our beloved country could do no wrong more than a little doubtful.

Your strong stand against the war is regarded by many as the only hope for the future. Unfortunately, the cries for war are louder and much more popular than cries for peace.

We admire both you and Senator FULBRIGHT for your courage and pray for your welfare and for a trend of events which will prove you right.

With our best wishes,

Mr. and Mrs. JAMES M. HAY.

JERICHO, N.Y.,
May 23, 1966.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The second Civil war in Vietnam only points out the fact that the people really do not support their Government. It seems to me we are in an untenable position. While we fight the North Vietnamese, the South Vietnamese fight each other.

Don't you think it is time now that we gracefully withdraw and let all of the Vietnamese work out their own problems? Our boys are dying and our money is being expended to no avail in that unhappy country. I truly do not believe that Communism will take over the world if we gracefully withdraw from Vietnam. This is not at all a situation similar to the time that Hitler invaded Europe. There we had to step in to stop the march of Nazism over Democracy.

I believe fervently that the whole area where the Vietnamese crisis is occurring will calm down once we remove our troops and the natives are allowed to determine their own destiny.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD RAPOPORT.

MAY 20, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thanks for your unflinching courage and deep insight and understanding regarding our Viet policy. Keep it up.

Sincerely,

ROBERT J. GAUDETTE.

MARBLEHEAD, MASS.

CORTARO, ARIZ.

The Honorable Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Bless you for your open and courageous stand on the Viet Nam issue. Please keep being a statesman instead of a politician.

Yours truly,

Mrs. B. B. FERRELL.

CHICAGO, ILL.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: After observing you and Senators FULBRIGHT and GRUENING on television at the congressional hearings I felt I must write to you and tell you that you are right. I can hardly deny that the democratic party's internal policies led by President Johnson has been both needed and beneficial. I find no words to describe his foreign policy. I agree with all I heard you say on television and the magazines. Keep it up! Yours is a sane voice in the Senate.

Since the Republican party offers no alternative (Except escalation) what is our recourse in 1968. I am a freshman at the University of Illinois and will be able to vote in 1968. While I would like to vote for Johnson on the basis of his domestic strides, the Viet Nam issue is so dynamic that it entirely overshadows other consideration. Could it be possible to stage an upset at the democratic convention and put in a peace lover (KENNEDY perhaps).

Keep the pressure on the Hawks! You have 100% support from these quarters.

Gratefully yours,

PETER ANDERSEN.

INTERLAKEN, N.J.,
May 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I had hoped to find the opportunity to make a suggestion to you at the New Jersey SANE banquet Saturday night, but you had to catch a plane and there was never the chance.

The suggestion is simply this: the late President Kennedy, at the time he secretly raised our commitment in Vietnam by sending in more "advisers," drew a very explicit line about the extent of our commitment. I have a vivid memory of the televised press conference at which he made the statement, and you will find the exact quotes, I believe, in Schlesinger.

It went as I recall like this: Kennedy was asked about the increase in our forces, which had not yet been openly reported to Congress, and he said we were sending in more advisers, giving more aid. Then he said something like this: "We can help them. We can give them aid and military advice, but we cannot win the war for them. It is their war to win or lose."

The significance of this statement, of course, is that it negates everything Rusk and the administration now say. Everytime Rusk raises the phony issue of the SEATO treaty or pretends that the Johnson administration is simply carrying out Eisenhower and Kennedy policy, it seems to me that this quote could be and should be very effectively rammed down his throat. The film clips of that televised press conference must still be available, and I would think you might find occasion to make dramatic and convincing use of them.

Kennedy, obviously, did not consider this a holy war against aggression covered by the SEATO treaty and requiring us to fight; he

clearly regarded it for what it was, a civil war in which we might help by giving aid to the boys on our side. Johnson—and Johnson only—abandoned this policy and made it our war, and I think the film clip of that press conference would be good and convincing evidence of the fact.

Hope this helps in some small way.

Yours truly,

FRED J. COOK.

CHICAGO, ILL.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you so much for your stand against the president on the Viet Nam war. It is a comfort to know that you are in there fighting for us. Believe me, there are thousands and thousands of us on your side. I only wish I lived in Oregon so that I could vote for you.

Please don't ever give up your great work.

Yours truly,

ELIZABETH KROHN.

SILVER BAY, MINN.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senator, The State of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of your speech on the legal issues in our United States involvement in Viet Nam.

I have recently done considerable research on the situation myself, and we were, it would appear, by no means justified in going into Viet Nam in the beginning (setting up Diem), nor in furthering our military involvement since 1960, nor in escalating and bombing in the North.

But how can one change our foreign policy there? I have written to both of my senators. I have written, strongly urging the recession of our bombing there to the President himself. And all we keep hearing is reactions to the so-called "critics." I personally appreciate what you, Senator FULBRIGHT, my own Senator MCCARTHY are doing. I just wish there were some way our State Dept. could be influenced to phase our involvement in Viet Nam out as rapidly as possible.

At any rate, thank you for your stand, and this issuing of your speech.

Cordially yours,

RICHARD J. EINERSON.

COLLINGWOOD, N.J.,
May 18, 1966.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I'm with you.

Sincerely yours,

JEAN K. MAXWELL.

OCEANSIDE, L.I., N.Y.,
May 15, 1966.

WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is to commend your courageous humane and hard hitting stand on Viet Nam.

Your statements both within and outside the committee hearings are most illuminating and assuring.

It is hoped that if our Government can not extract itself it will at least exert all its influence in behalf of free and fair elections.

Good fortune and success to you.

Very truly yours,

HARRY POLLACH.

TRUCKEE, CALIF.,
May 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: It is very heartening to know that there are a few courageous

and farsighted individuals such as yourself in the Senate. In your opposition to the way in which the Johnson administration is dragging the United States deeper and deeper into the civil war in Viet Nam you demonstrate your intelligence and courage.

Since I am not one of your constituents I cannot endorse your stand by voting for you but as one citizen I am free to let you know how much I admire you and support the view you present of the United States' despicable participation in the Viet Nam war.

It is a shame to see ones own country engage so bullheadedly in a war in which we are so obviously at fault as a consequence of our own actions.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES LOWRIE.

MAY 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am thankful that you are in the Senate.

It takes courage to disagree when the crowd howls "lack of patriotism" in answer to logic.

We are fighting a questionable war by impossible methods. If we do not get out of Vietnam now, it will mean an endless drain of our manpower and our wealth for many years.

Our military power is so vast that we need no face-saving.

Continue to use your powerful voice to help us get out.

Respectfully yours,

SAMUEL WILNIN.

EL DORADO HILLS, CALIF.,

May 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As one who has long admired your part in our American system of government, I wish to add my support to your present stand on this issue of our commitment in Viet Nam.

I have followed the televised hearings and find that your statement in this dialogue is a clear definition of a sane policy which the nation could most profitably follow.

I have written, also, to the Senators from my State, hoping that one more letter might help in avoiding a further increase in military activities and an immediate and genuine, attempt be made to solve peacefully this ridiculously dangerous situation.

I surely agree with your idea of a "Yugoslavia" in South East Asia—interesting and beneficial in the light of present problems in that region.

Sincerely,

LIANE L. MARTIN.

KINGSTON, ONTARIO,

May 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a Canadian who has lived for ten years in the United States, I wish to commend both you and Senator FULBRIGHT and others for your courageous stand on the behalf of humanity against those who make a mockery of Western Civilization and the Christianity which they so vociferously profess.

I enjoyed my sojourn in the U.S.A. and found the American people friendly and democratic in all respects but in the realm of international politics very immature. I found the attitude of the majority of Americans difficult to understand in regard to their conduct towards Russia, Cuba, and many other areas of the world. For this reason I left the U.S.A. (deciding against taking out citizenship) to return to Canada. However I find little consolation in the attitude of many Canadians. Indeed, Canada is sharing in the

prosperity of the War in Vietnam with all the privileges of the good satellite and no spillage of blood. For this reason your protest and the protests of many of your fellow Americans is refreshing and welcomed (and to me at least an unexpected development). I believe your words and actions will do much to restore the image of the America of Lincoln and will not be lost on all areas where freedom is either being sought or enjoyed.

Our mutual and esteemed friend Mrs. Luce once remarked in explaining your conduct "that you were kicked by a horse in your youth." It would be a great satisfaction to many of us in this world if Mrs. Luce, the American President, our Prime Minister and many others could locate and receive the same treatment from this horse's hoof. Their conduct is more that of another beast of burden.

With great appreciation for your actions and words which if they had happened in Germany of yesteryear would have made a one way trip for many of us unnecessary.

Yours very truly,

JAMES W. FORBES.

BELLE, W. VA.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I and my family support you in your effort to stop this senseless Viet Nam War and bring our boys back.

Sincerely,

(Mrs. Charles) GENEVIEVE SPARACINO.

DOWNERS GROVE, ILL.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for sending me your very fine speech that you gave in the Senate February 25, 1966 titled "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam." You will go down in history as one of the greatest statesmen and millions of our rational people thank you greatly for all you have done to bring about peace to the world.

Yours truly,

ALBERTA DANIELS.

BARRE, VT.,

May 11, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just finished listening to CBS reports coverage of the Senate hearings today. This has again brought forth to me the vital importance of your proposals. I wish to express my gratitude for your courage and perseverance in expressing an unpopular but singularly realistic appraisal of our actions in Viet Nam.

You have grasped what few in U.S. Government policy making positions today seem to understand; namely, that the day has gone when one nation can assume leadership of world problems and arrogate to itself the task of adjusting international relationships. Problems of conflict between nations can only be resolved by the combined intelligence and judgment of truly international institutions such as the United Nations or Geneva Conferences on Disarmament.

Senator FULBRIGHT has been identifying much of the same weaknesses in our present foreign policy. It seems it must inevitably fall because it does assume such a pre-eminence of the United States, because it so unrealistically assumes all power to reside in the force of arms and threat of destruction through the use of those arms.

I hope you will continue to press for a more objective, ethical and politically realistic appraisal of our role in the Viet Nam conflict.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS W. DODGE.

MADISON AVENUE, N.Y.,

May 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for providing me and the rest of the American people with the nourishing grace that's a natural result of sense and truth, especially when a man of your vigorous eloquence speaks out.

I will not say if, but optimistically when, men of the future recall the hard beauty of the American experience in the twentieth century, your voice and actions will undoubtedly be remembered and revered as expressions of our true heritage.

Sincerely yours,

MAGGIE McNAMARA,

TV Producer.

HATFIELD, MASS.,

May 19, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for sending "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Viet Nam."

From the start of our involvement in Vietnam I have felt most strongly that our position was untenable except in an advisory or economically constructive capacity. I have been quite vocal in the local press; and have followed the Foreign Relations hearings intently. Every scrap of information on TV or in the press was eagerly seized on. For weeks on end I would wake at 3, and 4 o'clock—sometimes before that and been unable to sleep afterward. I have written to the President. I have preached from the pulpit my deep concern.

This thoroughly documented statement by the Lawyers Comm. on American Policy seems to me unanswerable, convincing and one that needs to be "shouted from the housetops" by others than yourself in the public hearings on TV. I have been amazed and disappointed that I, for one am practically the only one who has expressed his opinion in our local press. And now there seems to be a general muffling of dissenting voices that the President be not embarrassed any more than he is by late developments. I have ceased to talk.

It seems that the spoken or written word makes little or no effect on the nation. Only events now transpiring will convince the nation of the illegality, the immorality, the folly of its conduct in the world. And it must learn that lesson with unmitigated severity once and for all.

I do not blame the President. I have felt he was simply following advice, and that advice was one-sided and not the result of free debate. The dissent that has been allowed has only been a safety valve to let off steam. It has been easily counteracted by chauvinistic appeals to support our boys who are doing such a heroic work.

Admittedly their pacification program is praiseworthy. But even on that basis, the highest idealism may often (and I feel it has in this case) lead us to do harm under the guise of doing good. It is a most subtle form of paternalism, which is as much of an invasion of freedom as aggression. It leads to smug self-righteousness and defense of acts of outside interference which we would certainly resent if practiced on ourselves.

We cannot carry on two contradictory programs simultaneously—i.e. pacification and war. The idea that peace, unification, security can be attained by force has been disproved and must once and for all yield to rule by international law.

Again let me thank you for this copy from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and for the stand you have been taking. May God give you strength to continue.

Very sincerely yours,

ALLEN H. GATES.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Your stand on Viet Nam and U.S. foreign policy is most commendable! Best wishes!
Sincerely,

SAMUEL D. SHRUT, Ph. D.

MAY 14, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am a California college student and attended a speech you delivered in Oakland, California in April. To say the least, you are my representative in Washington. I have no purpose here, other than to thank you as an American for the work you are doing regarding United States policy in Viet Nam. We have approximately the same views regarding the war and I feel that it is the only view justified by both fact, rationality, and morality. Please do not lose hope as you instruct the Senate and the nation, and question the bankrupt policy of our government. You are one of the few legislators who will shine in the history books when this chapter of United States history has been written.

Thank you.

RICHARD STEINBERG,
SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

FLUSHING, N.Y.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I agree with your views on Vietnam and I too am fearful of the threat of a third world war. I admire your courage in speaking out against most of your colleagues as well as the President and the Democratic party.

Thank you for doing what you feel is right.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID PENCHANSKY.

PARAMUS, N.J.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to say that I admire and support your position on the Viet Nam situation.

I would like to take a more active part in implementing your feelings. Can you suggest what I can do.

I am a veteran, a democrat and the father of military age sons. I am not a pacifist or a communist.

Yours truly,

JAMES DUFFY.

P.S.—You may use this letter as you wish.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are absolutely right when you said that the American military was a threat to the peace of the world. I have felt this many times recently.

If more of our "spokesmen" were as outspoken and clear thinking as you and Senator FULBRIGHT, peace might be a much more tangible thing.

Sincerely,

ELEANOR COEN.

CENTRAL VALLEY, N.Y.,
May 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The sticker on my car reads "Elect MORSE President '68." I mean it. You speak for me on Viet-Nam. Tell Senators GRUENING and FULBRIGHT they're doing OK, too.

Sincerely,

NADYA SPASSENKO.

TAKOMA PARK, MD.,
May 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I have just a moment to let you know that I appreciated receiving a copy of your Senate speech which I have received. The only thing that I regret is the fact that you left GOP and joined the Democrats. If it was not for a few farsighted men in each party, who are willing to speak their convictions, we all would be lost in the woods of despair.

While we do need the two party system, it does not make so much difference which party we belong to, if we are honest and serve our country unselfishly. Human nature is the same where ever you find it and I think it is very dangerous to have either one of our parties in power to long at a time. Personally I sincerely trust that you have been doing your own party a justice by being so frank in pointing out the evils of the Democratic party.

It is sickening to me to know that there is so much dishonesty among our public men. So many of them are taking advantage of their position to increase their own riches. I recognize that it would be even worse, if we did not have men like yourself in the party.

Please stay with us a long time, however I feel confident that you could do even a better service, if you would jump your party again and join with such outstanding men as Senator DIRKSEN. He is another man that thinks a bit straighter than many of your colleagues.

Please keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

FRANK D. WELLS.

HILO, HAWAII,
May 18, 1966.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senator,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am not a constituent of yours, but I must write and tell you that I appreciate deeply the witness you are making in protest to our involvement in Viet Nam.

I am certain you have been the recipient of a great deal of abuse and criticism, and I feel you have borne this with dignity and respect. Indeed, you have borne it for all of us, and we are indebted to you for your courageous stand in the face of seemingly impossible odds.

Certainly this will be small comfort to you, for the administration seems bent on our mutual destruction. But, I suspect that the distance between present national indifference and outright opposition is not very great. Perhaps we can hope that the swelling tide of protest will bring indifference to its side.

Our thanks again to you, sir, for your work at a hard and difficult and thankless task.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. FISKE.

MAY 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE MORSE: I received in the mail yesterday a copy of your speech made in the Senate (Feb. 25, 1966) regarding the legality of the United States involvement in Vietnam and I want to reply.

Let me say first that, particularly in light of the recent activities in DaNang, it is most refreshing to know that people in positions of political influence (such as you and Senator FULBRIGHT) are undertaking rational criticism of President Johnson's present policy. Until the open hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee several months ago, we were much distressed by the lack of congressional opposition to Johnson,

and especially the lack of many-sided advice to him.

Second, let me assure you that my family and I admire and appreciate your stand and the stand taken by all those who have carefully appraised our situation in that country. It appears that Johnson's speech last night in Chicago underscores, once again, the quick-sand-nature of the basis of his decision-making in Vietnam. He stated that his decisions were based on the consideration of what's best for the United States, whereas formerly they were based on our "commitment" to the Vietnamese people. (Perhaps last night he was merely being frank.) What is most distressing is that those in positions of power seem to ignore the honest appraisals of eminently better qualified people than those in the State Department. Sadly the present actions of the United States seems to be based on a myth which is transparently unrelated to reality—even with the mass media as one's only source of information.

Thirdly, the alternatives to Johnson's present course as proposed by the Lawyers Committee on World Peace Through World Law offer a positive approach which I feel it dishonest of him not to acknowledge or to consider. (Not to mention many other alternative proposals.)

I have written to both Senators DOUGLAS and DIRKSEN regarding this matter, but they feel it necessary to defend our present actions; as you must know. I am sending copies of this letter to Senator FULBRIGHT and President Johnson.

With sincerest regards, I am

NAN KOEHLER ALLEN.

Mrs. Nan Koehler Allen.

CHICAGO, ILL.

STEVENS POINT, WIS.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I agree wholeheartedly with the stand you have taken against our action in the war in Vietnam. I think you were right when you told Secretary McNamara that Vietnam might well be another Yugoslavia if we had not interfered and aided in continuing the terrible bloodbath.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. Lee A. Burress, Jr.
MAXINE BURRESS,

PASADENA, CALIF.,
May 15, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Only a brief note to say thanks for the courageous stand you are taking in behalf of truth. Perhaps you feel as I often do—That we are like a small boy crawling through a dark pipe and in panicky doubt as to whether to go forward or back.

If the United States is to avoid a sure collision in the near future the nation should follow the ideas you bring to their attention.

Most sincerely,

LYNN THOMPSON.

MINDEN, NEBR.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you so much for the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD telling of the findings of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam. This is most helpful and we are grateful for this definite information. So often what we get in the newspapers is so fragmentary or slanted that we are not sure of what we are reading. Furthermore, in this part of the country our largest State newspaper does not often print anything that would

suggest that we might be on the wrong track with our foreign policy. Our own Senator CURTIS (from our town) gives no help along this line either.

We appreciate what you are doing in the Government and pray for more men and women like you who will bring to light "unfavorable" facts which we all need to know.

We hope that our Nation can do the right thing about Vietnam and regain her position as a Christian nation truly helping other nations and peoples to a full and free life. We feel that we have no right to be in Vietnam militarily and that we can help to eliminate communism by acts of love only. Our being in Vietnam as aggressors is only going to cause more people to become communist.

Thank you again for sending your speech. May God bless you.

Sincerely,

CHARLES and RUTH MOORER.

CLINTON, N.Y.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My husband and I both want to express our appreciation for the stand you took on the Vietnam war at the recent questioning of Mr. Rusk and Mr. McNamara by the Foreign Relations Committee. We both feel very strongly we have no moral or legal right to take the stand our country has.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. HAZEL G. WEIL.

MIAMI BEACH, FLA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I just want to send along this note registering my wholehearted support for your dissent from administration policies in S. Vietnam.

Thank you for your insight and courage.

Sincerely,

ELLEN RUDT.

WHEELING, W. VA.,
May 17, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Am in receipt of your speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pertaining to "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam."

I have taken time to read it over carefully. I agree with the memorandum and thank you for showing your great concern to arouse even larger numbers of Americans to the serious threat that faces us in Vietnam.

I tell all my neighbors and friends that the American people are more fortunate than the Germans before Hitler and during his rise as they had no Senator MORSE, FULBRIGHT, GRUENING, and others to break from the "Status Quo" and forewarn that nation to the dangers of that era.

The service you and the colleagues mentioned render are truly in the interest of the American people. I have and will continue to press forward in my area to get increasing numbers of local people to also accept the challenge facing them and work in the interest of world peace through law.

Ever hopeful,

GENNE KUHN.

PHOENIX, ARIZ.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The American people seem to be like Lemmings running headlong to destruction.

We talk about education but don't take the advice of intellectuals when they speak. Why is that? Don't tell me—the answer is greed.

I don't pray any more—there just *can't* be a benign someone anywhere—but I send love and admiration to you. I hope to attend the United World Federalists meeting in

Washington and indeed it would be an honor to meet a man like you.

In "Thoughts for a Good Life" it says "A man is rich in proportion to the number of things he can afford to let alone." (like Vietnam.) and "The way of this world is to praise dead saints and persecute living ones" so be assured you will get your rewards after death like Albert Schweitzer has and Bertrand Russell will.

With deepest appreciation,

RUTH GLESPEN YEAGER.

LOS ALAMOS, N. MEX.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to register my vote of support for your courageous stand in advocating and pursuing full and open discussion of American foreign policy. I feel that you, Senator FULBRIGHT, and the other members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are doing the American people a great and much needed service.

Sincerely,

DENNIS L. ORPHAL.

MAY 17, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to express my opinion on the Vietnam War, or Johnson's War. After seeing you on TV last night, I agree with you and Senator FULBRIGHT. I cannot imagine why our boys are being slaughtered over there. I have a son there so am very concerned about the whole mess. Keep up the good work.

Best wishes,

Mrs. RICHARD GLADDEN.

TURTLE CREEK, PA.

RIPON, WIS.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This note needs no acknowledgment. I just want to express appreciation for the stand you take on Vietnam and other related matters. It takes courage and conviction on your part, and we realize how difficult it is—also how valuable it is.

I am in the process of reading the reprint from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: Legal issues of U.S. position in Vietnam. But this envelope was addressed before I received the reprint, as I wanted to express my appreciation.

Gratefully yours,

ETHEL L. BRYAN.

WILSON, N.Y.,
May 18, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is simply a vote of thanks for your stand on Viet Nam. I'm glad someone dares to stand up to the truth. I have followed the situation quite closely for several years and I too concluded the U.S. is meddling in a civil war.

The latest casualty figures are a crime. We are sending our boys to the front to get killed while the ARVN takes it easy in safety. The latest civil disturbances surely support your calling Ky a tyrant.

Yours truly,

Mrs. JAMES SCHOTZ.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
March 5, 1966.

DEAR SIR: Having heard over local TV the Portland man who is collecting signatures for the recall of Senator MORSE several of us in Seattle would appreciate the reaction of your office to a 50-state canvas of friends and admirers of Senator MORSE, using the enclosed statement (still in a tentative form) with which to collect signatures.

It is our feeling that quite possibly Oregon groups have already started such a campaign. Because we feel this is important and to avoid spinning our wheels with several groups acting in an uncoordinated (and inefficient) way, we would welcome your counsel in this matter.

Above and beyond the wider implications of what Senator MORSE has been doing for his fellow citizens, it seems to us that he and his family should not have to wait until he is gone from us for a generous and widespread expression of support and thanks.

Please convey to the senator my appreciation of his letter and enclosure of Oct. 26, 1965, sent to me in Rome.

Sincerely,

RICHARD J. CARBRAY.

We, the undersigned, citizens of the United States of America, hereby associate ourselves with the courageous efforts of Senator WAYNE MORSE, Oregon's senior senator, in his continuing attempts to be heard in the vital area of foreign policy. Senator MORSE, in speaking out for what he believes to be right, is fulfilling one of the noblest traditions of our democratic heritage in the face of constant and powerful opposition.

We salute him as a loyal and patriotic American.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: If America had stayed out of Europe we would not today be in Vietnam.

World War I destroyed the unity, leadership and power of Europe in world affairs by the defeat of Germany. The victors were false to Western Christian civilization. They were lawless men who by their own corruption and violence, and by collaboration with the tyranny of old Czarist Russia and her heirs, the Bolsheviks, split civilization wide open from Berlin to Vietnam, down the middle, in a gulf of lawlessness and godlessness, into which they now are trying to push the other, or, having both fallen into this abyss of hate and selfishness which they made by World War I against Germany, they are now trying to escape their own errors and bridge the gap. See what Germany is doing for Europe today.

Yours truly,

J. M. WARD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 23, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: This letter is written for the purpose of expressing my sympathy for the stand you have been taking in public and in the Senate for legitimate procedures for ending the war in Viet Nam and for the assumption by the United States of a posture in world affairs more in keeping with our historic role as a proponent of liberty and a defender of the rights of man.

I write not as a "nervous Nellie" but as one who earned the right to wear the Combat Infantry Badge for facing the enemies of our country in World War II, and I do not relish the image of the United States, a military Goliath among the nations of the world, on the center of the world stage, punishing with mighty thrusts a small nation of peasants . . . the very ones for whom our hearts should reach out in charity. Nor do I like the ambiguity and double-talk that comes from the administrators of our democracy in explaining the reasons why they have catapulted our country into this role. The smell of wheeler-dealing assaults my nostrils and, I believe, those of most sensitive and thinking Americans.

The hints from Washington that the declaration of national emergency, and even of war, might quiet the public discussion of foreign affairs intimates that our so-called leaders think of themselves more as the trainers of animals than as the responsible leaders of a people and the inspiration of its youth. What morale can we ever have in such a situation?

The American people must thank you and the handful of Senators and Congressmen who have succeeded in "leaking" whatever intelligence the American people have gleaned from this debate.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM T. BAKER.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
May 24, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I can only say thanks and congratulations. You have said publicly what many of us have thought but been afraid to utter—besides who would listen to me if I did say it. This is about what I have heard from Vietnamese friends here in the United States. They too would be afraid to say this except to sympathetic friends, and besides the opposition would shoot them down.

Keep up the good work, and your support is gaining, as even the Philadelphia Bulletin seems to be giving a little more footage to the opposition to war in Viet Nam.

Very truly yours,

MISS A. M. BRIDGES.

HYANNIS, MASS.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Here is how I feel: WAYNE MORSE, Yes; Administration's present Viet Nam policy, No.

Yours truly,

RICHARD O. STAFF.

May 21, 1966.

P.S.—My thanks to you for your continuing strenuous efforts.

R.O.S.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I don't agree at times with the things you say, however on Vietnam I must say I agree wholeheartedly.

I don't pretend to be too smart but neither am I too stupid.

I am going to say something that perhaps I should not say.

It is my opinion that the President after all his preaching of peace in his campaign speeches then got the most votes of any President in the history of our country.

Then all of a sudden he starts bragging about how powerful this Nation is and begins to act like a drunken sailor.

We are involved very deeply, our boys are being killed for what?

I have listened and read, watched TV. Our cabinet members say everything is OK. No black market, no bawdy houses and then some stupid reporter sends tapes back and they are shown on TV.

The amount of money our fighting men are dropping in Saigon, the new taprooms opening up.

I can see why they asked for our help and boy are we dishing it out.

Secretary McNamara telling Senator GORE about thousands of cans of hair spray. What are we sending anything to Vietnam for, I am stupid and confused.

There are so many things that have happened in Washington it makes one wonder what next.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN McGRATH.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

May 24, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: How lucky Oregon is to have you for its Senator. You make sense. God bless you—let's get out of Vietnam and stop the bloodshed.

Yours truly,

I. KLEBANOFF, D.D.S.

CHELMSFORD, MASS.,

May 21, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I recently received a copy of your speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD titled "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam", probably due to my being on the mailing list.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation for your position taken in Congress and I hope you are successful in changing some of the policies our Executive Branch.

Yours truly,

WALTER RAY MILLEN.

DAILY CITY, CALIF.,

May 19, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Keep trying to get us out of Vietnam. Southeast Asia can't be worse off than it already is.

Reg. Demo.

EDWARD ARRIGOM.

CHAMBERSBURG, PA.,

May 23, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A copy of your speech made in the Senate of the United States on February 25, 1966, has been received, and I appreciate having this copy.

I agree with you wholeheartedly in the stand you have taken regarding the war in Vietnam, and I know that there are many other people who agree also.

We all feel very helpless and ineffective when it comes to doing anything, or even expressing ourselves on this issue, because we can be misconstrued as either unpatriotic or softening up toward communism, neither of which is true.

The saddest part about the whole thing is that we have demonstrated, in deed, the inadequacy of the United Nations in dealing with world problems. Up until this time, it seemed, there was some hope.

Since you and your colleagues have demonstrated clearly the illegality of the United States' position in Vietnam, have we also shown the world that we no longer respect World Law? It would seem that we have never been in such a disturbing and precarious situation.

Keep speaking out on these matters, Senator MORSE, for many of us are back of you.

Respectfully yours,

(Mrs. J. E.) FLORENCE M. KEMPTER.

ALBANY, N.Y.,

May 23, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I were among those who heard you speak in Page Hall at Albany, N.Y., yesterday afternoon.

I know you do not look for accolades, but I do want to tell you that I think you did a marvelous job and inspired a great many people. In all my experience in Albany I never saw such enthusiasm or such response to a speaker as I witnessed yesterday.

To my mind, this demonstrates two things. The first is that you presented your views in very excellent fashion. But the other point, and the one I consider even more important, is that there is finally developing among the people an awareness of the terrible situation we are in. I am particularly impressed by

the fact that this awareness is being evidenced among the young people, such as those in your audience yesterday. I think this gives us reason to hope that our country may still find its way out of this terrible mess.

I want to thank you for your very valiant efforts in bringing this message to the people of Albany, and indeed to the whole country.

Sincerely yours,

MAX S. WEINSTEIN.

AKRON, OHIO,

May 24, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: You have no doubt seen the figures shown in this Gallup Poll, but I thought you might be interested to know that a poll of this area also bore out the fact that this "Civil War" in Viet-Nam is not for us.

Your courage in holding the line is much admired by folks like me who think we should not try to play God to the whole of our planet.

Sincerely yours,

BEATRICE V. ORR.

PLAYA DEL REY, CALIF.,

May 19, 1966.

HON. SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want you to know I agree with your views regarding the war in Viet Nam. I am discouraged that your opinions to halt this war are not heeded. I think it takes a very "big person," to admit they are wrong and I don't think President Johnson is a "big person."

No one has ever explained to my satisfaction any real justification for our involvement in Viet Nam or any reasonable solution.

Thank you for standing up for our convictions and I will pray for your continued courage.

Sincerely,

Mrs. VIRGINIA RUNYON.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,

May 23, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an expression of support of your position regarding the American involvement in Vietnam, I am sending you a copy of a letter sent to President Johnson. I am sure you are aware that for every letter like this sent, there are dozens of people who are sympathetic with this point of view, who do not send letters. Your courage and determination in taking a strong stand against the Administration's policies are a source of hope and inspiration to us in a time when reason and principles seem to be largely ignored or abused. For all of us who feel so helpless to change our country's direction, please continue your valiant fight.

Yours truly,

MOLLY BROWN.

WESTPORT, CONN.,

May 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As one "Nervous Nellie" to another, I wish to commend you on your continuing efforts to alter the irrationality of our present policy in Southeast Asia.

The increasing military intervention in Vietnam is not only fraught with peril; it is such a colossal waste of men and resources.

I am in complete agreement with Senator FULBRIGHT that to work for what one considers correct national policy is the highest form of patriotism, whether or not the viewpoint coincides with that of the Administration. It is in the interest of the very boys we are sending to fight in Vietnam that a large segment of the American population is

working to prevent further escalation of the war. The attitude that this somehow constitutes disloyalty and betrayal is not worthy of comment.

With very best wishes, and with hope that the day is not far off when our President will lead us in showing the true greatness of the United States to the emerging world.

Sincerely,

HARRY P. BAILEY.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 23, 1966.

HON. W. MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am an American, a Democrat, a businessman and father of two American boys.

I wish to thank you for your intelligent stand in the tragic Viet Nam matter. I also wish to ask you to try everything within your power to convince other members of House and Senate to join you in your opposition to the actual conduct of American foreign affairs at this moment. It is unfortunate that definite limitations of imagination seem to produce an attitude which makes it almost impossible to change anything. Either we go on fighting or we withdraw—there is nothing else—according to many. What we seem to need is clear thinking—as painful the results might be—and able diplomacy. Compromises are not only necessary in national politics also in international affairs. The economy of America is in danger—not just because people are buying too much. Our relationship to many important friendly nations is in danger and our whole position in the world is in danger. We can not, we must not commit the mistake to consider an enemy anybody who does not subscribe to everything we are doing—as we considered officially everybody in the country unpatriotic until recently, who was against the war in Viet-Nam.

We are in my eyes the best country in the world—which does not mean anything to an Englishman or a Frenchman or a Russian and if we make mistakes and insist upon making them we must oppose them.

Thank you for doing just that!

I remain,

Respectfully yours

ROBERT W. ALFREDSON.

SCHENECTADY, N.Y.,
May 21, 1966.

Senator W. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

The only thing better than one WAYNE MORSE of Oregon is Howard Morgan also of Oregon for Senator.

They will get us straightened out. It's a hard, hard task!

Please help them!

FORT WORTH, TEX.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please know of my appreciation of your courageous opposition to the Administration's policy in Southeast Asia and for your contention for a negotiated settlement.

With all best wishes I am.

Sincerely

EDWIN A. ELLIOTT.

MAY 17, 1966.

FRESNO, CALIF.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In regards to you speech on May 18, 1966 you called on the American people to put a end to the Viet Nam war. There is no other way to go about it except through you the men we elect to office and

still stay a United Country. Our hopes lays with you—an men like you to stop these men from sending Our Son's to their death for a cause that is not Ours. This war is not of the American people choise—it is not even for our country. Whatever our reason is for being there, the American people haven't been told the true cause. the majority of us ask why, why do you draft Our son's to send them to Viet Nam to fight communist. When we allow it on Our Universities and men to be set free from Our courts that are known communist.

Our hope lies with men like you to guard our country and youth from this. May there be enough of you to keep this trust.

Sincerely yours,

GENEVA CLABORN.

ROGUE RIVER,
May 18, 1966.

To Senator MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Mr. McNamara stated that if we got out of Viet Nam now, there would be a "blood bath"—making this a line, why we should stay in Viet Nam—Well we the people, want to know, how come we don't mind a "blood bath" of our young men?

Dear God—Someone has to stop this horror—I wish the Vietnamese Catholics would put on a demonstration, "Yankee's Go Home."

I've talked to many mothers of boys over there & they tell me of the letters they've received—saying, "they don't know what they are doing over there, & that the Vietnamese do not want them,"??

Sincerely

EMILY S. BELTRAM.

ASHEVILLE, N.C.,
May 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have no intention of wanting to burden a busy man with unnecessary correspondence, but I do want to thank your office for sending me a copy of your Senate Speech of February 25, 1966: "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam."

There are many of us in this Country, Senator MORSE, who are, like you, deeply concerned about the role of the United States in world affairs. We feel that men like you and Senator FULBRIGHT have been consistently mis-interpreted and, until recently, largely ignored in the press media that we depend upon for our news. It is good to have in my own hands a copy of something you actually said rather than a résumé of one of your speeches on page 29 of section 2.

For some time I believe that the voices of dissent re: Vietnam have been regarded as "troublers of Israel" who would, hopefully, go away quietly. I think it is much to your credit, as well as a service to this country, that you have not gone away. I think it is also a service to people like me that you have not become quiet, either.

I believe that those in the Congress opposing our position in Vietnam should know that the President's support is largely on the basis loyalty in time of danger. I think that this support is wearing thin. Admittedly, I am no expert and have access to no real sources of information. However, as a pastor, I am a person to whom other people talk a great deal. Press releases of "light to moderate casualties" have resulted in rather grim night time calls to my residence or office because some of those casualties have been human beings whom people of my acquaintance have known very well, often in the most intimate ways as sons and husbands.

The people I know do not regard Congressional opponents of our Vietnam involvement as traitors. Many of us think it is tragic that we are there at all. We think it

is dangerous beyond description that, by drift or design, such things can happen. We feel that such action's going unchallenged threatens to make this country something less than what it is. We aren't communists; we believe there is more to a man than a full belly. It's a tragic thing that at the time we are beginning to export our people around the world in creative roles like the Peace Corps we now have to export them in the role of marine and green beret.

Please keep up what you are doing.

Sincerely,

JOHN N. McALLISTER,
Assistant Rector.

SAN MATEO, CALIF.,
May 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As long as we have you and Senator FULBRIGHT around, the country is not lost. We intend to vote only for those candidates in the coming elections who are against our Viet Nam policy—if we can get any of them to indicate where they do stand. I only pray that we won't be too late.

Thank you for all you are doing. We appreciate it.

Sincerely,

EILEEN LARSEN.

COFFEYVILLE, KANS.,
May 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I heard President Johnson's threat to his critics as he delivered it at the Democratic Party Dinner, May 17, 1966. He sounded more like a Dictator trying by threats to suppress his critics of his actions in the Vietnam affair.

I hope the Senate Foreign Relations Committee goes ahead with its investigation of the legality of the U.S. action and of Johnson's actions in Vietnam. I have written a similar letter to Senator FULBRIGHT.

Sincerely,

A. A. BAKER.

BALLANTINE, MONT.,
May 15, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have been following the televised Foreign Aid hearings and wish to commend you for your beliefs. It is indeed encouraging to see one man stand by his convictions.

Sincerely,

FRANCES V. SHAULES.

COALGOOD, KY.,
May 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: We appreciate very much the privilege of reading your presentation of the Viet Nam situation of the Senate floor.

We have felt from the beginning that President Johnson was wrong in his foreign policy toward Viet Nam. Just this morning the news reports him calling his critic a bunch of "Nervous Nellies." He has begun to lash back at us but we wonder if he has been calm through all of this.

We voted for him for we believed him to be the better of the two candidates who were running. But we doubt very much if we would vote for him again.

Your presentation is logical in all of its aspects. We wish that you would have this situation presented from the Foreign Relations Committee on the air as you told Secretary Rusk last week.

You may be in a minority but always remember that Majorities have not always been right. We are also on Senator FULBRIGHT'S side. We have just finished reading his book which is very good.

We are a Methodist minister down in the hills of Kentucky. Let me say there are many of these hill people who are with you in your endeavors.

Sincerely yours,

A. L. OSBORNE.

P.S.—We wish that every American voter could receive a copy of your presentation.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
May 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am sorry that I have not written you before to show my support of your position of honest dissent to our policy in Viet Nam. The President's attack yesterday has put me into action.

Meanwhile I want you to know how heart warming it is to have an articulate and intelligent minority willing to stand up for their dissenting views. I hope you and the rest will continue to question, to be as firm and fair as possible.

Every best wish.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. CECILL LARSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I congratulate you on your stand in the recent discussions over the dire situation in Viet Nam. Without your very able and balanced thinking and statements we, the public would wonder indeed where are the honest and wise men in this administration. At this time, when the world situation is so desperately critical it is heartening indeed to know that the voices of a very few are heard in the political field.

Please continue with your wonderful frankness Senator MORSE, you may have powerful enemies but you also have friends behind you and your friends also have voices and the power of speech as you know can be mighty enough to help avoid the greatest catastrophe that has ever befallen mankind.

Yours in admiration,

LISA BAILEY.

EAST LANSING, MICH.,
May 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: At times I am tempted to move to another state so that I might have the opportunity to vote for someone like you or Senator FULBRIGHT. I want to thank you for the magnificent job you are doing in fighting the war hysteria in our government, and in the country as a whole. Some day I believe you will be recognized as the true patriots.

I think the Administration would like to get off the hook if it could do so without losing too much face. If, as seems likely, a further civil war develops in Viet Nam, it would seem that this would present them with a perfect opportunity to throw up their hands in disgust and get out. We can expect a dictatorial type of government there regardless of who takes over so long as the supply of arms and ammunition is sufficient to hold the unarmed people in subjection, but even so I believe fewer Vietnamese will lose their lives than at present.

I spent the year 1958-9 as a Smith-Mundt professor at the University of Saigon. While we were there my wife and I had opportunities to travel quite extensively in the country. So far as I could see, at that time the ruling clique were practically all from the

North, a few people were becoming very rich off American aid, and the majority of South Vietnamese were peasants who were much more concerned with getting enough to eat than they were with democracy, communism, or any other political ideology. From the papers I would judge that it is these little people who are the cannon fodder for both sides.

The Vietnamese whom I knew were very kind and friendly people. If I thought that we could be of any real assistance to them, I would plead strongly for keeping our forces in the country. Despite the fact that I am sure that much of it would be misused, I would support a massive nonmilitary aid program for South Viet Nam, because some of it would be bound to trickle down to those who most need it. They badly need roads, electrification, communication systems, and many other things which we could help them acquire, and which would provide jobs for some of them.

As things are at present, I can see no possibility of free elections there. I doubt that any single group would be willing to allow opposition candidates to appear on the ballot. The best that could be hoped for would be a temporary coalition of two or three major groups.

Again, thanks for your fine work.

Most sincerely,

V. E. LEICHTY.

ALVA, OKLA.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I just want you to know that we in my family firmly believe that you are right in your stand on the Viet Nam situation. Of course since all we know about it is what we get on TV, radio and through the newspapers we may be wrong in our thinking. We don't have but one son to lose in deal but we sure do think a lot of him. It might look different to us if this would have been a war declared by the Congress instead of one man. I can't see why we have to be sending military aid to these countries for them to be setting up military regimes instead of governments supported by the people. We may be a world power but see what has happened to the other nations that have tried to run the world. I think that if we would look at ourselves a little closer we could do a little cleaning up here at home before we go abroad. If every state would do the same I think we would have a better country to live in than what ours is getting to be. Set an example of good before we go abroad.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE GRAY.

MIAMI, FLA.,
May 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I would like you to know that I have appreciated your hard-fought stand to show some light on the Viet Nam situation. I note that President Johnson, in a speech in Washington last night said that we had to honor our commitment and keep forty other commitments to other nations. This appears to me to be an impossible situation, as we cannot police the world, and I do not believe that any president has the right to declare war without a vote of Congress.

May I say at this point that I have been a member for more than 50 years of the Bar of the District of Columbia, as well as of Florida, and that I was, at one time after the first world war, an attorney for the government myself.

It further seems fair to me that if everyone else's son and son-in-law should fight

these various wars, that the prospective son-in-law of President Johnson should also be involved on the active front in any of the 40 odd wars that he expects to have.

Thanking you for giving this your personal attention, I am

Respectfully,

HERBERT A. SIMON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God for you and FULBRIGHT. I hope the President's new call for an end to criticism will only renew you in your brave efforts to save us from World War III. Thank you for your magnificent stand against our illegal and immoral war in Vietnam.

Mrs. GEORGE B. LEONARD.

FOREST HILLS, N.Y.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My deepest gratitude to you for your continued brave and honest stand on the Vietnam war. I am deeply distressed by the Administration's policy on what appears to be a hopeless and unnecessary struggle which is only leading to greater bloodshed. May your opinions prevail.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. E. F. LYON.

BLOOMINGTON, IND.,
May 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have just read about President Johnson's speech given last evening at a fund-raising dinner in Chicago. I am writing to you mainly because the President's remarks somehow had the effect of inducing in me a sense of terror. Perhaps my training as a historian is responsible in that I am led to see parallels, and to draw conclusions that are unwarrantable. I hope so. But so far my reason has been unsuccessful in dispelling a feeling that tells me our situation is critical.

I mention these things to you because it seems that our best hopes lie with men like yourself. For if sanity is to prevail it will depend precisely on your continued efforts, on your willingness to speak out and to take whatever risks are necessary. Even this may not be enough, but I urge you to re-double your efforts and to do whatever must be done, public opinion and executive coercion notwithstanding. Let me assure you that there are many like myself—some, unfortunately, afraid to speak out—who will support you and other pacifically inclined members of the Senate to the hilt. I am sure that you are fully aware of your tremendous responsibilities, nor is it my intention to remind you of them. Rather it is my wish to encourage you, and to ask that you let me know what, if anything, I can do to help. With all best wishes,

Sincerely,

PHILLIP L. THOMPSON.

MCMINNVILLE, OREG.,
May 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
209 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just a note to say that I appreciate and support your vigorous and courageous efforts to keep citizens informed on international affairs. Thank you also for your continuing efforts on behalf of the State of Oregon and for "Senator MORSE Reports." In teaching Freshman Composition and upper division literature courses, I occasionally use your good name as an example of the kind of responsible involvement and dedication that I consider makes an

educated man. I (and I hope many others) count on you to confront, observe, learn, speak, and act for me. The *Salem Statesman* informs me this morning that I am a "Nervous Nellie." I am not, however, turning my back on my government and country (a World War II veteran, I'm sitting in my office wearing the shoes and khaki pants from my Naval Reserve officer period). This letter is my feeble but sincere protest and offer to help.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR G. KIMBALL.

SOUTH POMFRET, VT.,
May 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My family thanks you for mailing us the "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam."

I am glad to have the facts to study as I am behind you and Senator FULBRIGHT 100 percent.

Thank God for people such as you.

Very sincerely,

DORIS BRETTLELL.

WALNUT CREEK, CALIF.,
May 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please keep your voice loud and clear. Our country needs men like you.

It takes more courage for a President to admit his judgment has been wrong than it does to call those people "Nervous Nellites" who disagree with him.

Let us not make a human scrap-pile of our young men and destroy the economy of our country for no purpose.

Sincerely,

ANNE HAISEN.

EVANSTON, ILL.,
May 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator of Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for sending me the copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam." I appreciate it very much. I am writing, too, to thank you again for your courage in speaking out against the Administration's policy in Viet Nam—and for speaking out against the Administration's foreign policy in general. I read all of your public statements and privately applaud them. As a private citizen and the mother of three small boys (5½, 4, and 2 years), I am so grateful to you for speaking out against Rusk and President Johnson's policies in the Dominican Republic, Viet Nam, and as regards Prime Minister Ky. You speak for me, too. And you speak for me, too, and many other mothers when you say that it is the *American military* that is the greatest threat to world peace.

I signed and mailed in to Washington the recently circulated voter's pledge—pledging support to all congressional candidates who will work for peace. I hope that my signature and other signatures throughout the country will give you and the handful of courageous Senators who will speak out against administration policy in Viet Nam and against present Administration foreign policy in general some support.

I hope, too, that the bill will be passed which will help to curb C.I.A. activities by having some members of the Foreign Relations Committee on a committee to watch over its activities.

Again, many thanks for your courage in speaking out against Administration Foreign Policy—particularly as regarding Viet Nam.

Most sincerely,

MARSDA CONNER.

SAN JOSE, CALIF.,
May 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For some time now I have been writing my California Senators expressing my view that I was greatly concerned over the increasing dominance of the military over foreign policy, they didn't seem to pay too much attention to my personal views, perhaps now that you have "laid it on the line" in such a manner as your recent press remarks on the subject, perhaps now the Senators from California will begin to "see the light"!

Thank you for bringing to the American public this grave danger.

Sincerely,

JACK FIELDS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
The Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the reprint you have sent me: and thank you above all for your courage in speaking more directly and honestly the truth of this barbaric adventure in Viet Nam of the Johnson leadership. I think there are only 3 honest and brave men in official posts today: yourself, Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator ROBERT KENNEDY: if only the Congress representatives would speak for the American people, we would hear an almost unanimous appeal—even a command—to stop this useless murder of Americans and Southeast Asians alike.

Very sincerely yours,

ERMINE KAHN.

HERMOSA BEACH, CALIF.,
May 16, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to ask you to try and keep your voice heard in your argument against the unlawful conflict in Vietnam. I hope you don't feel alone because you are not. Many Americans are beginning to question. So keep the discussion open!

Sincerely,

Mrs. GORDON EVANS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am in full support of your views and proposed actions in this atrocious war that this country is waging in Vietnam. I congratulate you on your tremendous insight and courage to pursue the course you have taken.

Yours very truly,

SYLVIA D. LOPEZ.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
May 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We commend and support you for your strong stand on the Vietnam situation and for your untiring efforts in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. You are a breath of hope to us who at times see little future in the direction our country is going in Southeast Asia. We hope you will continue to stand firm in your position of not supporting the killing of our boys and denying appropriations for such purposes.

As fellow Democrats we are increasingly concerned about our nation's objectives and role in Vietnam. How can any honest American youth look at the present Premier Nguyen Ky regime (supported by American money and energy) suppressing Buddhist

dissent in the Hue and Da Nang area and say he is willing to die for this?

Keep up the good work! It gives the average citizen of the United States a challenge and comfort to know we have men like you in leadership willing to speak the truth.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. and Mrs. ROBERT C. LUCAS.

CAIRO, EGYPT,
May 10, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: I cannot vote for you, but I am with you 100%. Do not give up the ship there must be many who feel as we do.

Thank you for your sincerity and tenacity. Yours with great admiration.

HELENE LA PORTE.

WORTHINGTON, OHIO,
May 14, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We want to let you know that we greatly appreciate your courageous statements on the Viet Nam situation. You express very well our deep concern regarding the direction of further escalation. We fear that our government may be closing doors to any alternatives or to possible negotiations by increasing bomb attacks or use of gas of any kind.

Many people to whom we have talked feel the same way. We thank you for your articulation of our feeling.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN and MEREDITH FARMER.

SAN CLEMENTE, CALIF.,
May 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR: You & Walter Lippmann seem me to be the only sane & courageous men in the public eye today.

I hope the country will understand your warning before it is too late.

It is a pity that the dual Henry Wallace's warning was not heeded, when the Truman Administration turned away from the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Good Neighbor Foreign Policy.

Your suggestion that the Vietnam problem be taken to the United Nations is sound.

We hope you can convince President Johnson of the wisdom of such a move.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOSEPHINE P. SHIRELY.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
May 16, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your opposition to the administration's Vietnam policy is relevant and valid for a dual reason; not only are you, I feel completely correct in your well-taken criticism, but the criticism itself is in keeping with the high purpose of the political body of which you are a member.

As a lifelong democrat I feel particularly hurt, in having helped to elect a president who pursues the "wrong" policy; this is of course an executive prerogative with which I disagree. Mr. Johnson's quest for unanimity is what really bothers me, as it apparently does you.

Keep it up!

ARNOLD REIFER.

ROCKAWAY, N.Y.,
May 15, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

We support your courageous stand to bring about a realistic and humane foreign policy.

Mr. and Mrs. SIDNEY and SONYA ROSEN.

MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.,
May 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in complete agreement with your Viet Nam policy. Good luck.

Dr. BERNICE BAUMAN.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Our thanks and appreciation for your every valiant effort to enlighten this administration in its policy on Viet Nam. If only you could prevail.

HERBERT and MERCEDES MATTER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please continue your efforts to bring sanity to the Vietnamese situation.

JOHN LIZARS.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We watched you on television. You are speaking very clearly on the Vietnam and our foreign policy. Our wholehearted support. May God bless you.

Mr. and Mrs. BARNEY SCHULTE.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly object provocation of war with China.

JAMES EASTON.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Belated thanks for your speech to Democratic voters to end the war in Vietnam and your subsequent remarks at Senate hearings. Wish I had a chance to vote for you.

MARY HEATHCOTE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I appreciate your continued questioning about why we are in South Viet Nam. Please don't stop. My family and I want to understand.

JANICE MARS BERENBERG.

KENSINGTON, CALIF.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge you demand immediate halt to shaping of foreign policy by Strategic Air Command.

WOMEN FOR PEACE OF EL CERRITO, RICHMOND CITY, STANFORD, KENSINGTON, CALIF.

INDIANA, PA.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I admire your fortitude.

FRED MUSSER, Sr.

REDWOOD CITY, CALIF.,
May 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

To display unity behind an erroneous and falling policy is to misuse the great freedoms of our constitution. Already we tempt China to war. Inevitably this policy will bring it. There are better places than the Vietnamese graves for our young men.

The policy is not liked in America. Lack of protest thru lethargy, feeling of lack of envelopment and inability to influence policy and safety in distance are not to be confused with support for the war. Let's get out. Keep up the opposition.

ROBERT J. DELL'ERGO.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You are a voice of reason in the midst of hopeless confusion. Please persist.

Dr. M. KLEINMAN.

BERKELEY, CALIF.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly support your Vietnam policy do everything in your power for cease-fire and negotiations.

JOHN K. DERMAL.

YONKERS, N.Y.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We fervently back your stand on Viet-Nam may your fellow Senators follow.

STEVEN and SUSAN KANOR.

LOS GATOS, CALIF.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up your courageous protests against this unjust war. Millions of people are with you.

Dr. and Mrs. ALAN CLARKE.

KEW GARDENS, N.Y.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Your voice in Congress gives the rest of us courage. Congratulations.

Dr. and Mrs. HENRY LEONARD.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Schotts Court NE.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please accept sincere appreciation for standing strong against administration policy in Viet Nam. Senate—May 16th.

MICHAEL ROSENBAUM, PATRICIA KESSLER, KENNETH ALBERT, LINDA FALK, LOIS PILSON, STEVE SCHNAPP, MELVIN ALLEN, SUSAN PERRY.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,
May 19, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Viet Nam: In complete agreement with you. More power to you.

JANE B. BROWN.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Senator MORSE: I agree with your program wholeheartedly and I think you are one of the few men in Government that really represents American people. I think if we had more people like you we'd have less rioting and fighting. I don't know what else to say. I think you are a grand gentleman. I just want you to know that this is another American citizen that believes in you. Thank you

very much for your wonderful efforts on behalf of the public.

SAM BONNIFIELD.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
May 18, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Am in complete accord with your Vietnam policy and am grateful to have men with the courage of their convictions as you and Senator FULBRIGHT have so ably shown.

Mrs. T. E. M. OSORIO.

MEDIA, PA.,
May 19, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you so much for your continuing efforts for peace and justice.

EDITH W. COPE.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.,
May 23, 1966.

FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE,
Attention Senators MORSE and FULBRIGHT,
Washington, D.C.:

Please keep up the great work and emphasize United Nations coming in. Many of us are behind you. Thanks.

FLORA CLAR MOCK.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
May 16, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is to congratulate you for your courage and wisdom shown in your public utterances on the question of Vietnam, with which I have been able to agree only after long and careful consideration. I only wish that you would appear on the national ticket so I can vote for you.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND S. BIBER.

MAY 16, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Again "Thank God for Men Like You." We read in our Ka'zoo, Gazette of Sunday May 15, where "Three LBJ Critics Call for Congress To Join In Action". A headline such as this truly lifts our morale, and as we read into it there is much more encouragement, and I'm writing to the Honorable CLIFFORD P. CASE, and to the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK. You by now know my views, therefore I'll be as brief as possible, mainly to wish you the very best in all of your endeavors, and God be with you in finding more men in our Congress who will see things as you see them, work as diligently as you have and are, and as speedily as possible bring our boys out of that mire! In honor of the thousands we have now lost all for nothing, seems that we've learned our lesson the hard way. All of you, please bring them home!

Thanks for listening, and all good wishes!

Sincerely,

Mrs. I. E. FORWORD.

ARLINGTON, VA.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing to tell you how much I appreciate your courage and statesmanship in your work on the Committee of Foreign Affairs. I am sure there are moments of great discouragement but it should be good for you to know that there are millions in this country standing behind you, Senator FULBRIGHT and the other gallant fighters on that committee.

Thank you for your leadership.

Very truly yours,

JEANETTE G. GLASSBERG.

DETROIT, MICH.,
May 17, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God for a man like you. You are the only one in Washington that has the guts to tell the truth about the mess Johnson has got our country in. You speak the minds of the people. I am disgusted. Our boys should be brought home. I wouldn't trade one drop of American blood for all the Communist in the world. Keep up your good work. I wish I could vote for you.

My sincere best regards,
MELVIN TURNER.

FAR ROCKAWAY, N.Y.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

HONORABLE SENATOR MORSE: As concerned Americans we wish to honor you for your honorable and courageous fight to halt the war in Viet Nam.

We urge that you continue to keep this most important matter before Congress and the American people.

It is immoral and heartbreaking that more and more American boys are killing and dying to maintain in Viet Nam such a corrupt military government as the Ky government. Pray, sir, fight ever harder to extricate us as soon as possible from the morass into which we are sinking.

The events of the last few days again prove how alien to American principles and ideals is this wretched Ky government.

Respectfully,
SOPHIE and MAX NOWAK.

ATLANTA, GA.,
May 16, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The attack by the Ky regime in Da Nang makes it quite apparent that this government does not want our advice, but merely seeks our assistance in money and the precious lives of our young Americans.

Even though we are allegedly committed by the word of three Presidents to assist this nation, I feel that the action on the part of Ky in Da Nang in the past few days relieves us of any further obligation.

I respectfully submit that a nation as powerful as ours certainly can cope with the advance of Communism, if it be a fact, and if we should be faced with that situation in the future.

It is quite apparent from the activities of all the factions in South Viet Nam that no particular faction actually wants our presence there, for the Buddhists certainly don't want us there, the Catholics have indicated that they do not want us there, and it appears that we are interfering with a situation which is purely internal. The situation is one which is analogous with one interfering in an argument between husband and wife.

I respectfully submit that we should pull out of Viet Nam completely with a warning to those nations which advocate the Communist form of government that unless they let the people of Viet Nam handle their own affairs, then in that event, we will take steps to see that the rights of Viet Nam are protected.

It is crystal clear that at this point we do not know what the Vietnamese people want, and we, as a great nation and respecters of rights of individuals, certainly should not interfere.

It is interesting to note that we have been living in peaceful coexistence with a vast Communist nation, the Soviet Union, and certainly, we can tolerate another little nation of that political philosophy if that is what the people of that little nation might want.

It is also interesting to note that our great leaders have indicated that if an election were held, the Vietnamese people would choose the Democratic form of government, and if that is a fact, we need not worry about the elections properly conducted, and further, with a warning that they should be properly conducted.

I respectfully urge that we get out of Viet Nam completely and let them range over their own differences without interference by us, with the strong warning, however, that if their differences cannot be settled legally and according to the will of the majority of the people of Viet Nam, then in that event, we will take steps to secure the proper exercise of the will of these people.

We must understand, of course, that after all is said and done, that we cannot stand over these people with bayonets in hand and tell them what form of government they should choose, and also, warn the adversaries that they cannot do this either.

Under the circumstances, because the action of the Ky government has relieved us of any obligations which we may have, and further, because he indicated that he does not need our advice and need not consult with us, I respectfully submit that we should immediately leave the country of Viet Nam.

Further, last week, Premier Ky stated that he would not abide by the results of the elections and that if a majority of the Vietnamese wanted a Communist form of government, he would fight that result.

The big question appears to be, are we to support an individual with such a capricious attitude by giving him money, materials, and supplies, and most of all, the lives of young Americans.

I firmly believe that we should get out of Viet Nam immediately and not be parties to this internal squabble.

Respectfully yours,
LUCIO L. RUSSO.

BLAIRSTOWN, N.J.,
May 16, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you very much for "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam." It is a most powerful argument against the outrages being committed there.

I should like to take this opportunity of thanking you again for your forthright courage and clear thinking.

Sincerely yours,
CAROLINE BABCOCK.

SAN CARLOS, CALIF.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to commend you for your very courageous and inspiring stand against this terrible war in Vietnam.

I hope the American people will soon awaken and realize what a self-defeating and disastrous course the Johnson policy is leading them into. I am certain that future historians will deal very harshly with this benighted Administration and will acclaim you as one of the few enlightened voices of reason and true patriotism in our country today.

My best wishes for your continued success.
Yours very truly,

DOROTHY FELDMAN.
BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

May 16, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for the copy of your speech on the legal issues of our position in Vietnam.

Please remember that there are many Americans who oppose our bungling involvement in the affairs of that unhappy country. Unfortunately, too few of your fellow sena-

tors possess your courage and honesty, so you are one of the few to whom we look for leadership. I can imagine the pressures and arm-twisting you have to endure and the petty little blackmailing that might have been tried to stifle your heroic voice.

The leaders of the nations of Europe criminally allowed themselves to become enmeshed in the first World War without realizing what they were doing. This time the world can not afford this kind of mistake.

Stand fast and keep refuting those phoney issues the supporters of this dirty war try to hand us. Right now a few brave men like you are the hope of those of us who don't accept the propaganda being handed us about why we are there and how we are serving humanity by bombing and escalation.

God bless you.
IRVING SMITH.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 17, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: A resounding bravo for the position you've stated regarding Viet Nam.

Mr. Rusk's apologies and justifications were pathetic and embarrassing. I dislike being in opposition to my gov't., but I can find no morality in supporting Ky.

Sincerely,
H. WIERUM.

PONTALA VALLEY, CALIF.,
March 8, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As a citizen who is sickened by seeing my government behaving in Viet Nam in ways not very different from the Nazis, I deeply appreciate that you at least are one voice, in government, that clearly condemns the immorality and illegality of our official actions.

I don't know how many people write to say so, but I say thank God for you, Senator MORSE.

FRANCES BENVENISTE.

SIoux CITY, IOWA.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Oregon.

"The time has come," the Walrus said,
to talk of many things:
Of shoes—and ships—and sealing wax—
Of cabbage—and kings—
And why the sea is boiling hot—
And whether pigs have wings!"

Lewis Carroll.

While watching the Senate Hearings I'm constantly reminded of these nonsensical lines—probably because this war makes as much sense to me as the words do. The "talks" are late—but, "better late than never." We are a Democracy—the people do have the right to know the facts—to question our Government's actions and our Government's intentions. We certainly cannot say to our young men—"Yours is not to reason why—your's is but to do or die"—For the right to "reason why" is the greatness of America to me—Please keep up the good work.

HUMBLE HOUSEWIFE IN
SIoux CITY, IOWA.

P.S.—No disrespect intended—the "Walrus" in this current situation is very wise.
Mrs. ROGER H. LAMBERT.

DES PLAINES, ILL.,
March 11, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to take a few moments to commend you on your stand on the Viet Nam issue. I do regret that I have been so remiss in writing this letter because I am certain that we share a reasonably unpopular opinion, one in which you need as much popular support as possible. This evening I intend to write to the two Sena-

tors from Illinois and to President Johnson informing them of my beliefs. I hope that thereby, in some small way, I can influence the President to change a senseless policy of slaughter and ravaging of a people who are for the most part in rebellion against the tyrannical and unstable oligarchy in Saigon, or at least to change an attitude toward negotiation with the Viet Cong, and not with Hanol.

It is lamentable that the word Communism conjures up such fear in the American people that they defend a national policy that refutes all the ideas that our nation has stood for. For the first time in my lifetime I feel that my country is wrong. I know that the influence of the late Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin has left a hideous scar across the breast of the country, a scar that manifests itself in the present situation. Somehow it has become proper to support immorality as long as the fight is against Communism. Right now we are in the exact position the Russians were in ten years ago in Hungary, and we are defending our actions under the subterfuge of anti-Communism.

There is another point I would like to make. Many people fear China, I among them. However, isn't it necessary to recognize and talk to this country? A frightened little dog barks much, precisely because it is frightened. At the present time China is a frightened country and it is making much noise. Unfortunately, it is also a nation of great potential and a nation which will be of great danger to our own United States within a very short period of time, antagonized deeply by our refusal even to admit that it exists. Perhaps in ten years it will be too late; our conferring and negotiating with China must begin immediately. Co-existence is a worldwide necessity, not a manifestation of weakness or sympathy toward the ideals of Communism.

Sincerely yours,

DON D. SMITH.

SEATTLE, WASH.,
March 20, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I wish to express my sincere appreciation for your firm and consistent effort on behalf of world peace. I fully agree with your remarks and action, (voting record) as chief critic of the administration's war escalation policy in Viet Nam.

It is amazing how our war psychology has grown to the extent that one man stands almost alone in the U.S. Senate in vigorous opposition. Yet, I am confident a great many Americans share your view and appreciate a senator who understands and respects international law; who is concerned about the drift toward nuclear holocaust; who puts national interest ahead of "party loyalty", and disregards political expedience.

Best wishes to you and all the people in the great State of Oregon who consistently return WAYNE MORSE to the United States Senate.

Respectfully yours,

NEAL SNYDER.

SALEM, OREG.,
March 13, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please be informed that I support your stand on the war in Vietnam. I have read your senate speech of January 19th, and congratulate you for standing firm, as always, on your convictions. Our nation needs more of your type of leadership.

With the initiation of medicare, I trust that a break through may come in the long-restricted research on cancer by use of chemotherapy. It will take someone of your caliber to get the job done. Your attention

to this tragedy of our times will be personally appreciated by me and my family.

Very truly yours,

GERALD J. BOWERLY.

MODESTO, CALIF.,
March 24, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I read on March 22nd that you and Senator ERNEST GRUENING stood alone and voted "No" on the \$13.1 appropriation bill, most of which will go to finance the war in Viet Nam.

It takes a brave man, indeed, to do a thing like that. Your names will go down in history as men of great courage.

I suggest you run for President, because I refuse to vote for or support in any way men who are in favor of this war in Viet Nam or any war.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. LEORA CHASTAIN.

FLINT, MICH.,
March 11, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Oregon.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to congratulate you on the aggressive stand you have taken in opposition to the "Idiotic War in Vietnam."

I'm sure you have millions of secret admirers in America. And it is a shame that they fail to openly express their support of you and also Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. DELAY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 13, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You are magnificent! Last Sunday night, at midnight, we stood discussing the Vietnam situation at O'Hare Airport in Chicago and the next morning you were at the Senate hearing spelling out the truth to Secretary Rusk.

I know how little sleep you had during the night because I boarded the plane with you in Portland at 5:20 p.m. You must have arrived in Washington around 3 a.m., and only a few hours later you were on television; sharp and incisive. If we had 100 senators of your dedication, sir, I am sure this nation would not be in its present precarious and embarrassing position.

As I told you in Chicago, I have a son who reports to the Army this week. I only hope that you and Senator FULBRIGHT and the small band of dedicated legislators can bring this nation to its senses before this wonderful boy and his contemporaries become Vietnam casualties.

Keep up the fight, Senator MORSE, and if I can do anything toward influencing our California Senators or Congressmen, please let me know the approach to take.

Sincerely,

JOHN I. INGLE,
Dean.

LA VERNE, CALIF.,
May 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This note is to thank you for a copy of your address to the Senate as of February 25, 1966, entitled: Legal Issues of the U.S. Position in Vietnam.

It is a real service to voters to have conveniently at hand the detail of the legal aspects of this most complicated situation as assembled and presented by the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam.

May I assure you of the appreciation of many of us here at the grass roots level.

We thank God for a Senator who is not afraid to speak out as a United States senator should.

We in the sticks are not as dumb, nor as completely brain-washed as some in power appear to think. For example, I speak as one who survived the traumas of two hot world wars, then cold wars, and now these times of ignorance of the lessons of history as exhibited by so many in positions of power.

So do keep on saying the things which need to be said if America is not to destroy herself.

Yours respectfully,

HARRY A. BRANDT.

DETROIT, MICH.,
May 20, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep up the good work about Viet Nam. Yours is like a voice crying in the wilderness.

Many here seem to disagree but I am 100 percent behind your arguments.

Viet Nam is an expensive mess and I don't think we have any business keeping our troops in action there.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. TOBIAS.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to thank you for the position you have taken against escalation of the war in Vietnam.

The internal conflict in Vietnam is not being solved by the presence of American troops. Rather, we are sapping the resources of Vietnam, killing many innocent people, alienating our international allies, and risking the onslaught of nuclear war.

I would be much more confident of our future if more senators were to face the Vietnamese situation as you have done—with honesty, objectivity, and the realization that morality overrides the selfish interests of the United States.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ELAINE HAYNES.

(Copies to Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS.)

EVANSTON, ILL.,
May 9, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like to just agree with you that your statement concerning Viet Nam being an illegal war has much validity. This is a civil war that has to be settled by both the North Viet Name and the South Viet Name. I have always compared it to our Civil War. We are a power that is aiding and abetting a temporary government that no longer has the active support of its citizens.

We must permit a free election as soon as possible so as to determine who the people wish to represent them, and if they wish our forces to leave, we must honor the request and leave.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY ADAMOWICZ.

TOPEKA, KANS.,
March 25, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I want to thank you for the courage you display by standing firm for what you believe is right. It is time that more of our elected officials had this courage rather than bend to the political winds of self-righteousness. I sympathize with you and hope that you will continue your forthright stand.

I served a year in Viet Nam and I cannot agree with you more. War is wrong no matter what country is waging it. We are guilty of a policy of "might makes right". If we really believe in democracy, then let us have the faith to trust in free elections and be willing to abide by the results. Prolonging our war in Viet Nam is only going to add to the total cost, not change the results; for we are building our policy on sand.

Thank you for your consideration. I support you in your endeavors. It is comforting to know that a few are trying to stand against the forces of totalitarianism that are engulfing us. The greatest danger that faces America is from within, not from without.

Yours truly,

ROBERT E. BARRIE.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.,
March 14, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Like most thinking and conscientious citizens of this great country, I have been viewing President Johnson's involvement in Vietnam with grave concern and misgiving. I have also been reading and listening to every one of your statements as well as those of your few colleagues and your many opponents.

I must say that you have earned my deepest admiration and my highest respect for your patriotism, your courage and your integrity in speaking out so boldly and so sincerely in defense of justice and against wanton and unnecessary bloodshed.

Keep up the fight of the minority. Majorities have been wrong in the past; they can be wrong now. May God bless you!

Sincerely yours,

DAVID RAPPOPORT.

PLATTEVILLE, WIS.,
March 25, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We have too long delayed expressing to you our deepfelt admiration and gratitude for your leadership in providing "loyal dissent" from U.S. policies in Viet Nam and toward mainland China. In fact, it was admiration for your leadership and that of others which led to the formulation of the attached resolution (passed unanimously by the entire Midwest Council of United World Federalists). We congratulate you.

Personally, Mrs. Short and I feel that American policy toward China is unrealistic and without vision while the involvement and escalation of the Viet Nam war is tragic and foolhardy.

Where could we choose a more unfortunate place to have a showdown with Communism than this land war with the Asian masses 9,000 miles from our shores? Mao must be grinning triumphantly at our lack of wisdom, for we are in precisely the kind of war we are least prepared to fight successfully—but the kind the Reds are best at.

Indeed, we feel that even an unlikely military victory would be of no real worth, for the present government could not survive a free election and the Vietcong would win at the ballot what we are killing and destroying to prevent their doing by force. It just makes no sense to us, and to most people we know. We, too, question the opinion polls.

So please do not grow weary of performing what must at times be a lonely, difficult—though highly valuable—service to our nation and the world's people. We have been greatly impressed by the quiet, confident, informed manner you displayed on television. Yours is a real "profile of courage" and we are indeed grateful.

Meanwhile, please keep pressing for things like a non-proliferation treaty, total disarmament under world law in a strengthened U.N., and other long-range programs which can avert future Viet Nams and settle disputes through world courts rather than bloody battlefields. God bless you.

Cordially and sincerely,

Dr. and Mrs. RAY E. SHORT,
Head, Sociology Department.

BELMONT, MASS.,
March 24, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Benjamin Franklin once said, "Justice is as strictly due between neighbor nations as between neighbor citizens . . . and a nation that makes an unjust war, is only a great gang . . ." I want you to know that there are many Americans who are proud to say that WAYNE MORSE is not a member of the "great gang" which conducts the foreign policy of the United States.

For the sake of mankind, please continue your present efforts to change Vietnam policy.

Sincerely,

EUGENE F. HAGERTY, Jr.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: Keep up the fight. We oppose the U.S. Foreign Policy.

WALTER POLACHECK, M.D.

WHITE PLAINS, N.Y.,
March 14, 1966.

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your unsurpassed courage in opposing the administration's drive to escalate the Viet Nam War into a world conflagration.

Keep up your wonderful work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. NAOMI H. BILLOW.

MARCH 15, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We commend you in your position against our government's policy on the war on Viet Nam.

It is encouraging to know that there are a few people in our Congress who have the courage to speak up against policies which are a threat to humanity throughout the entire world.

We hope you continue in bringing these issues before the people.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. SARAH GOLDBERG.

CHICAGO, ILL.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
March 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I salute you. May God bless you and give you strength to carry on, as you have been.

Sincerely,

STANLEY MAYMARK.

P.S. I have been in 122 countries throughout the world which includes a trip around the world last September visiting a number of nations in Asia and a stop in Saigon.

SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
February 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to express my thanks and gratitude for the stand you have taken in the Vietnam war. I have always admired your courage and integrity, but your current contributions to peace are invaluable.

Please continue the good work and, believe me, your type of legislator is what re-

stores my belief in the American system of government.

Yours truly,

DANIEL C. PIXA.

EVANSTON, ILL., March 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: An increasing number of us who are paying the bills note with interest and satisfaction your policy of resisting the avalanche-policy of "managing" national affairs from the White House.

A visit to the war scene leaves one completely disillusioned for we note that our "allies" Great Britain and Sweden—to mention only two—are continuing to supply our enemies with war materials thus leaving us with no other conclusion but that we are "at war" with them.

So, added to months of accumulated evidence that this is a war to benefit big business and without other justification, we must ask those responsible for serving as our representatives how rational is the thinking which permits its continuation.

Manipulation of international affairs has long been one of the skills of the State Department, the Pentagon and Congress. The press releases exactly what is in the interest of this great program of "control." A voice lifted against anything planned in Washington immediately calls out the hounds whose baying intends to mark the individual as traitor.

And let us add that Congress, since Johnson is little more than an echo of the Texas voice.

Again, Senator, we welcome your willingness to stand alone where necessary in opposing this landslide experience which surely can lead only to bankruptcy and increasing international trouble.

Sincerely,

HAROLD S. DYER.

HELENA, MONT.,
March 17, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This letter is to let you know I think you are a Senator and a man to be proud of. I read every word you say. It is nice to know there are two Senators, "WAYNE MORSE and ERNEST GRUENING" who are trying to do everything in your power to save the lives of American Boys and to end this "Operation kill and be killed" in Vietnam. I feel so sorry for those poor people and our boys forced to destroy their country and take their lives.

There are many here in our city who think you are in the right and all we are doing over there is wrong.

Sincerely

Mrs. BESSIE DUNN.

BARRINGTON, ILL.,
March 22, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have observed with great interest the recently televised meetings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Your performance as a member of that committee has given me new hope and reassurance that this country has a dedicated interest in the preservation of our great moral heritage. Today when so many Americans cannot see beyond their own selfish interest it is refreshing to find men who represent our government with respect, and who feel responsible for the morality of our actions with and against others who live on this planet with us. I heartily agree with you that if we seek to fight a war we ought to declare it as provided for in our constitution. I also concur with you that we are not recognizing our responsibilities under the charter of the United Nations.

Twelve years ago this month I was on an aircraft carrier piloting attack aircraft in Tonkin Bay, presumably ready to give even greater aid to the dying colonial interest of France. From that time we have pursued an irrational policy of aggression against those war weary people.

The China Policy of our country has also been an interest which I have pursued academically and I do appreciate your untiring efforts to bring a more realistic view of this situation before the public.

Thank you again for the very great service you have performed, and are performing in behalf of all concerned Americans who love and wish their country to live up to its great heritage.

Respectfully,

JOHN A. PAPADAKIS.

THE CITY COLLEGE OF THE
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., March 23, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to express to you my profound gratitude for your courageous, independent, and intelligent opposition to the Johnson program in Vietnam. That a few of our dedicated public leaders have been willing to attempt to attain a clear understanding of what is occurring in Vietnam and have dared to speak their minds on this most critical of matters is heartening. I trust that it may be encouraging to you to learn the amount of public support that you enjoy.

Sincerely yours,

BRAYTON POLKA,
Assistant Professor of History.

SEATTLE, WASH.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have always been an admirer of your forthright positions on domestic and foreign issues.

I have followed your remarks regarding Vietnam for the last six months and appreciate the courageous stand you have taken particularly when you were all alone. I am pleased to see more and more people are now joining you to vindicate your position. I entirely agree with your statement that if Goldwater had been elected the Democrats would not have been so anxious to vote the money to support this war.

I have written numerous letters to President Johnson expressing my abhorrence for the Vietnam war. I have just written him again telling him I am sorry I ever voted for him and that I shall never do so again.

In the coming elections I hope the "true Democrats" that have had the courage to stand by their convictions will be able to poll a tremendous victory.

Sincerely,

JEANNE SMITH.

KEW GARDENS, N.Y.,
May 19, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I would like you to know that I and many others believe you are right and courageous in speaking out on the situation (mess is a better word) in Viet Nam.

You are the only one I believe who really has called the turn in the happenings connected with Viet Nam.

I urge you to keep it up.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH NEWMAN.

LARAMIE, WYO.,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We thank you very much for your kindness in sending us a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD "Legal Issues of U.S. Position on Vietnam." It is especially valu-

able in that it provides, with legal commentary, the exact provisions of such international agreements as the 1954 Geneva Accords and the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, documents not at once accessible to the average layman working in non-legal or governmental fields. We shall study it with care and hope to be able to use it in doing our part to bring about a more educated citizenry on the issues represented in Vietnam.

We support you wholeheartedly in your courageous and difficult stand against what Senator FULBRIGHT has so incisively called our "arrogance of power." We are profoundly ashamed that a nation with the tremendous intellectual resources of the United States, and such dedication to the principles of human liberty and the sanctity of human life, should choose to employ its enormous military power in a simplistic attempt to cut the Gordian Knot of Vietnam's internal problems. We understand that ten Vietnamese civilians die for every military casualty ("enemy"). And this horrifying toll shall, we suspect, leave the country of Vietnam no better off than that of South Korea, after the abortive war there which cost more than 2 million Koreans, 150,000 American, casualties. We are not allowing the Vietnamese the rights of political self-determination we so self-righteously announce; instead we are seeking to play the role of a "benevolent despotism," seeking to impose our own political system and theories. We shall first devastate the country militarily and then try to rebuild it overnight, oblivious to the suffering and bereavement of millions in Vietnam and thousands in this country—experiences not to be obviated by the gift of a new technology. Our administration is sacrificing lives by the thousands at the behest of its own self-righteousness.

So we fervently give thanks that there are men such as yourself and Senator FULBRIGHT in our government, who make it possible to retain some vestige of one's pride in the fact that one is an American citizen.

Respectfully yours,

JUERGEN and MEREDITH SCHROUR.

MAY 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For myself, my 3 children, and my possible grandchildren I wish to express my thanks for your courage, sanity, and statesmanship in a terrible time in our history. Please continue your task, and I pray God spare you until this country's leaders return to sanity.

Sincerely,

CHARLOTTE PLASHLABERG.

DETROIT MICH.

MAY 16, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE

DEAR SENATOR: We admire the stand you are taking against the Johnson war in Vietnam. We believe that we should not only get out of Vietnam but also we should get out of the United Nations the so called peace keepers of the world. Since its beginning we have had no peace. You know we are spread out all over the world and have no friends any where. Let's regain the respect of the world and restore our Independence.

May God bless you and guide you in the work you are doing.

Mr. and Mrs. W. O. MOUERY.

SIoux FALLS, S. DAK.,

May 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We agree with your stand on the Viet Nam situation and want you to know how much we admire the courage you are displaying.

We believe that our government has already fulfilled its promises to help Viet Nam. Now that the problem has been shown to be beyond our ability to solve, we believe that by withdrawing we will gain the respect of other nations.

It simply is not right or fair to sacrifice any more American lives or to have Americans killing Asians of any creed.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. and Mrs. D. J. PEIK.

MAY 9, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank God for your voice saying so much of what has to be said!

I am a mother of three young children, and the wife of a doctor completing his residency training as a specialist in Neurology. We look carefully each day to see if our mail contains his draft notice. But before our personal concern about the war in Vietnam, we have a grave concern about the direction and power-seeking role our country is assuming in Asia, and elsewhere.

Without a declaration of war by Congress, we are asserting ourselves into a civil war in a country in which we have no legal, or moral, right to be. We, as a nation, are providing a testing ground for our new weapons, and in the process we are conducting an obscene war on a people who are victims of our power-struggle with Communism. It is difficult to understand how President Johnson and his State Department can perpetrate such moral reasons as our "commitment to South Vietnam and the SEATO countries," or "the domino theory" or any other untruths on the people—and get away with it so very easily. The dead and the wounded are weapons of our nation, which is becoming greedy and immoral in its quest as a sovereign nation to show its power.

Senator Morse, with your voice and those of the others who are speaking out against this insanity, perhaps there is still hope for our great nation to assume its proper place in the sun, by allowing other nations to do so, too.

May you continue to have the strength and fortitude to speak out for a return to sanity in these United States. Thank you.

Sincerely,

RUTH GREENBAUM,
Dr. and Mrs. HOWARD GREENBAUM.
BRONX, N.Y.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I want to commend you for your sensible and courageous stand on the war in Vietnam. I appreciate your courage and sincerity in the face of many hostile remarks in the press.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR R. UPGREN, JR

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SENATOR MORSE: My heartfelt support goes out to you in your efforts to stop this most stupid war. I hope you will never tire in your courage and determination.

PAUL KUNDGINS.

TACOMA, WASH.,
May 9, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE: As one who is greatly concerned with the war in Viet Nam I am taking this opportunity to commend you for being such an 'outspoken' critic of the present Administration's foreign policy, and I am also seeking some information. Although I am completely adverse to this war for a great number of reasons, one aspect of it has me completely puzzled; that is SEATO. In listening to Mr. Rusk speak before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee I heard him, and yourself, make a great number of references to SEATO; I believe the conclusion was that the U.S. would probably be in Viet Nam regardless of SEATO, yet it is a factor for our present involvement (according to Mr. Rusk). What disturbs me is that I can find no connection between SEATO and South Viet Nam, other

than S. Viet Nam being a nation in south-east Asia; South Viet Nam doesn't appear to be a member of this organization, nor has it ever been.

I had previously supposed that our connecting SEATO with Viet Nam was due to the French (both the U.S. and France being members of SEATO), and with their defeat at Dienbeinphu we moved in to protect French interests there, or at least to carry on for them. But now I am led to understand that SEATO didn't come into existence until after the French defeat at Dienbeinphu; and South Viet Nam itself was never a party to this organization. It is with this in mind that I continue to wonder what LBJ and the State Dept. are talking about when they constantly refer to our commitments to South Viet Nam as manifested through SEATO. If South Viet Nam is not a member of this organization how in the world can we claim commitments to them as outlined by SEATO? I am hoping that you can solve this problem of 'comprehension' for me.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure, as a Republican, to see you do battle against our present policies and I wish more Republicans would follow suit. I must add, in all sincerity, that if I lived in Oregon you would receive my 'Republican' vote. Please keep up the terrific work!

Yours truly,

MICHAEL D. BICK.

GREENVILLE, VA.,
May 14, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

HONORABLE SIR: In the news tonight we hear one of our marine units was wiped out!

After all the hearings and talks, how much nearer are we to ending this holocaust?

If the elections were to be this fall, any decent candidate who was for peace would be elected.

The tragedy of the whole awful mess!
Isn't there anything that can be done?

Yours truly,

Mrs. EMMA HANSON.

Expect no reply.

HANCOCK, MICH.,
May 14, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Watching the hearings on television, I noticed that when the senators were asked what they think should be done about the mess we are in, in Viet Nam—not one said that we should pull out lock stock and barrel, but tried explaining that we should hold on to what we have and wait. I believe that it would be better to take a shameful retreat now, than wait until it turns out into a third world war and atomic destruction of the world. To me it seems that the senators see the bigness and might in big battle ships, big bombers, and large stock piles of hydrogen bombs, they do not see the—biggest, bigness which is the same among nations as with individuals—the bigness of admitting that you were wrong, and simply just pulling out of the whole mess.

Johnson-Rusk-McNamara are typical examples of seeing bigness—in might. Big battle ships, big bombers and big stock piles of hydrogen bombs. The government claims that the majority of the people are behind the Viet Nam war in the United States, but at least in my neighborhood everyone seems to be against it, and I am sure the elections will prove it. It seems to me that, if the senators cannot decide whether we should pull out or stay in, I would suggest that let the people decide in the next election.

With best wishes,

RUDOLPH KEMPPA.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
May 12, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The opinions you express are enlightened and sensible. Your opponents belong in the caves of 100,000 years ago.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. NELL SEARLE.

MAY 9.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm hoarse—from cheering you in front of my T.V. set!

Please—keep up the great work!
Thank you, thank you, from us who hope for a saner world.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LILA SUSSMAN.

ENGLEWOOD, N.J.

MAY 11, 1966.

SENATOR MORSE: I have never written to any member of Congress before but I feel compelled by my conscience to do it now. I feel you are so right about the Viet Nam war and the administration is so wrong, I wish we had 99 more senators like you to convince LBJ, Rusk and McNamara of their folly. Keep trying. There are plenty of Americans who agree with you.

JOSEPH E. PETKASH.

MAY 16, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have spent all night writing letters to congressmen and senators, so yours will be brief. Please just accept my moral support for your position in condemnation of our misguided adventure in Viet Nam.

Thank you.

EUGENE BLINICK.

MADISON, WIS.

SANTA CRUZ, CALIF.,
May 19, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Office of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Thank you for having had a copy of Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD sent to me. The reading of it has given me a much wider understanding of the unfortunate Vietnam affair. No other publication has so clarified it for me.

I would that your influence as well as that of Senators FULBRIGHT and GRUENING might bring our country out of that War. This for the sake of the people of Vietnam and for our military personnel.

Very respectfully yours,

MISS EDITH COLD.

CHARLOTTE, N.C.,
May 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Just wanted to let you know we're still behind you one hundred percent! Keep up the good work. You're performing a unique (with Sen. FULBRIGHT) and very vital service (!) to their country.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. SANFORD ROSENTHAL.

EVANSVILLE, WIS.,
May 17, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I wish to thank you for a recent copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pertaining to the Legal Issues of the United States position in Viet Nam. I pray that you

will continue to make your voice heard in defence of a soul program in Southeast Asia. Furthermore, will you please continue your efforts of criticism of our programs of foreign aid. I am not opposed to foreign aid, but I certainly feel that it should not be tied to our military assistance programs.

In concerning foreign aid, it is my understanding that the United States offers foreign aid in the amount of .33 (one-third of one percent) of her gross national product. France averages 1.5 of her gross national product, and the Netherlands 1%. I would urge you to support greater outlays for foreign aid, if these programs can be offered to any and all countries, and not made contingent upon their political situation. It is greater economic aid most countries in the world need and not military involvement.

In admiration of your labors, I remain.

Respectfully,

ALAN J. KROMHOLZ.

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
May 17, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: May I express my appreciation for your willingness to speak out against overwhelming odds and to suffer ridicule and scorn. It is gratifying to know that you have not been swept by the popular and passionate appeal of this war.

The man of integrity, the man who stands on his conviction must often live a lonely existence. There are so few that do. But thank God for the few!

I am sure that your concerns spring out of a deep and abiding love for our country; and that this is a mature love which extends itself beyond our own shores to a love of humanity. We need men of vision in high places. May you continue to keep this vision in focus.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN K. HANASHIRO,
Minister, Hilo Coast United Church of Christ.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
May 18/66.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Keep up the good work! We, the American people are with you in your fight against Pres. Johnson's war in Viet Nam.

T. V. TEEL.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
May 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: In my opinion, our government's action in Vietnam will be recorded as one of the most brutal interventions ever to have taken place. It is in complete violation of international law and the charter of the United Nations. How can the American people sanction the killing, maiming and burning of men, women and children in Vietnam? How can they tolerate the loss of their young men to satisfy the power hungry ambitions of those who profit from war?

Let us not forget how the extermination of six million Jews during World War II shocked the peoples of the world. The German citizen excused himself by claiming ignorance of what was taking place. Today, the American people know full well what our government is doing in North and South Vietnam for reports are brought into our homes daily by television, radio and the press. We see a pilot wiping out a whole village by dropping bombs, gases and napalm. We hear him say how wonderful it is to see his bombs hit the target and to see the people running for their lives. We are told that the mass killing of a Viet Cong

unit was just like a turkey shoot in Tennessee. We see our soldiers torturing Viet Cong prisoners, marines burning a village, schools and hospitals demolished, crops killed by chemicals and stores of food destroyed.

Why is our government ordering these un-human acts? We are told that it is to prevent the spread of communism, that it is to preserve freedom and that it is the best interests of the United States. These statements are disturbingly similar to those made by German leaders to justify their genocidal acts and their attempts to achieve world domination.

I respectfully, urge you to ask the President to stop hostilities so that negotiations can be started for a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam. I believe that a continuation of the conflict will almost inevitably lead to a nuclear confrontation between the great powers.

Yours sincerely,

RICHARD G. MORGAN.

MILAN, GA.,
May 19, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I received CONGRESSIONAL RECORD sent to me from your office, Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam.

I wish to say that I am in full agreement with your position concerning the Vietnam War. I do not have not one member of our Church who likes our policy or, our being in Vietnam. We believe if it was left up to the voters of America, we would be out of Vietnam.

We do not believe that the President has the right without the vote of Senate and Congress to send our Army to wage an undeclared war.

We do not believe we should send our Army to other countries every time a few communists start shooting.

I will be glad to vote against some of our leaders if I every have a chance.

Blessing on you and all members of your tribe. Stick to your guns. I do not know of one in our county who oppose your view on Vietnam. I am

Fraternally Yours,

B. L. CALDWELL.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
May 18, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You, Sir, are a great and courageous man, a man of honor. I am proud that you represent my native state.

I applaud your valiant and persistent opposition to the frighteningly immoral, destructive policies of the Johnson Administration regarding Viet Nam. Please continue your fight for peace and for decent government. You represent hope for our country and, indeed, for the world.

Respectfully yours,

PENNY HICKS BROMMER
Mrs. James Brommer, Jr.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 4, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: When are we going to end this horrible war in Vietnam, and stop slaughtering our boys by the thousands, as we did in Korea? Why hasn't it been ended and peace brought to the poor Vietnamese people?

We can win this war. We could have won it a long time ago, and stopped the long blood bath and torture that the free people of Asia have suffered at the hands of the communists. We can have a total victory, without appeasement the further advance of communism of the mistake of allowing

them to break any future treaties, such as they did the Geneva Treaty. Make a treaty to protect the safety of these poor people, and end their misery, hunger and perpetual fear.

Respectfully yours,

IRENE DUNKLY
Mrs. Irene Dunkly.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 20, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I thank you for sending me "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam."

It seems to me excellent.

May God bless your leadership for justice and peace!

Sincerely,

L. H. R. HASS.

MAY 17, 1966.

Senator MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I want to express our admiration for you and your courageous and gallant fight against this war in Viet Nam. We fully understand this is only bringing shame and disgrace to our country.

I heard you speak here in Gary a few years back, and might also add that I worked in your beautiful state once in Salem. Brick-laying is my trade.

We are writing the President and our Senators. Hope it will do some good for the cause of peace.

With great respect for you and the ones that are fighting with you.

Yours truly,

JOHN SUNDMAN.
GRETA SUNDMAN.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,
May 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR MORSE: You certainly are a fine, courageous person to continue—almost alone—to speak up for peace.

I feel as you do regarding America's involvement in Viet Nam. In fact, I would go even further. I feel we should withdraw from another country's civil war. The South Vietnamese don't want us there, either; and we don't belong there. Let's get out!

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. DOROTHY BALOWS.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
May 20, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE: The American Legion has asked its members to express their opinion on the Viet Nam war to government officials in Washington.

As a veteran of World War I, I wish to say that in my judgment the Viet Nam situation is one of the blackest periods in American history and is inexcusable.

Yours truly,

KENNETH E. GOIT.

MAY 19, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for being able to "see" beyond the mass of statistics supplied by the Defense Department, beyond the "we have made overtures towards peace with Hanoi" of the State Department, and beyond the President's "we must support our brave men in Viet Nam", and bless you for bringing out into the open the fact that we have no business in Viet Nam and no right to do what we are doing!

Your plan for the United Nation Forces to be utilized to bring about the peace is the best plan yet and actually should "naturally—by reason of parliamentary procedure" been applied a long time ago. Don't ever apologize for having the courage of your

convictions; don't ever feel like an isolated voice crying out alone * * * you are not * * * it is just that we who feel as you do have no way of reaching the men who make the decisions.

It is indeed sad to see our fine domestic programs being scuttled or maimed by the very representatives who launched them (borrowing from these programs or eliminating or postponing them because of war needs) just to finance the Viet Nam War!

It is as though a fever has taken over their minds and bodies and all they can think of is sending more men over to die and to come home crippled beyond human belief.

When the Viet Cong attacks one of our bases, possessions or an army of occupation lands on the shores of our mainland, then let us go all out with our fantastic statistics of men, weapons and strategy, but until then let us not lose our reason!

Is there not some legal way that this question of "to be or not to be in Viet Nam" can be referred to the people (such as in fall elections?) so the pulse of the people can be taken? What is more indicative of the desires of the American people than at election time? I don't mean by just being wise in our voting privileges choices this fall, but could it not be put on a Yes or No basis (like the national polls of which I know you are not fond). If such a referendum to the people is possible, I believe the results would be an "eye opener"!

In closing, I wish to assure you that I am not a "radical", a member of any leftist or rightist group or any subversive group. I am an American who enlisted in World War II because I loved my country and felt it my duty. I am just a plain, forward speaking and sincere Democrat who doesn't want to see our wonderful country broken (or even dented) by those who cannot "see" the lack of integrity and wisdom in our decisions in this Senseless War.

Hoping that my letter brings you comfort and will help bolster your stand which is so rational, honest and truthful, and urging you to keep up the good work, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. DOROTHY BACKUS.

FLINT, MICH.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.,
May 23, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The majority of our Congressmen have stated repeatedly that they were looking for a means to "honorably withdraw" from Viet Nam. Well, the events of the past two weeks surely offer that escape. Premier Ky took it upon himself (ignoring our Military) to send marines into De Nang to beat the Buddhists into submission. Ky later said he is under no obligation to notify us of his intentions. The Buddhist leader sent a cable to President Johnson requesting removal of Ky's men to prevent civil strife. Washington denied receiving such a cable but a couple of days ago a reply was reportedly received by the Buddhist in which President Johnson stated he could not withdraw support of Ky. Eleven thousand Americans filed past the White House in protest of Viet Nam.

Senator ELLENDER in a TV address yesterday, concluded that a reevaluation of our commitment in Viet Nam should be made . . . and quickly. The recent happenings simply prove that which has been said before by men knowledgeable, that America alone will never be able to establish stable states in Asia. General Douglas MacArthur said, and both Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy agreed, that it would be a tragic mistake for America to place foot soldiers on Asian soil in a contest with China. Then, there's always France's defeat in Indochina.

Yet, our President continues in his attempt to singly disprove the facts. Time is overdue for Congress to put a sudden halt to this hopeless waste of our Life's blood and the staggering expenditures which we can't afford in the first place.

We say we are fighting to prevent a "Communist take-over"; that we want to 'guarantee' free elections . . . even tho the People may choose Communist rule. Does that make sense? Down thru the centuries these Peoples have lived in fear of China and have always successfully resisted the enemy . . . but we are now going to drive them into the camp of Red China by our tactics. France tried to prevent free elections and suffered a decisive defeat. Dien came along and refused, in 1956, to permit free elections guaranteed under the 1954 Geneva Agreements . . . and we supported him. Premier Ky sprung into power, also determined to prevent free elections and we turned our support to him. How can we speak out of both sides of our mouth at the same time? Is there any wonder why we are not trusted? Can there be any doubt that we ARE the aggressor? Is there any reason for allied support in this venture?

President Johnson said we will continue the war "until peace comes." What opportunity is he looking for? He has had an offer last month from the Hanoi government and he deliberately ignored it. "Many opportunities have been missed to settle the Viet Nam crisis" said Mr U Thant in London on April 29th. Mr. McGeorge Bundy, former Presidential Advisor, in Tokyo on May 10th offered a choice reason for our present predicament. Congressman HEBERT bared records from the Joint Chiefs of Staff showing their disagreement with Mr. McNamara's cancellation of the B52 bombers and he charged the Defense Chief with deceiving the public and defying Congress. It has been estimated that we have More men in Southeast Asia than is admitted by the Defense Department. Are we Trying to provoke a war with Red China?

It's time for Congress to call a halt and bring back our troops. For the third time this spring, American casualties have exceeded those of the Vietnamese. This needless bloodshed is a crime. There is NO evidence to support our presence in this rat hole. If we are "committed" there, to Whom are we committed? To the People—who don't want us there? To Premier Ky—who doesn't have the support of his own People? What 'Victory' can we possibly achieve? To kill and plunder for the obligation to rebuild their country? The right to maintain possibly 100,000 troops there "to keep the peace"? Provided we are not confronted by Red China and Russia?

While our Allies supply North Viet Nam and build a steel mill for Peking, we send our boys there to fight Communism? Let's not be duped into a continuance of this War by any momentary gains Premier Ky may have in quelling the Buddhists. Get out of Viet Nam now.

Respectfully,

ERWIN ENGERT, Sr.

PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
May 18, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Please continue to enjoy "the luxury of fighting each other back home." Please continue to expose that rampant ego I helped install in the White House. Please continue to question our Cabinet officers.

I have written my first letters to the President, my Senators, Senator FULBRIGHT, and Senator MANSFIELD. I am proud of my country when I know it can produce men of your fibre.

Thank you,

ROBT D. POULSON.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
May 23, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I appreciated receiving a copy of your speech in the Senate, on Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam.

A great number of my friends and myself have a very high regard for your continued fight against the Administration for being involved in Vietnam and elsewhere, where we have no moral right to interfere.

It seems that the Administration has a great Lust for Interference without any concern for the lives of "our boys" in struggles which are not any of our business.

LBJ and his inept Advisors should have enough of American Guts left within themselves, to admit their wrongs—and order a halt their Immoral Orgy—not to save their own face, but to save what is left of the Image of the United States.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN G. C. SOHN.

MIDWEST CITY, OKLA.,
May 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I'm still rooting for you and your efforts to call a halt to our involvement in Vietnam. I'm hoping that this past week of "dog eat dog" in that miserable country may have brought a lot of people to their senses. How can they see what's going on over there and still approve the senseless slaughter of our boys? The sooner we get out and stay out, the happier I'll be—and the better off the U.S. will be.

Thanks for your time. Keep up your fine work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ALINE T. CALEDINE.

MAY 23, 1966.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Just a few lines to applaud your stand on the Viet Nam issue. Regardless of how the President tries to justify it, the war is a disgrace and a shame to all right thinking Americans.

Our boys are dying and suffering for nothing in that Asian stinkhole, if anyone had the whole of Viet Nam they would have nothing but a vast relief project. We want America and our sons out of Viet Nam, it is all for nothing.

McNamara and Rusk, a pair of proven liars must go, elections coming up in Nov. will really show how many (nervous Nellies) there are, it will not be a day of rejoicing for any democrat that stands out for this disgraceful war, and I say that altho I am a lifelong democrat.

Keeping on pounding away and educating the people, you will be proven right in the end, even as our distinguished Mr. Keating was when he called the turn on the Cuban situation.

Cordially yours

A. G. BARWOOD.

BEAVERTON, OREG.,
May 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: Be assured that we share your concern regarding making and use of foreign policy, particularly in southeast Asia. It would seem that our position in Viet Nam is becoming increasing untenable.

It is fortunate that the Foreign Relations Committee hearings were opened to the public. Surely many of our people are strongly influenced, and they should make themselves heard.

The people have the right to determine their own destinies through their repre-

sentatives, and all who work for that and discover the highest praise.

Yours truly,

GUY and MAY DODSON.

P.S.—I am continuing my study of problems of the aging, and currently am working on a Committee of the American Association of Retired Persons, seeking ways to reactivate the State council on aging.

MAY 20, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: I am writing to express my admiration and gratitude for your courageous stand on the Vietnam war. I realize there are few things more difficult than to stand up for one's beliefs, especially in these times when to do so results in being called a Communist, unpatriotic, or at best, a "muddled thinker."

As a college student I want to thank you for your demonstration of integrity and perseverance. Believe me, most of the people I speak to do not really know why we are in Vietnam, and want more than anything else to find a way to end this situation.

Please do not give up your fight, Senator. I respect you and encourage you in your thoughtful criticism of U.S. policy in Vietnam. Please remember the people of Oregon have great confidence and faith in you.

Sincerely,

MAY LYNN MORRISON.

PHOENIX, OREG.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 21, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: This is the first time I have written to you. I am a firm supporter of your viewpoint. In my opinion we have made a major blunder in Vietnam, and I applaud your courageous stand against the administration's policy. I fully support your efforts.

Respectfully yours,

DAVID A. BERMAN.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,
Saginaw, Mich., May 22, 1966.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Permit me to congratulate you most heartily on your position on Vietnam from both the legal and moral standpoint. I count myself among those who feel that we have made tragic mistakes the past five years.

I make many calls in this parish. I have found only one person who would defend our involvement there in any way. All the others are extremely critical of this Administration's policy.

It is clear that thoughtful, knowledgeable and patriotic Americans would like to find another way—and soon. Surely the elections this fall will register the doubt of the American people about our present course.

May I venture to suggest that a movement be started to get Senator FULBRIGHT nominated by the Democrats for the presidency in 1968. He is fearless, honest, and utterly without guile.

Keep up the good work. Sooner or later it must bear fruit.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY A. NELSON.

EASTWOOD BAPTIST CHURCH,
Syracuse, N.Y., May 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SIR: I wish to thank you for the reprint from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding the legality (or lack thereof) of our position in Viet Nam.

The names of MORSE and FULBRIGHT will go down in history as men who stood in the way of the complete sell-out of the nation

to dangerous, unilateral, and immoral action. I am saying this from my pulpit, and there are a few others like me, at least.

I'm sure you get many damning letters, but I should like to be recorded on the side of those who express deep appreciation.

Sincerely,

HUGH F. MILLER,
Pastor.

MONTROSE, MICH.,
May 22, 1966.

Senator W. MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The commendable work you are doing on the war issue is greatly appreciated.

Eighty Five per cent of our community feel we have no justification for being in the present conflict.

Thank you,

C. K. DETTMAN, M.D.

MAY 21, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: After viewing you on television I find myself in sympathy with your views about the government's involvement in Viet Nam. I would very much appreciate receiving a letter stating what your general views are about this also would like to know if there is anything a private citizen can do to help change the foreign policy over Viet Nam.

Most Respectfully,

PAUL W. LEE.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.

NEWCASTLE, CALIF.,
May 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Almost to a person everyone I know feels horror and indignation over our participation in the Vietnamese War. These feelings are usually timidly and fearfully expressed—by self-effacing citizens whose taxes are paying the bill and whose sons have been herded into a conflict the justice of which they do not perceive.

The one bright star on the horizon was the probe into the Asian conflict by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and our congratulations to members like yourself. This probe is one of the most encouraging political actions of our times. Please do not stop at merely making Americans "discriminating" about a "local war"—as if servicemen were not paying constantly with their lives for our lack of action. Please fire up this opposition; it could be the start of a method for ending war altogether.

Sincerely,

Mrs. LUCILE JORGENSEN.

CARMICHAEL, CALIF.,
May 22, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATE MORSE: My only regret after listening in on all the T.V. foreign relations hearing—pro. & con—is that I am not a resident of Oregon & could therefore vote for you. Please continue your efforts in the American people's behalf. Yours may be a minority stand in the house & senate, but I'll wager it is not across the country. To think otherwise (from you & Sen. FULBRIGHT) is an insult to the American voters' intelligence or is it a fight, between idealism & practicability.

Please tell the American people at the next hearing what we (millions I am sure) can do to voice en masse our disapproval & also give your group the much needed support. Your stand is indeed a chapter for "profiles in courage" & the American people congratulate you. It will not harm your career. I'll continue to clip the many "letters from

the people" in our local Sacramento Bee newspaper.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. J. H. SWEDBERG.

DIFFERENT CRYSTAL BALL

EDITOR OF THE BEE: Sir: If Mr. Niles used a crystal ball to see the future of WAYNE MORSE, it does not agree with mine.

In my crystal ball I see WAYNE MORSE in the White House, L.B.J. back on his ranch and our boys out of Viet Nam, God being willing.

In our system of electing a president we, the people, have little choice. Too many times we are given a choice between two people, neither of whom we want. Correction of this situation should be high on the agenda of our representatives in Washington.

G. M. M.

SACRAMENTO.

MAY 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: For many years I have been a WAYNE MORSE fan, but unfortunately not a voter. We don't have the likes in North Carolina. I feel so disturbed about this tragic war in Viet Nam I just don't know how to effectively oppose it, so I write expressing my support. I'll say just one thing. If the Chinese were over here burning alive my grandchildren, I don't think I'd ever tire of killing them, only death or practical considerations would stop me. This is the kind of fury our sons must face on the other side of the world. Let's bring them home alive.

If it is convenient, I would like to have a copy of the disputed resolution Pres. Johnson used to get America into this war.

Sincerely,

S. B. RICKETT.

HENDERSONVILLE, N.C.

DALLAS, TEX.,
May 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Sir, we have a nineteen year old son fighting in the war in Viet Nam. Sir, He is our only child. Perhaps we are "nervous nellys," but we are concerned about him and all of the others over there who are caught in this "war within a war." We stand behind you 100 percent, Sir, in that we should get our sons out of Viet Nam now. Please do all you can to get our sons out of Viet Nam, Sir. We want our son back safe and well the same as other parents do. People have begged and pled with the President to get our sons out of Viet Nam only to be ignored, not even a reply.

Sir, the government is "of the People, for the People and by the People," and we, the People, do not want this war. We do not have any business there as long as it is not our war and war has not been declared. Do they appreciate our being there, spending tax payer's money and sacrificing tax payer's sons? They do not. There is no way of knowing how many of our sons have been slain by those we are supposed to be helping. They pretend to be farmers in the day time and are Viet Cong at night. Sir, is it right to throw our youth in the fire of the foe while there is such turmoil among the Vietnamese people? We expect our son to come home safe and well, Sir, can't the People sue Mr. Johnson for murdering our sons in his illegal undeclared war?

Mrs. R. B. BLAKE.

STOCKTON, CALIF.,
May 23, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: My wife and I wish to thank you for keeping the Vietnam escapade under review and we are hopeful you can stimulate any action for termination.

We both feel that the Congress has been & is remiss in not standing firm in their

right and duty to be the agency responsible for the declaration of war.

Sincerely,

JOHN and MARJORIE PHILLIPS.

MAY 22, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: You are speaking my feelings about Vietnam. Please continue to represent me since I have no representation from my State.

Sincerely,

HARRIET JOSLYN.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

IMLAY CITY, MICH.,
May 20, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.

DEAR SENATOR: I'm very proud of you. It's good for the American people to know there are a few men in high office position who have the stamina to speak out their beliefs. It's time for the people of this country to wake up before it's too late. And you, as one of our representatives, has been doing your share towards this. Most of our public officials are afraid they will jeopardize their position and prestige, and when one like yourself speaks out the truth, it's good to hear. We're all tired of lies and tired of wars. President Johnson may be surprised some day to find the people of this country are not as dumb as he thinks.

I am supporting you 100% in your efforts to stop the war in Vietnam.

More power to you.

Respectfully,

Mrs. MARJORIE CIRSS.

HOPKINS, MINN.,
May 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your speech, *Legal Issues of United States Position in Viet Nam*, has been carefully read.

There was just a faint, fleeting sense of security when one realized that even one Senator would find voice to condemn our action in South East Asia.

Can we ever have respect for or confidence in the Senate again?

Years ago a book appeared on our markets titled "It Can't Happen Here." In our lifetime we have seen it happen here—the capitulation of elected officers to overpowering arrogance (a dirty word) of an Executive who has flouted international agreements and led us into untenable circumstances.

The Senate Foreign Relations discussions were greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

DOROTHY BREN.

MAY 23, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I received your document entitled "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam" printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of Friday, February 25, 1966, for which I thank you.

I support your position whole-heartedly and urge you to continue your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT B. DAWKINS.

MAY 22, 1966.

Senator PHILIP HART,
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have consistently opposed United States action in Viet Nam and will continue to do so under present conditions. At one point I could see a reason for holding certain defensive perimeters and encouraging the South Vietnamese to resistance, but now I must go along with complete withdrawal. I had hoped that the president's

foreign policy and military advisers would be prudent in the use of force, but they have not been. In fact they are constantly expanding it. In this light the only solution is complete withdrawal where the temptation to use force is minimized.

The latest evidence of United States irresponsibility is the destruction of about 98,000 acres of crop producing land in South Viet Nam, according to an A.P. article. I know they say "war is hell" but this is going a little too far. We are waging herbicidal war against the farmer, and the present (and incidentally, the State Dept. says, against some Viet Cong, who in most cases are also farmers, and peasants). We are destroying a crop base that Asia needs very badly. We are adding the chance of famine to a long list of United States instigated miseries. It is action like this that convinces me that we are morally wrong in just about everything we do in Viet Nam.

Sincerely,

EDWIN R. CARLSON.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

cc—Representative GERALD FORD, editor of the Press (Grand Rapids, Mich.)

SOUTH VIET NAM CROP KILLING IS EXPANDED
WASHINGTON.—The area of crops destroyed in South Viet Nam to deny them to the Communist Viet Cong has been significantly expanded in recent months, according to figures made available by official sources Saturday.

As of about two months ago—the latest figure available—the area covered by crop-killing herbicides was listed at slightly above 98,000 acres.

The previous total on this, as issued by the State Department on March 9, was around 20,000 acres. That was said to have been the total as of last fall. Data arriving here run behind the program, which officials said has been under way since 1962.

The 98,000 acres was estimated to be roughly 1½ percent of the total area under cultivation in South Viet Nam. Authorities said the affected lands are only in certain areas, like parts of the central highlands, long under Red control.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
May 22, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Do use your influence to withdraw from Vietnam, where our presence is not wanted, and our position doubtfully legal.

Economically, I feel we should do what is required, but I am very much against our boys being sent there, where even the South Vietnamese are turning against us.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. BENNO RUBEL.

BLUFFTON, OHIO,
May 22, 1966.

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you for your outspoken criticism of the administration for the military action in Vietnam. Thank God! There is a statesman, like you, in Washington who is willing to put country before party.

It is an insult to the intelligence of the American people for the administration to continue telling them that American boys are in Vietnam saving the world from communism. The patriotism of the American people is being sorely tried.

I am a general practitioner in a rural area. My patients are good average Americans. They are confused, disgusted, discouraged and very much opposed to the senseless sacrifices being made in Vietnam.

During World War II I served as medical officer with the Chinese troops. I was with the first group of the Chinese army that entered Haiphong after VJ day. I have some idea of the sacrifices of American life and material that was made for China during WW II. Now, look at the result.

If an armistice is signed it will only be another Korea. We will have to enforce it with American troops for the next decade.

Once you have lost face in the Orient as we have you are finished. We should pull out as quickly as possible. The responsibility for the future of Vietnam should be placed in the hands of the United Nations. If they fail it will be upon their shoulders. The common people of Vietnam cannot suffer much more than they have under this terrible civil war.

I debated with myself some time before writing this letter. It is of the rights of democracy for which we are supposed to be fighting in Vietnam.

Please continue your criticisms of the Administration loud and clear. You are in position to be heard.

Respectfully,

F. F. RODABAUGH, M.D.,
Former Major, U.S. Medical Corp, Re-
cipient Legion of Merit.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH,
St. Petersburg, Fla., May 23, 1966.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your predictions about chaos and confusion in Viet Nam have certainly been fulfilled. Now I hope you will continue to work for an end to this tragic war and a return home of our American boys.

Gratefully,

AARON N. MECKEL.

MAY 20, 1966.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As an informed American I urgently request that you continue to lead the fight against present U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I hope you will continue and increase your efforts toward withdrawal of U.S. troops from that country. Millions of Americans violently protest our immoral involvement in that country and we will be heard in November.

Thank you for your efforts on my behalf.
Sincerely,

Mrs. W. B. MITCHELL.

DELRAY BEACH, FLA.,
May 23, 1966.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I just wish to add my name to those who appreciate the great work you are endeavoring to do in connection with this terrible mess in Viet Nam. I agree your attitude is 100% correct. We don't belong there and what possible justification is there for this terrible slaughter of American youth. May God help you and others with your courage. Help get us out of this inexcusable commitment.

Respectfully,

LAYTON ROGERS COLBURN.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
May 23, 1966.

Re speech on legal issues of U.S. position in Vietnam.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MORSE: First, I wish to express my profound respect and admiration for you, who have had the moral fortitude, integrity and persistency in Senate speeches and hearings to expose and defy an overwhelming majority of our Government leadership who are selling us, the citizen of U.S., down the road. A leadership that is legalizing the steal of our tax money to pay for wars such as in Vietnam, in which U.S. Servicemen,

Vietnamese and Vietcong, both civilians and Servicemen, are being killed and maimed, and property destroyed.

Fortunately, by one means or another I received a copy of your February 1966 speech before the Senate titled "Legal Issues of U.S. Position in Vietnam." It appears as though the title might have read "Illegal Issues". I was happy to receive this article because its complete detail answered many of the questions I have had in mind concerning our involvement. It was concise and thorough. I have some further questions to ask you later in this letter.

As I discuss our participation in this affair with many friends and acquaintances, the majority are opposed to our participation. I am wondering if my experience in this respect may be representative of the citizens throughout the country. If such is the case, it is deeply regrettable that neither the Democratic nor Republican party chooses to take a God-like and legal stand in such policies.

If nearly half of the United States citizens are opposed to this war, couldn't a third party formed on the platform of abolishing it and still fostering individual initiative and free enterprise, possibly win out against a divided half (the other two parties)?

This letter is being dictated a day before your Oregon Primary. I should fervently hope that your candidate is nominated, although I feel that he would have had a considerably better chance of winning had he been willing to do some campaigning. Many people may feel that he won't produce if he won't campaign. Perhaps the results for this reason will not be truly representative of what they might have been otherwise.

And now to a few questions to which I would appreciate your frank answers.

To where does the man turn, like myself, who refuses to vote for any nominee who has not demonstrated his definite desire to terminate this war and similar interferences throughout the world, in his desire to vote for such a man? Isn't the time ripe for a national push in this direction?

Why did Eisenhower and Dulles refuse to permit free elections in Vietnam in 1956, according to the Geneva accords? Was it because they refused to be willing to accept the apparent results of such an election, which would have undoubtedly given the Communists a definite majority?

Why has our Government continued for ten additional years from the date of such proposed election, to refuse to permit free elections in Vietnam?

What is the Administration's true reason for the Vietnam engagement? Is it really to protect United States capital invested in Vietnam?

I will sincerely appreciate your answers.

With every good wish, I am

Most sincerely,

SPENCER BERG.

P.S.—Would it be possible for you to please supply me with 25 additional copies of your Senate speech referred to herein?

FLORAL PARK, N.Y.,
May 23, 1966.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Keep speaking out for sanity and decency. You are on the side of Truth and Humanity.

End the shameful, criminal war in Vietnam! We want our boys back home! Recent events in Vietnam make me very sick and ashamed. How much longer?

Gratefully,

Mrs. HILIA ELAN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
May 25, 1966.

MOST DISTINGUISHED SENATOR: I am a Catholic Priest; with these following few

words, I wish to tell You that I am completely agree with You and entirely support your honest and noble opinion which You are preaching now to the American public. The Motto of this Country is: "For God and for Country". How can we (Christians) say again for God, since we are killing God's people every day in Viet-Nam? Only Americans are God's people? God said to us (Whoever believes in Him) Thou shall not kill "well, as you know, we do kill people every day with a well planned project (not a treaty nor contract). How can we justify our actions before God and before Men (of good will)? As for Country: I say we are not fighting to defend our country; Vietnam is not our country our kind of people; we have nothing in common with those people: physically, geographically, historically, socially, morally, customary physiologically or traditionally etc. They are Asians, not Americans nor Europeans. Why don't we let them settle their own differences? Why our young Americans must die for their country, not for our U.S.A? If America, for instance: Alaska or Hawaii being attacked, I will be fully supporting and fighting against our enemies, but this is not the case. This is their civil war, (I don't say: we are intervening) but Johnson-Lodge-Rusk-McNamara and Taylor are pouring gas and oil in that fire, and give no sign to seek for an alternative, yet every day our naive young soldiers (thinking perhaps they are patriots) and Vietnamese (as innocent, as ignorant they are) died by hundreds or (thousands in the near future) . . . For what reason they died? For what cause? I think, for no other reason or commitment (unilateral as it is) but yankee determination or stubbornness. Namely they are wrong, they will keep going to do wrong until the end and they will listen to no one. This attitude will lead U.S.A. into most disastrous consequences etc.

I say it again: How do we justify our actions in Vietnam? *before God and before our Countrymen?* What the historian will put into the book of history? I think, we getting more aggressives than anybody else in the free world today! A democratic system with a aggressive form. I suppose, if we are getting deeper into the war with China, some day with Russia. *Are we save and secure from Russia an Atomic Bombs and rockets?* How about Cuba? Do you think that Castro has no atomic weapons in his Island? Only crazy people think so. *If we are not save, why then we are continuing to play with the fire?* I am so worry about the war going on in Vietnam, I pray and I hope that Almighty God deign to show His merciful intervention. Dear Senator, I wish you will continue your activities to explain to the naive americans about the involvement in Vietnam and I will support you with my intensified prayers every day in my Masses. May the Holy Spirit enlighten our leaders to see that they are doing something wrong to ourselves—to our free world and to the poor—ignorant Vietnamese people; May the Holy Spirit deign to inspire them a good and sound policy to follow. As a Catholic Clergy, I say again: *It is unpatriotic to fight not for one's own country (Vietnam is not our country) and it is not wise and prudent to violate the Commandment of God (yet we say: in God we trust).* I know and I feel that When God's Punishment comes, no one can stop Him, then that would be too late, if we began to beg for His mercy ! ! ! Well, I *predict* now, if Mr. Johnson and his colleagues refuse to change their policy, *no one of them will die in peace* (I wish, you remember that Dear Senator) Finally, I wish and I hope that You and Mr. FULBRIGHT will sustain with energy your sound judgment against unsound policy. May God bless you and your colleagues and co-workers for the peace in Vietnam. God keep you well! Your useless servant in

Christ. (Excuse to disclose my name) if you wish. You might read to or quote my writing to the public.

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
May 23, 1966.

Re: Peace in Vietnam.
President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Please get us out of Vietnam now.

Vietnam is not important to the security of the United States.

Your administration's actions in Vietnam hinder the United States from building a society of freedom and equality of opportunity, the Great Society that I believe you wish to advance.

Your administration's actions in Vietnam hinder efforts to move the world away from the brink of nuclear war to a peaceful world under the rule of law.

Please get us out of Vietnam now.

Yours truly,

BENJAMIN M. SHIEBER.

cc.: Vice President HUMPHREY, and Senators FULBRIGHT, MANSFIELD, MORSE, LONG, and RUSSELL.

FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1151, S. 985, and that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). The bill will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 985) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Fair Packaging and Labeling Act".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Informed consumers are essential to the fair and efficient functioning of a free market economy. Packages and their labels should enable consumers to obtain accurate information as to the quantity of the contents and should facilitate price comparisons. Therefore, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to assist consumers and manufacturers in reaching these goals in the marketing of consumer goods.

PROHIBITION OF UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE PACKAGING AND LABELING

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in the packaging or labeling of any consumer commodity (as defined in this Act) for distribution in commerce, or for any person (other than a common carrier for hire, a contract carrier for hire, or a freight forwarder for hire) engaged in the distribution in commerce of any packaged or labeled consumer commodity, to distribute or to cause to be distributed in commerce any such commodity if such commodity is contained in a package, or if there is affixed

to that commodity a label, which does not conform to the provisions of this Act and of regulations promulgated under the authority of this Act.

(b) The prohibition contained in subsection (a) shall not apply to persons engaged in business as wholesale or retail distributors of consumer commodities except to the extent that such persons (1) are engaged in the packaging or labeling of such commodities, or (2) prescribe or specify by any means the manner in which such commodities are packaged or labeled.

REQUIREMENTS AND PROHIBITIONS

SEC. 4. (a) No person subject to the prohibition contained in section 3 shall distribute or cause to be distributed in commerce any packaged consumer commodity unless in conformity with regulations which shall be established by the promulgating authority pursuant to section 6 of this Act and which shall provide that:

(1) The commodity shall bear a label specifying the identity of the commodity and the name and place of business of the manufacturer, packer, or distributor; and

(2) The net quantity of contents (in terms of weight, measure, or numerical count) shall be separately and accurately stated in a uniform location upon the principal display panel of that label; and

(3) The separate label statement of net quantity of contents appearing upon or affixed to any package—

(A) if expressed in terms of weight or fluid volume, on any package of a consumer commodity containing less than four pounds or one gallon, shall be expressed in ounces or in whole units of pounds, pints, or quarts (avoirdupois or liquid, whichever may be appropriate);

(B) shall appear in conspicuous and easily legible type in distinct contrast (by typography, layout, color, embossing, or molding) with other matter on the package;

(C) shall contain letters or numerals in a type size which shall be (i) established in relationship to the area of the principal display panel of the package, and (ii) uniform for all packages of substantially the same size; and

(D) shall be so placed that the lines of printed matter included in that statement are generally parallel to the base on which the package rests as it is designed to be displayed.

(b) No person subject to the prohibition contained in section 3 shall distribute or cause to be distributed in commerce any packaged consumer commodity if any qualifying words or phrases appear in conjunction with the separate statement of the net quantity of contents required by subsection (a), but nothing in this subsection or in paragraph (2) of subsection (a) shall prohibit supplemental statements, at other places on the package, describing in non-deceptive terms the net quantity of contents: *Provided*, That such supplemental statements of net quantity of contents shall not include any term qualifying a unit of weight, measure, or count that tends to exaggerate the amount of the commodity contained in the package.

ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) The authority to promulgate regulations under this Act is vested in (A) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (referred to hereinafter as the "Secretary") with respect to any consumer commodity which is a food, drug, device, or cosmetic, as each such term is defined by section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321); and (B) the Federal Trade Commission (referred to hereinafter as the "Commission") with respect to any other consumer commodity.

(b) If the promulgating authority specified in this section finds that, because of the

nature, form, or quantity of a particular consumer commodity, or for other good and sufficient reasons, full compliance with all the requirements otherwise applicable under section 4 of this Act is impracticable or is not necessary for the adequate protection of consumers, the Secretary or the Commission (whichever the case may be) shall promulgate regulations exempting such commodity from those requirements to the extent and under such conditions as the promulgating authority determines to be consistent with section 2 of this Act.

(c) Whenever the promulgating authority determines that regulations containing prohibitions or requirements other than those prescribed by section 4 are necessary to prevent the deception of consumers or to facilitate price comparisons as to any consumer commodity, such authority shall promulgate with respect to that commodity regulations effective to—

(1) establish and define standards for characterizing the size of a package enclosing any consumer commodity, which may be used to supplement the label statement of net quantity of contents of packages containing such commodity, but this paragraph shall not be construed as authorizing any limitation on the size, shape, weight, dimensions, or number of packages which may be used to enclose any commodity;

(2) establish and define the net quantity of any commodity (in terms of weight, measure, or count) which shall constitute a serving, if that commodity is distributed to retail purchasers in a package or with a label which bears a representation as to the number of servings provided by the net quantity of contents contained in that package or to which that label is affixed;

(3) regulate the placement upon any package containing any commodity, or upon any label affixed to such commodity, of any printed matter stating or representing by implication that such commodity is offered for retail sale at a price lower than the ordinary and customary retail sale price or that a retail sale price advantage is accorded to purchasers thereof by reason of the size of that package or the quantity of its contents; and

(4) require (consistent with requirements imposed by or pursuant to the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as amended) that information with respect to the ingredients and composition of any consumer commodity (other than information concerning proprietary trade secrets) be placed upon packages containing that commodity.

(d) Whenever the promulgating authority determines, after a hearing conducted in compliance with section 7 of the Administrative Procedure Act, that the weights or quantities in which any consumer commodity is being distributed for retail sale are likely to impair the ability of consumers to make price per unit comparisons such authority shall—

(1) publish such determination in the Federal Register; and

(2) promulgate, subject to the provisions of subsections (e), (f), and (g), regulations effective to establish reasonable weights or quantities, and fractions or multiple thereof, in which any such consumer commodity shall be distributed for retail sale.

(e) At any time within sixty days after the publication of any determination pursuant to subsection (d) (1) as to any consumer commodity, any producer or distributor affected may request the Secretary of Commerce to participate in the development of a voluntary product standard for such commodity under the procedures for the development of voluntary product standards established by the Secretary pursuant to section 2 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 272). Such procedures shall provide adequate manufacturer, distributor, and consumer representation.

Upon the filing of any such request the Secretary of Commerce shall transmit notice thereof to the authority which has caused notice of such determination to be published.

(f) No regulation promulgated pursuant to subsection (d) (2) with respect to any consumer commodity may—

(1) vary from any voluntary product standard in effect with respect to that consumer commodity which was published—

(A) before the publication of any determination with respect to that consumer commodity pursuant to subsection (d) (1);

(B) within one year after the filing pursuant to this section of a request for the development of a voluntary product standard with respect to that consumer commodity; or

(C) within such period of time (not exceeding eighteen months after the filing of such request) as the promulgating authority may deem proper upon a certification by the Secretary of Commerce that such a voluntary product standard with respect to that consumer commodity is under active consideration and that there are presently grounds for belief that such a standard for that commodity will be published within a reasonable period of time;

(2) establish any weight or measure in any amount less than two ounces;

(3) preclude the use of any package of particular dimensions or capacity customarily used for the distribution of related commodities of varying densities, except to the extent that it is determined that the continued use of such package for such purpose is likely to deceive consumers; or

(4) preclude the continued use of particular dimensions or capacities of returnable or reusable glass containers for beverages in use as of the effective date of the Act.

(g) In the promulgation of regulations under subsection (d) (2) of this section, due regard shall be given to the probable effect of such regulations upon—

(1) the cost of the packaging of the commodities affected;

(2) the availability of any commodity in a reasonable range of package sizes to serve consumer convenience;

(3) the materials used for the packaging of the affected commodities;

(4) the weights and measures customarily used in the packaging of the affected commodities;

(5) competition between containers made of different types of packaging material.

PROCEDURE FOR PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Regulations promulgated by the Secretary under section 4 or section 5 of this Act shall be promulgated, and shall be subject to judicial review, pursuant to the provisions of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 371 (e), (f), and (g)). Hearings authorized or required for the promulgation of any such regulations by the Secretary shall be conducted by the Secretary or by such officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as he may designate for that purpose.

(b) Regulations promulgated by the Commission under section 4 or section 5 of this Act shall be promulgated, and shall be subject to judicial review, by proceedings taken in conformity with the provisions of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 701 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 371 (e), (f), and (g)) in the same manner, and with the same effect, as if such proceedings were taken by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) of this section. Hearings authorized or required for the promulgation of any such regulations by the Commission shall be conducted by the Commission or by such officer or employee of the Commission as the Commission may designate for that purpose.

(c) In carrying into effect the provisions of this Act, the Secretary and the Commission are authorized to cooperate with any department or agency of the United States, with any State, Commonwealth, or possession of the United States, and with any department, agency, or political subdivision of any such State, Commonwealth, or possession.

(d) No regulation adopted under this Act shall preclude the continued use of returnable or reusable glass containers for beverages in inventory or with the trade as of the effective date of this Act.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 7. (a) Any consumer commodity which is a food, drug, device, or cosmetic, as each such term is defined by section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321), and which is introduced or delivered for introduction into commerce in violation of any of the provisions of this Act, or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act, shall be deemed to be misbranded within the meaning of chapter III of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, but the provisions of section 303 of that Act (21 U.S.C. 333) shall have no application to any violation of section 3 of this Act.

(b) Any violation of any of the provisions of this Act, or the regulations issued pursuant to this Act, with respect to any consumer commodity which is not a food, drug, device, or cosmetic, shall constitute an unfair or deceptive act or practice in commerce in violation of section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act and shall be subject to enforcement under section 5(b) of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(c) In the case of any imports into the United States of any consumer commodity covered by this Act, the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this Act shall be enforced by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 801 (a) and (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 381).

REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

SEC. 8. Each officer or agency required or authorized by this Act to promulgate regulations for the packaging or labeling of any consumer commodity, or to participate in the development of voluntary product standards with respect to any consumer commodity under procedures referred to in section 5(e) of this Act, shall transmit to the Congress in January of each year a report containing a full and complete description of the activities of that officer or agency for the administration and enforcement of this Act during the preceding fiscal year.

COOPERATION WITH STATE AUTHORITIES

SEC. 9. (a) A copy of each regulation promulgated under this Act shall be transmitted promptly to the Secretary of Commerce, who shall (1) transmit copies thereof to all appropriate State officers and agencies, and (2) furnish to such State officers and agencies information and assistance to promote to the greatest practicable extent uniformity in State and Federal regulation of the labeling of consumer commodities.

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to impair or otherwise interfere with any program carried into effect by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the provisions of law in cooperation with State governments or agencies, instrumentalities, or political subdivisions thereof.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 10. For the purpose of this Act—

(a) The term "consumer commodity", except as otherwise specifically provided by this subsection, means any food, drug, device, or cosmetic (as those terms are defined by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act), and any other article, product, or commodity of any kind or class which is customarily produced or distributed for sale through re-

tall sales agencies or instrumentalities for consumption by individuals, or use by individuals for purposes of personal care or in the performance of services ordinarily rendered within the household, and which usually is consumed or expended in the course of such consumption or use. Such term does not include—

(1) any meat or meat product, poultry or poultry product, or tobacco or tobacco product;

(2) any commodity subject to packaging or labeling requirements imposed by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or the provisions of the eighth paragraph under the heading "Bureau of Animal Industry" of the Act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 832-833; 21 U.S.C. 151-157), commonly known as the Virus-Serum-Toxin Act;

(3) any drug subject to the provisions of sections 503(b) (1) or 506 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 353(b) (1), 355, 356, 357);

(4) any beverage subject to or complying with packaging or labeling requirements imposed under the Federal Alcohol Administration Act (27 U.S.C. 201 et seq.); or

(5) any commodity subject to the provisions of the Federal Seed Act (7 U.S.C. 1551-1610).

(b) The term "package" means any container or wrapping in which any consumer commodity is enclosed for use in the delivery or display of that consumer commodity to retail purchasers, but does not include—

(1) shipping containers or wrappings used solely for the transportation of any consumer commodity in bulk or in quantity to manufacturers, packers, or processors, or to wholesale or retail distributors thereof;

(2) shipping containers or outer wrappings used by retailers to ship or deliver any commodity to retail customers if such containers and wrappings bear no printed matter pertaining to any particular commodity; or

(3) containers subject to the provisions of the Act of August 3, 1912 (37 Stat. 250, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 231-233), the Act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1186, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 234-236), the Act of August 31, 1916 (39 Stat. 673, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 251-256), or the Act of May 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 685, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 257-257i).

(c) The term "label" means any written, printed, or graphic matter affixed to any consumer commodity or affixed to or appearing upon a package containing any consumer commodity;

(d) The term "person" includes any firm, corporation, or association;

(e) The term "commerce" means (1) commerce between any State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any territory or possession of the United States, or territory and any place outside thereof, and (2) commerce within the District of Columbia or within any territory or possession of the United States not organized with a legislative body, but shall not include exports to foreign countries; and

(f) The term "principal display panel" means that part of a label that is most likely to be displayed, presented, shown, or examined under normal and customary conditions of display for retail sale.

SAVING PROVISION

Sec. 11. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to repeal, invalidate, or supersede—

(a) the Federal Trade Commission Act or any statute defined therein as an antitrust Act;

(b) the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; or

(c) the Hazardous Substances Labeling Act.

EFFECT UPON STATE LAW

Sec. 12. It is hereby expressly declared that it is the intent of the Congress to supersede

any and all laws of the States and political subdivisions thereof insofar as they may now or hereafter provide for the labeling of the net quantity of contents of the package of any consumer commodity covered by this Act which differs from the requirements of section 4 of this Act or regulations promulgated pursuant thereto.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 13. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the sixth month beginning after the date of its enactment; *Provided*, That the Secretary (with respect to any consumer commodity which is a food, drug, device, or cosmetic), and the Commission (with respect to any other consumer commodity) may by regulation postpone, for an additional twelve-month period, the effective date of this Act with respect to any class of type of consumer commodity on the basis of a finding that such a postponement would be in the public interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will leave to the Presiding Officer, when he takes the chair, the second responsibility that was given to me: That of adjourning the Senate in accordance with the agreement previously entered into.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SPARKMAN BEFORE HOME BUILDERS ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on Tuesday, May 24, 1966, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] spoke to the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Pittsburgh, Pa. The subject of his talk was "U.S. Foreign Policy." While I may not necessarily agree with everything the Senator from Alabama said in his talk, I believe it is an excellent discussion of our foreign policy and so that others may have the opportunity to read his remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have the Alabama Senator's speech printed in the RECORD in full.

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

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

(Statement prepared for delivery by JOHN SPARKMAN, U.S. Senator from Alabama, at the General Membership Meeting of the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Pittsburgh Pick-Roosevelt Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa., 7:00 p.m., May 24, 1966)

I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak to the Home Builders of Metropolitan Pittsburgh.

When I was invited to come here, it was suggested that I might talk on any subject I felt would be of interest to you. And, furthermore, it was left to my discretion just how long my remarks should be. Let me warn you now that this is a dangerous invitation to extend to a Senator, especially a Southern Senator. We have been known to speak at length in the Senate! I promise

you, however, that I will not filibuster here today.

My subject today regards U.S. Foreign Policy. But before going into that matter I have a few comments to make with respect to housing, mortgage credit and pending 1966 housing legislation.

I would be fooling you if I did not say that the housing picture for the immediate future looks a little bleak. Our national economy has "heated up" much more rapidly than anyone had predicted. The Vietnam situation is causing continued concern and the indices of inflation are continuing to move up.

Many economists claim that we are in a critical situation and the President must take action now to curb inflation, either through new taxes or by cutting back government spending, or both.

I am sure you are aware of the divergent views taken by some of those who suggest the economic patterns the nation should follow. I refer mainly to such men as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and the Secretary of Treasury. On the one hand Chairman Martin of the Board is advocating immediate restraints on inflation in the form of a tax increase while on the other hand, Secretary Fowler of the Treasury is of the opinion that no drastic tax or wage-price controls are needed at present.

The Administration, as well as the Congress, is watching all economic signs very carefully, and I can assure you that if these signs do not show a stabilizing trend for the future, some action will have to be taken.

Nevertheless, partly spurred by the action of the Federal Reserve Board last December, interest rates on mortgage loans and other investments are at a 30-year high. This, of course, bodes no good for housing and unless things change for the better very shortly now, I believe we can count on housing starts dropping off this year.

This is not the first time we have been plagued with a shortage of mortgage credit. In fact, we experienced such a shortage twice in the decade of the 50's. During that period we tried certain methods to ease the flow of mortgage money. It is an old pet peeve of mine that whenever money gets tight, housing gets squeezed out. The strong borrowers, that is, those industries who have access to the supply of funds and can afford to pay the price, will get the money.

As I said, in other periods of tight money we have tried certain methods to ease the flow of mortgage capital and to some degree we found temporary solutions. On the other hand, I have on numerous occasions sought a permanent remedy for the so-called spasmodic flow of mortgage credit, but to be very honest I must admit that all suggestions made thus far are like trying to cure a stomach ulcer with an aspirin. We really have never found a permanent solution to the problem.

As one who is vitally interested in housing and mortgage credit I would certainly welcome any suggestions you may have that would bring a permanent solution to this problem.

I, for one, believe that a healthy, strong and vigorous homebuilding industry helps to make a healthy, strong and vigorous national economy and certainly we need a strong national economy in this particular period of our history.

Let me turn now for a moment to 1966 housing legislation.

To be very candid, I was a little surprised when the President sent his housing message to the Congress this year and followed it with not one, but *three* bills.

Only a few short months ago we passed a 4-year omnibus housing bill, that is, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, which authorized a host of new and complex—if not controversial—housing programs. Indeed it was only a short time ago

that a brand new Housing Department was established. I thought with last year's Act and the creation of a new Department the Administration would be busy for sometime to come.

The President apparently thought otherwise and submitted for Congressional approval a program which, in his words, would represent "an effort larger in scope, more comprehensive, more concentrated, than any that has gone before."

I will not go into the details of the three Administration bills for they deal more with urbanization and city development than they deal with housing per se, and are, therefore, measures in which, I believe, you would have only casual interest.

The Housing Subcommittee of the Senate, of which I am Chairman, has just completed hearings on the three Administration bills and some 30-odd other measures including mass transportation matters as well as amendments to the National Housing Act—the FHA programs.

At this point in time we have not scheduled further action on any of these matters because it does not appear to me, at least, that opinions have jelled to the point where we are ready to act on 1966 housing legislation.

This is not to say that we will not have a 1966 Housing Act. In fact, not having an act would be the exception rather than the rule these days. It is to say that we in the Senate, at least, are not ready to decide what a 1966 Housing Act should contain.

Let me turn now to the main subject of my talk—United States foreign policy.

I do so with an apology. It is that these remarks were prepared several days ago and for that reason they are general in nature. We may like to think our foreign policy is as positive and immutable as the Ten Commandments. This is not the case.

It is for that reason that speeches such as this must be couched in general terms.

Perhaps it would be helpful to think for a moment about foreign policy not within a framework of international society, but within a framework of domestic society. Let us suppose that the United States is a powerful individual living in a great enclosure with 120 to 150 individuals. Each individual has his own background and language and customs. They raise different products, have their own standards of morality and religion, have different means of transportation, and each pursues what seems to him to be his own best interests without much regard to the interests of the other hundred odd individuals. These individuals have a few things in common—such as their main physical attributes of hands and legs and hearts and lungs. But they are not of the same color, the same size, or of the same degree of wealth.

Within this framework it is possible to conceive in a small way some of the vicissitudes under which Uncle Sam must operate. He may want to sell cotton to Mr. Kawasaki, but not buy the shirts Mr. Kawasaki wants to sell. He may want to use the nearby lake for his powerboats, but his neighbors may wish to use the lake for fishing. Uncle Sam may wish to develop a body of a law so the community may live in peace, but he finds that his conception of law and order is not acceptable to the other members.

The point is that this microcosm of international society suggests some of the problems of real life among nations. Even the biggest guy—and we are—can't always have his own way. If Uncle Sam pushes the little fellows around, they may gang up on him. If Uncle Sam is a nice fellow and an easy touch, the little fellows may still gang up. And just to make things difficult, there are a couple of other residents in this world community who are out to do their best to organize it against Uncle Sam.

I need labor this parallel no more. In real life, just as in this imaginary community, there is little that can go on in this world which does not in some way affect the United States. I recall the remark of an American Ambassador who said that he wished the day might come when the American President could answer a press inquiry about trouble in some part of the world by remarking: "The United States doesn't really care what happens or who wins!" The fact is, of course, that is not the case now and probably will never be again.

The United States is a super power and there are few events which can occur anywhere that do not in some way involve the interests of the United States. And I might add, if the President ever does deny a United States interest in virtually any event abroad, his very lack of interest is significant.

For years to come the American people must expect that their power and prominence and world wide interests will condemn them to abuse. We'll be damned if we do, and damned if we don't.

The United States must pay this heavy price for its power because, in words written in the 17th century by John Tillotson: "They who are in highest places, and have the most power, have the least liberty, because they are most observed."

American power with its blessings and its burdens, is relatively new to Americans and will take some getting used to. Our history on this continent has given us spirit and drive and self-confidence. What we as a people have wanted we have been able to get. Sometimes we have gotten results by law, sometimes by hard work, sometimes because of our abundant resources—usually by a combination of all three.

But as C. B. Marshall has written, the writ of the United States does not run to all the world. One result is that things which we might get *within* the United States cannot be gotten in the world at large by law, or hard work, or abundant resources—or at least it may take a little time.

Let me be specific. It is easier to enact the Great Society into law, than to win the war in Vietnam or even to get negotiations under way; it is easier to balance the U.S. budget than to get delinquent States to pay their obligations to the United Nations; it is easier to settle a steel strike than to arrange a summit conference.

Perhaps these things are self-evident, but they bear some thought on our part. Failure to understand the complexities of international relationships can lead to national frustration and irrational reactions which may not serve our national interest. We can't get rid of De Gaulle by being bitterly frustrated with his tactics in NATO and stating that France is no longer a key link in NATO; we can't expect our frustrations with government in Vietnam to be satisfied by precipitate withdrawal of American forces, or by imposing American military government on South Vietnam; we can't let our frustrations with instability in underdeveloped countries inspire us to make stability the price of foreign aid.

A great and powerful nation like the United States must be able to withstand provocation and not lash out like the child who strikes the hornet's nest because he doesn't like the buzzing. Our reactions must be conditioned by more thoughtful responses than those frequently elicited by the morning paper's provocative headline, or the evening columnist's rage.

Patience, of which Americans have notoriously little, and historical perspective are important to the conduct of foreign policy. For example, it should give the thoughtful citizen pause to contemplate some aspects of recent history. It was only twenty-one years ago that Germany, Italy and Japan were at war with the United States and the United States was allied in

war with the Soviet Union and China. Today Germany, Italy, and Japan are among our staunchest friends and the Soviet Union and Mainland China our most violent antagonists. Five years ago the United States was arming Pakistan to help defend it from communism; today Pakistan is a close ally with Communist China. Ten years ago the United States spent hundreds of millions of dollars to create facilities in France to make her one of the mainstays of the NATO alliance, today, we are in the process of moving out. The fact that today's friends were yesterday's enemies suggests that today's enemies may be tomorrow's friends.

The world of nations and their relationship to each other is one of constant change, sometimes violent and tragic, but more often the change is gradual and imperceptible.

I suppose I could make headlines tonight by violent language and peremptory dogmatic statements. I could call on President Johnson to propose a summit conference to settle the outstanding problems between ourselves and the Russians, or between ourselves and the Chinese. I could call for recognition of the Vietcong, or the bombing of Hanoi, or the destruction of China's nuclear capacity, or the use of nuclear weapons to win the war.

But my prescription for the conduct of American foreign policy is less spectacular and less newsworthy. It is harder of achievement but more likely to assure the survival of this nation in peace and in freedom.

The basic purpose of our foreign policy is to promote conditions by which our relations with other nations will enable this nation to live at peace and in freedom. This can best be done, it seems to me, by choosing courses of action which will keep open the widest spectrum of options for peaceful change. Let me explain and illustrate.

As an Association of Home Builders you certainly know what it means to keep options open. You want to keep open options to purchase supplies; and I suppose you want to close off the competing options of potential purchasers.

In the field of foreign policy we must keep open as long as possible a wide spectrum of options to achieve the peaceful settlement of disputes and to promote peaceful change. I believe this is what President Johnson has been doing in Vietnam. If the President were to escalate the war in such a precipitate fashion as to compel the Chinese to intervene with their land armies, or in such a fashion as to bring the Russians in to honor their treaty commitments with China, he would foreclose options to settle the war in Vietnam short of all out war.

By the same token and looking for a moment in the opposite direction, if the President were to order the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam he would foreclose a variety of options for a settlement there which could range from independence and neutralization, to complete domination of the South by the Communist forces of the North and the possible abandonment of one field of conflict only to find that such action would be a step toward a later and more bloody conflict.

To come back to an earlier point, and perhaps to oversimplify, frustrated hawks might demand escalation in Vietnam, and frustrated doves might advocate withdrawal. I believe either course would be unwise because either act would destroy existing options for a more rational settlement of the situation.

It is a gross oversimplification of our problem in Vietnam to demand, as some have, that we "win or get out." This slogan is the cry of anguished frustration; it is a demand for total victory or total surrender, neither of which will serve the best interests of the United States.

American foreign policy is the policy of the most powerful nation on earth. It is a policy that is rooted in one of the most diverse so-

cles on earth—a society which has drawn its citizens of every color, of every religion, from all parts of this earth. It must be characterized by patience and perseverance, by measured response and magnanimity.

This is a hard prescription for an impatient people, but it is the only course which in the long run gives mankind the promise that the United States can wield its great power without corrupting it.

SOVIET SALMON FISHING IN AMERICAN COASTAL WATERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, first of all, I deeply appreciate the taking of the Chair by the Senator from Oregon because the matter I wish to discuss today is one in which he has long taken an interest. It affects our particular area in many respects, although it affects the whole world relationship in the field of fisheries.

Mr. President, yesterday, I advised the Secretary of State that unconfirmed reports of fishermen of my State—and let me say also the State of Oregon—were charging the Soviet Union with the taking of salmon from the coastal waters of both States, but in particular, off the Grays Harbor area, which is north of the mouth of the Columbia River, that these reports were increasing, and tension and concern among the citizens and fishermen are becoming explosive.

For some 2 or 3 weeks, the distinguished occupant of the chair and I have asked the State Department about this matter, not on one, but on several occasions. Thus, today it is with somewhat of shock and remorse that I must report that information received late last night and early this morning has positively convinced me that Soviet fishing vessels off the coast of the State of Washington are specifically geared to take salmon, and the numerous reports of our fishermen over the past few days are now confirmed to me beyond further doubt. It is a conservation tragedy that I must report to the Senate today.

Congress has long been acutely aware of the herculean effort to keep this priceless species at a level of proper yield. The inroads of civilization have cut deeply into the salmon's requirements for escapement and seeding. This great commercial and recreational species must, by natural instinct, seek its procreation in the upper stretches of our fresh water streams and lakes, past every conceivable barrier of sophisticated land and water use—the power dam, the irrigation and reclamation project, and the sins of civilizations' waste, both industrial and domestic. To the end that this great, fighting species might continue as a part of our Pacific heritage, Congress has regularly appropriated huge sums of money that this highly prized table delicacy and unequalled sportsman's challenge might have the opportunity for survival.

The Senate will remember the numerous occasions when I have risen on this floor to condemn the Japanese for what I considered to be an improper interpretation of the North Pacific Fisheries Convention, and their continued harvest of American stocks of salmon by net fishing on the high seas, a practice

banned to American fishermen by conservation law.

Mr. President, I have spoken often of the continued attitude of the Soviet Union joining with the United States in support of the principle that the high seas fishing by nets for salmon—as practiced by Japan—was a mounting danger to the species' very survival. The record is complete with numerous statements by the Soviets, not only condemning such fishing practice by the Japanese, but also regularly assuring the United States that such a fishery would not be in the Soviet interest.

Knowing these facts—and I have talked with Soviet scientists on this matter on numerous occasions—it was very difficult for me to accept the early, somewhat sketchy reports which came to my attention concerning that nation's fishery conservation posture. Up until this moment, I would have been readily prepared to state quite sincerely that the conservation record and attitude on most fishery questions by the Soviet Union was far superior to that of the Japanese. My judgment would have been based on the record rather than on any personal conclusion on my part, for her cooperation of long standing on fur seal conservation, and more recently, her attitude on king crab has been there for all to see. Up until today, I might have said that her position on salmon was in agreement—at least in principle—with that of the United States.

Earlier this week, I was advised by telephone that an affidavit was being forwarded to me purporting to the taking of salmon at night by a Soviet fishing vessel off the Washington coast.

That affidavit has arrived, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

MAY 20, 1966.

To Whom It May Concern:

On May 14th, 1966 about five-thirty A.M. I observed a Russian Vessel in operation approximately thirteen miles south of Destruction Island thirty fathoms off Willapa Rock.

I had just picked my anchor up and was preparing to lay my troll gear out, when I saw this Russian Vessel was taking aboard a Gill Net, a crew of five or six men were shaking fish from the net, which was operated from a large reel on the stern of the vessel.

As soon as the net was all aboard the reel disappeared below deck and conventional drag gear put into operation and the vessel moved off in a northerly direction.

I was quite close to the vessel and was positive they were taking salmon from the net.

Several days prior to this incident the Troll Fleet had been taking thirty to forty fish per boat which dropped off to nothing that day.

I feel that if this operation is not stopped immediately our salmon resources will be depleted to a point of no return.

Ernie Christian.

ERNEST CHRISTIAN.

430 Ave. North Tumwater, Wash.
Troller—"Little Mike."

MARTIN R. THURMAN,

Notary.

For State of Washington, Grays Harbor County residing in Westport.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have also heard of several other observations of the Soviet fleet's taking salmon by other American commercial fishing as well as sports-charter vessels, such as the *Flamingo* and the *Moduc*.

Yesterday, I was advised of another incident involving Capt. Don Nichols, of the Oregon trawler *Lynda Dawn*. The message, as reported to me by telephone, is as follows:

The fishing vessel, *Lynda Dawn*, out of Warrenton, Oreg., was anchored in 30 fathoms off Willapa Harbor. The captain picked up moving blips on his radar—he then pulled his anchor—and ran down to where these vessels were. There were several Russian fishing vessels running without lights, gillnetting salmon. He went to the middle of the fleet to observe these vessels.

Don Nichols is the name of the owner and his home port is Warrenton, Oreg. As soon as he gets ashore, he will notarize an affidavit and ship it air mail.

Mr. President, this information was second hand, the necessary affidavit has not arrived, but I felt the matter urgent enough to be reported to the U.S. State Department Fishery Advisory Committee which was meeting in Washington, D.C., yesterday to discuss, among other things, the Soviet threat to our coastal groundfish resources. A member of my staff has reported to me that the reaction of the fishery leaders to the information was sharp and bitter.

I still have difficulty understanding the Soviet position, however, as it did not appear to me to be in their national fishery interest to violate this long-standing conservation principle. Since that time, however, I have carefully reviewed the recent record of Soviet fishing on all coasts of the United States, and I find that a new judgment must be made as to their fishery posture. I shall detail my findings later in this statement.

Last night, Mr. President, I received the final, convincing world of evidence that shattered all doubt and dispelled all shadows from the truth. Unimpeachable sources advised me that the long-sought photograph is available—an enlargement is now being made for transmission to me—and it will show a Soviet SRT trawler, taken off the Washington coast, completely equipped with a gillnet reel for the taking of salmon by nets on the high seas. Even the trawl boom has been slung down for easier gillnet operation.

It is now crystal clear why the Soviet Union vessels are operating at night without lights, in flagrant violation of international rules of the road. It is still another step in what is now developing as a systematic desecration of America's once-rich offshore fishery resources.

In addition to the information I received last night on the salmon invasion by the Soviets, I received additional reports which were equally shocking. This week 15 Soviet trawlers were fishing by daylight off Willapa Harbor on the Washington coast for Pacific hake. I suspect that these same vessels are operating under the cover of darkness on our salmon resource, but by day they are beginning the systematic depletion of one of the great latent standing stocks of fish

in the Pacific area. They are fishing at about 50 fathom curve, approximately 15 miles offshore. It would appear they are the advance flotilla for an even larger number of Soviet trawlers which are now finishing up the final plunder of what remains of the Oregon perch populations, a fishery which, for the first 5 months of 1966, equaled only 27 percent of the 1965 Oregon landings for the same period. As soon as that resource is fished to the point where the return is uneconomic, even for the reduced Soviet fleet, we can expect the full effort to go on to the Pacific hake. And I might add that this perch is a slow growing species. Biologists estimate it would take nearly 12 years to rebuild a depleted stock. This is a tragic situation.

Mr. President, let me trace for a moment the pattern of the Soviet fisheries on the west coast of the United States. Beginning up north in the Bering Sea off the U.S. coast the Soviet Union, joined by the Japanese, have reduced the stocks of yellowfin sole, the major species in the area to a level from which it will take years to recover.

The rise and fall of the fishery can be seen from the following figures. The Soviets entered the fishery in 1955, and the total combined catch was 366 million pounds. In 1960, 966 million pounds; in 1961, 1,174 million pounds; 1962, 834 million pounds; 1963, 224 million pounds; and, finally, the low figure in 1964 of 165 million pounds. From nothing to the largest flounder-type fishery in the world—1,174 million pounds—and virtually depleted in less than 10 years to a mere 165 million pounds.

The 1958 Geneva Convention on Fisheries and Conservation states that the coastal nation has a "special interest" in the resources off its coast, and I should say that we have been derelict in our responsibility to the world in allowing this tragic desecration, without regard for the future.

In the offshore Alaska area, from the Aleutian Islands to Dixon Entrance, the same depredations have occurred, primarily on the part of the Russians. They first entered into the area in force in 1962 with a huge fleet of vessels fishing mainly for ocean perch. We do not have the needed catch statistics for the area, but the rapid decline in vessels and deployment to more distant grounds is evidence that the Bering Sea pattern is again being followed.

While the vast fishery resources off the State of Alaska now stand on the brink of depletion and the Soviet trawl fleet is busy writing the final chapter on the once-valuable Oregon perch fishery, a segment is already engaged in the beginning of a similar pattern on the Pacific hake. It might be well to note that numerous exploratory vessels have been working off the State of California, should there be doubt as to where this sinister armada may strike next.

I am sickened with the thought of the Soviet fleets in plunder of our Pacific hake. A new fishmeal plant is nearly ready at Aberdeen, and a large American fleet is preparing to depart for the fishing ground to harvest this resource. The Pacific hake, in my opinion, em-

bodies one of the greatest hopes we have, as a nation, to properly participate in the alleviation of world hunger. I do not believe we can stand idly by and watch still another resource go down the drain to unrestricted foreign exploitation.

Mr. President, this is a crisis. As I said earlier, the situation in my State is explosive. There is no longer time for meditation; it is time for decision and action, and I proposed to move immediately.

One of the problems we have been faced with, in making our determination as to the proper course of action, has been the confusion over surveillance results. There have been times when it has been difficult to determine even the number of vessels off our coast. I am convinced that this information is available, however, but there has been a distinct breakdown in providing the information rapidly enough for us to act properly and intelligently. I am asking for some factual determinations on a 24-hour basis through the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the U.S. Coast Guard. I want this information, at a minimum, on a daily basis.

I will ask the President to help us in this matter. I expect to talk to the President personally either on today or tomorrow.

I will ask that the President immediately contact the Soviet Ambassador and advise him that the United States is convinced that the conservation of these coastal fishery stocks is in jeopardy as a result of the Soviet fishing. I am going to ask President Johnson to declare this immediate conservation moratorium on foreign fishing in the stocks of salmon and Pacific hake, until such time as we can determine the conservation requirements of these stocks.

Our responsibilities as a coastal State dictate that we do this as a signator to the Geneva agreement.

If we do not act immediately to do something about our fish being depleted in this way, what might happen off the coasts of other nations which signed the Geneva Agreement in good faith and who are living by it?

Our responsibilities to maintain our coastal resources for the hungry of the world dictate that we do this.

There must be no delay.

I fully recognize, Mr. President, that this is a unilateral and unusual approach, but it is my contention that the path of foreign fishing plunder of our ocean resources must come to a halt, before it is too late. It is perhaps already too late for the yellowfin sole of Bering Sea; the halibut of Eastern Bering Sea; the perch off the State of Oregon; and untold species in the Gulf of Alaska.

We must see that it is not too late for the Pacific salmon and the Pacific hake.

In all fairness, I must say the State Department today, after a meeting of yesterday, had a long morning meeting with the Soviet Embassy and urged that there be an expedition of the facts to be sent to Moscow, and that there be immediate talks upon this whole matter.

Naturally, there could have been no conclusion reached this morning, and the meeting was not completed until 12:30 or 1 o'clock.

We are hopeful that in the near future, maybe over the weekend, or perhaps in the next 3, 4, or 5 days, we shall receive word on this matter.

I cannot conceive of any official in the Soviet Union, looking at this matter somewhat objectively, even in the interests of the Soviet Union, who is interested in conservation of fish in the high seas, would want this to continue.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and myself, some 2 or 3 weeks ago, in relation to the perch problem, came to the conclusion that steps should be taken to call together a world committee within the United Nations, or under the aegis of the United Nations, under which the maritime nations could meet and arrive at some practical guidelines for conservation of fisheries on the high seas. If we do not do it in the very near future, there will not be any fish for anybody, including the Soviet Union and the Japanese.

The Soviet Union has not signed the Geneva agreement, but it has expressed sympathy with the problems involved, and Soviet officials have stated that they went along with the agreement in principle, even though it had not been signed by the Soviet Union. Japan, as usual, has said nothing and has refused to do anything.

We are proceeding with suggestions that the State Department proceed to try to set up machinery for a world conference, so there may be some fish left for future generations, in the interest of the world economy and the problems of world food.

Something must be done about the tuna situation in the Pacific. There is not a fish scientist in the world who will not tell us that unless something is done in that respect, no tuna will be left. The tuna in the Pacific will be fished out, just as the tuna disappeared in the Atlantic.

The greatest fishery that existed in the 1800's and into the beginning of this century was the Atlantic tuna. Commercial fisheries have disappeared because of a lack of conservation.

I am sure that the President of the United States is in sympathy with our views in this matter. I am sure he will inform the State Department that it has his unqualified approval to move swiftly in this matter, to see what can be done as quickly as possible, before something untoward happens.

I am aware of the deep feeling that people in the fishing industry have about this matter. If conditions continue in this manner, I would not be surprised if incidents occurred about which we would be sorry later on.

In addition, we have been trying for years to effect conservation practices with Japan. Canada, Japan, and the United States are a part of a treaty in connection with the rich red salmon run in the North Pacific. Under the international treaty, a provisional abstinence line was set at 175 degrees west longitude. That line was set about 13 years ago, and the Japanese agreed to it at that time. At least, they made pious statements to that effect. They said they wanted to conserve the red salmon run, because they are participants in it—as are Russia and Canada; that they be-

lieved in conservation; and that they did not want to take North American stock.

Over the years, we have discovered that the larger salmon move west of that line and intermingle with the Asian salmon. We have found that the Japanese practice no conservation and just go out and fish. This, in turn, will deplete that rich resource.

We have made many attempts to remedy this situation. This is now the fourth round of conferences in 2 years, in which we have attempted to work out a solution.

Russia makes an agreement with Japan every year, in which Russia allows Japan to take a certain number of Asian stock. I am confused as to why the Russians wish to fish for salmon off our coast. I cannot quite understand it, because there is plenty of their own salmon, the Asian stock, on the west side of the Pacific.

This situation seems to me to be similar to one in which a fellow who has a well-stocked trout stream invites his neighbors over to fish. He has plenty for himself and his neighbors. But after inviting his neighbors over, he gets into his car and drives 100 miles to poach on somebody else's stream. It does not make sense, particularly when this species has to be conserved, because it spawns, as the distinguished Senator from Oregon knows, in lakes and fresh water streams in the country from which it comes.

So, in the midst of trying to work out some conservation in this matter, we received the latest news from Japan.

This year, of course, we had an unusual situation, one which presents serious problems not only to the American fishermen in Bristol Bay, but also to the future of all fish resources.

Our scientists estimate that in 1965, based on the smaller fish returning to Bristol Bay for spawning, the Japanese high seas net fishing fleets had access to about 20 percent of the run. Even then, the escapement to many of the Bristol Bay river systems was dangerously low, and the resultant salmon cycles will certainly suffer.

But this year, Mr. President, we have a crisis in regard to the kind of salmon available on the high seas. The runs this year will be made up primarily of large fish, and our scientists have determined that these salmon range farther West than the smaller ones, such as occurred in 1965, and thus are more available to the Japanese net fishery.

Japanese net fishery is a wonder to behold. The nets stretch from 5 to 12 miles and catch everything in sight. Then, when part of the net breaks off, it just drifts around the ocean and keeps catching fish until it rots and quits. That could happen for years and years, with nylon nets. So they are fishing immature salmon. It is not just a matter of what they catch and put in their boats. It is also a matter of the damage they do to the run. Our fishermen are not allowed to do that, because they have tightened their belts and wish to conform to the principles of conservation.

Considering what we spend to conserve our salmon, I wonder whether it might

be cheaper to buy salmon and give it to the Japanese, and thus get them out of these waters.

With this prospect facing us, a message came from the Japanese Ambassador yesterday, in addition to the problem of the Russians fishing off our coasts, indicating that the Japanese are now on their way to the line. They left on May 4, to start fishing immediately. They do not intend to limit their catch, but are going to catch as many fish as possible. This has occurred in spite of the negotiations.

It is interesting to note that these runs have been built up and are available in their present state as a result of the sacrifices of American fishermen and industry. This country can readily show the inequitable situation that exists. We are equitable and just in our dealings with other nations in conservation matter.

It is interesting to note that Japan has asked for a revision of the North Pacific Treaty. As I pointed out earlier, we have had three rounds of renegotiation with Canada and Japan, and the fourth round is ahead. It seems to me that the Japanese have a responsibility to this agreement which precludes their wholesale taking of salmon west of the line during this interim period. Japan is prepared, as I said—by the appearance of the situation and the word we have received from the embassy in Tokyo—to take every fish she can west of the line. There is no conservation sacrifice for her, but the American fishermen will have to tighten his belt unjustly in order that the runs may continue and that Japan may have salmon to harvest in the years ahead.

This situation is grossly unfair to our fishermen. I feel that the Japanese Government and industry should take a good hard look at its conservation image in this respect. Certainly, when a nation makes the necessary conservation sacrifice over many years; when another nation has no historic right to the fishery, because it had never fished prior to World War II in this area at all; when that second nation is even now fishing only under a highly disputed interpretation of the line which we felt was provisional—under circumstances such as these, there can be little doubt that objective judgment will hold that the American fisherman is totally just in his violent reaction—and I do not blame him one iota.

I am glad to announce that the House is cognizant of both these matters. Time is of the essence. Today, the State Department met with Russian representatives for about 2½ hours. I hope that something will be resolved, so that we can preserve not only for ourselves but also for the world the priceless fisheries resources of the high seas.

(At this point Mr. MAGNUSON assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington for his speech. I associate myself with every word the Senator has spoken.

I join the Senator in every request that he has made in an effort to try to see that relief is afforded not only for the

fisheries of the country but also for the conservation needs of the American people and of the people of the world.

(At this point Mr. MORSE assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I pointed out as long as 8 years ago the seriousness of our coastal water problem as it pertains to the conservation of fish. I cannot see what these people have in their minds when they do not want to sit down in an effort to try to preserve something that in the long run would benefit them far more than would their present course of action.

If the Russians are just trying to provoke someone, our fishermen are provoked rather easily when they are unjustly pushed around. That is what is happening on this occasion.

There is a realization for the first time on the part of those people dealing with this matter in the State Department that this is what is happening.

We received little or no help from them for a long time. We finally received help on the policy level last week, when a man of the rank of ambassador reported on this matter to the President and to the Department of State. This is a step forward. This is the time for immediate action.

I thank the Senator for his comment. I know that the Senator from Oregon is interested in this matter from what he has said on many other occasions.

Exactly what I have said would happen will happen unless prompt action is taken.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TUESDAY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the order of May 26, 1966, that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock Tuesday morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, May 31, 1966 at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 27, 1966:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Alfred M. Gruenther, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Troy V. Post, of Texas, to be a member of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Stephen J. Wright, of Tennessee, to be a member of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named person for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consular officer, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Allen S. Whiting, of the District of Columbia.

Now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consular officer of the United States of America:

Robert I. Owen, of New Jersey.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consular officer, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Vincent Baker, of Texas.

For appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consular officer, and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Samuel M. Pinckney, Jr., of Connecticut.

For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 7 to class 6 and to be also consular officers of the United States of America:

G. Paul Balabanis, of California.

Frank B. Crump, of North Carolina.

Michael A. Davila, of Texas.

Don J. Donchi, of New Jersey.

Robert W. DuBose, Jr., of California.

Richard A. Gardiner, of Utah.

James J. Gormley, of New York.

Allen S. Greenberg, of the District of Columbia.

Coleman J. Nee, of Massachusetts.

Arnold P. Schifferdecker, of Missouri.

William Seth Shepard, of New Hampshire.

Nathaniel Wilson, Jr., of Virginia.

For promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 7 to class 7 and to be also consular officers of the United States of America:

James A. Allitto, of California.

Miss Elizabeth A. Bean, of Connecticut.

Joseph F. Becella, of New York.

David G. Brown, of Pennsylvania.

James W. Carter, of Texas.

Stephen J. Hayden, of Oregon.

H. Kenneth Hill, of California.

James E. McGee, of California.

James Hamilton McNaughton, of New York.

Wilson A. Riley, Jr., of Connecticut.

Peter G. Smith, of Michigan.

Robert F. Starzel, of Vermont.

James Tarrant, of California.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Michael R. Anzovina, of New York.

James L. Barnes, of Florida.

Alfred R. Barr, of Virginia.

Gilbert R. Callaway, of Arkansas.

Richard Castrodale, of Pennsylvania.

Charles O. Cecil, of California.

Francis S. M. Hodsoll, of the District of Columbia.

William L. Jacobsen, Jr., of Washington.

Robert R. Little, of New York.

Nicholas C. H. MacNeil, of New Jersey.

Doyce R. McNaughton, of Texas.

Roger Morris, of Missouri.

Denman T. Snow II, of Georgia.

Richard A. Virden, of Minnesota.

Joel M. Woldman, of Ohio.

Murray B. Woldman, of Ohio.

John J. Youle, of New York.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, consular officers, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Peter J. Antico, of New York.

Armand Arriaza, of Virginia.

Miss Linda M. Beehler, of California.

Harvey Parke Clark, Jr., of California.

David B. Dawson, of the District of Columbia.

Rust M. Deming, of the District of Columbia.

Jerry L. Dodson, of California.

Stephen M. Ecton, of New York.

Chris Kunz, of Missouri.

Donald B. Kursch, of New York.

Anthony V. E. Miller, of New Jersey.

Robert David Plotkin, of California.

David Phillip Rehfuess, of Oregon.

John R. Savage, of California.

Daniel Scherr, of New York.

Carl D. Schultz III, of Maryland.

Raymond G. H. Sietz, of Texas.

Keith L. Wauchope, of Virginia.

David J. Zimmerman, of New York.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:

Raymond H. Close, of Virginia.

Earl Norbert Garrett III, of Kansas.

Kenneth Y. Millien, of the District of Columbia.

Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consular officers and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Robert M. Allen, of Nevada.

William K. Braun, of Ohio.

Robert H. Carlson, of Virginia.

Miss Eleanor M. De Selms, of the District of Columbia.

Henry A. Dunlap, of Maryland.

William H. Durham, of North Carolina.

John J. Ewing, of the District of Columbia.

Frederic A. Fisher, of Michigan.

Robert K. Geis, of Texas.

David D. Gries, of the District of Columbia.

Paul J. Haines, of Virginia.

Lawrence J. Hall, of Texas.

Robert C. Haney, of California.

Maurice Levy Hawes, of New York.

Robert H. Heron, of Florida.

Donald C. Horan, of Maine.

Bruce D. Hutchins, of Virginia.

James A. Jensen, of Illinois.

Edward N. Korn-Patterson, of Virginia.

Robert R. LaGamma, of New York.

Robert B. Lane, of North Carolina.

John H. Leavitt, of Virginia.

Robert A. Lincoln, of the District of Columbia.

Earl H. Link, of Pennsylvania.

Joseph L. Marek, Jr., of Texas.

C. Burdell Merrell, of Utah.

Dale A. Morrison, of Illinois.

James P. Mullen, of Minnesota.

Milton E. Pelkan, of Wisconsin.

Seymour Russell, of Connecticut.

Conrad C. Schubert, of New Jersey.

Theodore G. Shackley, Jr., of Florida.

George H. Sheeks, of Virginia.

Thomas R. Smith, of Indiana.

Robert S. Snow, of California.

B. Franklin Steiner, of California.

Wayde C. Stoker, of Utah.

William S. Stratton, of Tennessee.

Robert W. Tolf, of Illinois.

Mrs. Patricia G. van Delden, of California.

David M. Wilson, of Massachusetts.

Jack Guy Wood, of the District of Columbia.

Hugh W. Young, of Michigan.

Stanley A. Zuckerman, of Wisconsin.

Foreign Service staff officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:

Leon J. Bajek, of Virginia.

Douglass E. Bjorn, of Connecticut.

Charles R. Bone, of California.

Michael A. Cramer, Jr., of Colorado.

Norman D. Del Gigante, of Rhode Island.

George C. Del Valle, of Colorado.

Quetzal Doty, of Illinois.

Miss Lelsh J. Eastwood, of California.

Richard W. Elam, of California.

Flavio A. Esposito, of New York.

Miss Lorraine L. Forbes, of Mississippi.

Miss Sue E. Harlow, of Washington.

Harry M. Hutson, Jr., of the District of Columbia.

Harry E. Jones, of the District of Columbia.

James W. McGunnigle, of New York.

Murrow B. Morris, of Georgia.

Wilbur N. Nadel, of New Jersey.

Miss Mary Ann Newman, of Washington.

William M. Nikolin, of Indiana.

Miss Nancy E. Pearl, of California.

Miss Anne Preston, of Ohio.

James W. Reardon, of Illinois.

Miss Virginia M. Simpson, of New Jersey.

Miss M. Dora Trujillo, of Colorado.

Miss Jane Whitney, of Illinois.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate, May 28, 1966:

The nomination sent to the Senate on April 20, 1966, of Kenneth L. Payne to be postmaster at Leadwood, in the State of Missouri.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 27, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Jacob D. Beam, of New Jersey, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

John W. Tuthill, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

Eugene M. Locke, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan.

Elliott P. Skinner, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Upper Volta.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Teachers Corps in Disguise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 27, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great alarm that I received a press re-

lease from the Office of Economic Opportunity which all but announced that they are setting up a teachers corps in disguise.

The announcement said the OEO has concluded a contract with the National Education Association to enable teachers and counselors to work in Job Corps centers and then spend a year introducing new teaching methods in their local public schools. This is the same type of program which was rejected by Congress only last month when both the

House and Senate refused to appropriate funds for the Teacher Corps program.

This is a deliberate and intentional violation of the wishes of the American people and the intent of Congress.

The OEO's own press release announced that the new program "will make it possible to spread the methods used in the Job Corps centers through local communities." It went on to quote OEO Director Sargent Shriver as saying:

The new contracts would make it possible to start feeding the educational innovations