

from her work and moved to a rooming house in Bethesda as near to the hospital as possible, in order to spend all of every day with Julian at the hospital.

Mrs. Dusenbury has instilled an interest in people and public affairs in her three sons.

Her oldest son, Julian, a war hero of World War II, is a retired Marine major. He is a former member of the South Carolina House of Representatives.

Richard, a lawyer, is a former member of my staff and served two terms as solicitor for the 12th judicial circuit of South Carolina.

Bernard, a lawyer, is a former member of the South Carolina House of Representatives.

Mrs. Dusenbury, after 34 years of outstanding and faithful service to her government and the people, is officially retiring on December 1, 1967. Few women in the history of South Carolina have served others as well as Mrs. Dusenbury. She has rendered a distinct and extensive service to mankind both in her role as a professional in government and as a leader in community affairs. In addition

she has given our State and Nation three sons who have distinguished themselves by outstanding service in war and peace.

Her retirement after 31 years as manager of the Florence district social security office is well deserved, but knowing her as well as I do, I am confident she will have many more contributions to make to her fellow man.

I welcome this opportunity to call to the attention of the Congress and the Nation a truly great lady of South Carolina—Mrs. Suanee Moorhead Daly Dusenbury.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 meridian tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 30, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate November 29 (legislative day of November 28), 1967:

##### U.S. JUDGES

Winston E. Arnow, of Florida, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Florida. (New position, Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.)

Harry Fregerson, of California, to be U.S. district judge for the central district of California. (New position, Public Law 89-372, effective September 18, 1966.)

Gerhard A. Gesell, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia, vice Spottswood W. Robinson III, elevated.

##### ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Clyde O. Martz, of Colorado, to be Assistant Attorney General, vice Harold Barefoot Sanders, Jr., resigned.

Stephen J. Pollak, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice John Doar, resigning.

##### U.S. MARSHAL

Eugene G. Hulett, of Oregon, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Oregon for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Oklahoma Football Excellence

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 29, 1967

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, yesterday my good friend the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and I engaged in a discussion of the merits of the Nation's No. 2 and No. 3 rated football teams, the University of Tennessee and the University of Oklahoma.

These two fine teams will meet on New Year's Day in the Orange Bowl, and the outcome of that game will settle the debate which the Senator and I began yesterday.

Today I invite attention to one outstanding member of the University of Oklahoma Sooners football squad, Mr. Granville Liggins. Mr. Liggins has been named to the All-America team by three different sources and is now receiving the recognition his fine contribution to football deserves.

Granville is a graduate of Booker T. Washington High School in Tulsa, and is Oklahoma's All-America linebacker.

Also, I should like to point out that another winning grid team from my great State, the Golden Norsemen from Oklahoma Northeastern A. & M. College, in Miami, was last week the winner of the Shrine Bowl and crowned undisputed national junior college football champions.

This fine team finished the season with nine wins and a single loss, capturing the national championship under the able guidance of Coach Chuck Bowman.

Like Coach Chuck Fairbanks at the University of Oklahoma, Coach Chuck Bowman at Northeastern A. & M. is in his first year as head coach of a college football team.

These two teams, the University of Oklahoma Sooners and the Golden Norse of Northeastern A. & M. College, are fitting ambassadors of the State of Oklahoma and are helping in a most appropriate manner with the celebration of the 60th anniversary of Oklahoma statehood.

### The Kee Report: Thanksgiving

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

### HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed in this report is the observance of Thanksgiving.

The report follows:

This is Jim Kee—bringing you the Kee Report.

Our thoughts this week are centered on the observance of Thanksgiving, the day on which we give thanks to Divine Providence for the blessings bestowed upon the people of America.

By tradition, this is a day of family reunions and bountiful feasting. Thanksgiving is one of the first holidays designated by the Federal Government for national observance. However, before considering the significance of this day, I would like to inform you of a far-reaching change now under consideration in your Congress.

This is a movement to change the dates of

five Federal holidays so that each may be observed on a Monday, thus providing a three-day weekend. Under the proposed plan, Independence Day would be celebrated on the first Monday in July, instead of July 4th; Memorial Day on the last Monday in May; Veterans' Day on the last Monday in October; Thanksgiving Day on the 4th Monday in November and Washington's Birthday would be shifted to the third Monday in February and renamed Presidents' Day to honor all of our Presidents.

This radical change can be adopted if the American people want it. However, before taking this step, I think it might be well to review what these holidays mean in the spiritual life of our country.

The observance of Independence Day on July 4th is as old as the country itself. There was wild rejoicing throughout the colonies when the people learned that on that fateful July 4th, 1776, the Delegates at Philadelphia had cast off the yoke of Great Britain finally and forever. This day marked the beginning of freedom for our country. In a larger sense, it marked the beginning of political freedom throughout the world.

We may, if the people wish, convert Washington's Birthday into a day to honor all our Presidents. But, without the courage and determination of George Washington, the Revolution might not have succeeded. A short time later, it was Washington's leadership which held the Republic together during those early days when many believed it could not survive. I think Washington deserves one day a year to honor his memory.

The observance of Memorial Day arose spontaneously from the hearts of the people after one of the costliest Civil Wars in history. This day had a dual purpose in the minds of its sponsors, to honor the dead, and in Lincoln's words, to help bind up the wounds of war. The date of its observance has been fixed for nearly a century.

Our present Thanksgiving is modeled after the celebrated feast of the Pilgrims at Plymouth to give thanks for a bountiful harvest. The traditional family dinner of turkey, pumpkin pie and cranberry pie, had its origin on that occasion. But, while feasting played a prominent part, this was essentially a day of religious observance.

The first Thanksgiving Day proclamation, issued by a President of the United States, was issued by George Washington in gratitude for the adoption of our Constitution. The first proclamation fixing the fourth Thursday in November as Thanksgiving Day was issued by another great President, Abraham Lincoln.

There is no legal barrier to the proposed change of dates. My own view is that certain ones—like the 4th of July—have become sacred in the minds and hearts of the American people. I believe the national holidays should remain as they are, unless there is an overwhelming public demand for a change. Thank you for listening.

## Remarks of Hon. Wayne Hays at the North Atlantic Assembly

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the honor of serving as a U.S. representative to the North Atlantic Assembly. As a member of our delegation, I was particularly impressed by the ability demonstrated by our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, WAYNE HAYS.

On November 23 at a plenary session, Chairman Hays delivered an extemporaneous address which I feel was indicative of the outstanding manner in which he served our Nation.

His remarks, which were made following those of the leader of the French delegation, Mr. Boscher, were an eloquent, yet simple and easily comprehended statement of the relations between the nations of the Atlantic community.

As I am confident that my colleagues will find his statement enlightening and beneficial as I did, the text, taken from the transcript of the meeting, follows:

Mr. WAYNE HAYS (United States). It gives me great pleasure to follow Mr. Boscher of France who, I think, made a very balanced presentation of the views of his government, as I take it, and the dominant political party in France.

I should just like to emphasize at the very beginning that it seems to me that all of us here have more in common than we have differences. In saying that, I would not wish to paper over the fact that perhaps our differences have been sharper and more apparent in this conference than in others I have attended, but we do have a common concern about the well-being of our countries, of our peoples, and the Atlantic community, and I think this has been evident throughout our discussions.

I suppose it is fair to say that a good many of our problems in the Alliance are similar to the problems we have within our own countries, which are compounded by our mass media communications, because it has been my observation that they will take a molehill and very quickly make a mountain out of it, and they seize upon the sensational because they are in the business of selling advertising and newspaper space, at least in my country, and sometimes overlook the fundamental basic hard work that goes into a lot of the decisions made, not only in national governments but in international or-

ganizations. I speak specifically of a headline I saw in the paper yesterday, which says the French are mounting an attack upon the dollar. I said in the Standing Committee that I do not know whether it is true or whether it is not. I would hope that it is not, and until I see more evidence of it I will believe that it is not. But I would say, if it is, that this could be ultimately not only an embarrassment to the United States but a defeat for France as well. It might serve in passing to mention that the gross national product in France, a country of fifty million people, is only equal to the total gross product of the State of California, a state of twenty million people. I think as I said in the Standing Committee, that the international economic situation is so fragile that no country, or group of countries, can stand alone in the free world if someone else in the free world is trying to destroy them economically.

Why do I say this? Well, it seems to me that, if you look at the picture of the rivalry between the free world and the communist world in a balanced way, with the exception of China—and even their former partners in Russia admit they cannot fathom what goes on in Peking, nor does it make any sense to them—but if you look at the struggle outside that it seems any sensible view would be that we have moved more into an economic and political competition, than we at the moment, into a military confrontation.

At the risk of being a bore, I repeat what I have said to this Organization both in Committee and Plenary before, that the free nations of the world have proved with NATO and during World War II and World War I that they could stand together in times of military stress but that they could not stand together in times of economic stress. I think it is significant that some statistician pointed out that 50% of all the people living in Europe cannot remember World War II. If that be a true statistic, certainly it must be true that three-quarters of the people living in Europe and America today cannot remember the great depression of the late twenties and early thirties. Many people say there is a tremendous parallel between that time and what is happening today.

I am not an economist, so I cannot say, but I do know that if economic stress comes we had better stand together or, as the old American saying in the revolution goes, "We had better hang together or we will all hang separately." I do not know whether the governments of any of the nations in the free world could stand another economic debacle comparable to that which occurred in the twenties and thirties, and if they tried to do it alone I think they would not survive. So I am for the NATO Alliance being more than a military alliance, and I guess in that particular degree I disagree with some of my French colleagues, but I think the time will come when they will see this more clearly.

I hesitate to become a prophet, because I am neither omniscient nor omnipotent, but I do think we ought to be making arrangements not to try to destroy each others' countries, not to try to destroy each others' economic well-being, but to help. I would just like to point out that this rising tide of protectionism which Senator Javits spoke about is a real thing in the United States. It is not only because of competition affecting American industries.

I live in a constituency that has been seriously affected by European competition for the whole nineteen years I have represented them, because one of the big industries in my constituency was the making of dishes and glassware. I have heard this over and over again, but it is affecting more industries now, and there will be a serious effort, I think—if we keep reading in the Press about various attacks on the dollar and var-

ious schemes to get around the tariff lowering which we have agreed to in the Kennedy Round, as the Senator said, by road taxes and other things which are just as effective as tariffs in barring our products from your countries—there will be a serious effort, and maybe a successful effort, to do away with all the gains of the Kennedy Round. So I think it is to our interest to look at that, and I think it is to our interest as an Alliance to try to see that this does not happen.

I hesitate to speak about Great Britain's difficulties. I can only say this, that if devaluation is more than a temporary solution to their problems—and most economists think it is only a temporary solution—nobody will be happier than the United States, because we have no more desire to see Great Britain brought to the brink of disaster economically than we have to see France or Holland or Norway, or any other country in the free world.

I think it has been fair to say that while my country has accepted a lot of criticism, if you look back over the past history—and we expect no appreciation, let me say that in advance—of the American attitude towards its partners in Europe, starting with our intervention in World War II, succeeded by the Marshall Plan, we have been interested in the well-being of Europe, not only from the standpoint of its political aims, its freedom, but its economy and everything that goes to make life for mankind a better life. I say this, as I said, not expecting any appreciation because this is a commodity that is in short supply in the world, and I am not criticizing Europe, because I want to tell you I can turn it around and say it some other way.

The other day I was speaking to an audience in my own constituency. It was a question and answer period, and some fellow got up and said "Where is our European alliance when we are engaged in a struggle with our people dying in Vietnam? Where are they?" I said, "I guess they are exactly where we were, my friend, when Hitler raped Austria, attacked Czechoslovakia, marched into Poland, France fell, and he was standing on the Channel, and we were not interested until the first bomb fell on Pearl Harbor." So when I say that sometimes we feel a little hurt because Europe is not so much interested in our problems, I point out to you that this is a characteristic of people, and a characteristic of nations, and the further you are away from a conflict the less it really interests you. I do not criticize Europeans for this, because we have a lot of people in the United States who would rather go on with the business of deciding which kind of a third television set they would buy and which model of a second car they would buy than face up to the reality that we are living in a world with two competing systems, and one or the other ultimately, in my opinion, is going to have to prevail. So if you felt any hurt in anything that I said, or felt that I was speaking badly about Europeans, it was not that at all, it is just human nature.

The only thing I can pass on to you that has been of any value in my almost lifetime in politics is a definition which the teacher in the secondary school I went to wrote on the blackboard on the first day I went to the world history class. She said, "History is a record of the past, a guide to the present and a forecast of the future." All of us here in this organization are literate, all of us have read history, and it seems to me that if we cannot draw the conclusions from it to guide us in the future we really will have failed our people.

I would like to conclude these remarks by just pointing out one simple thing that I think is really overriding in the competition between Communism and Capitalism. The United States has had a problem for many years of producing more than it could con-

sume in the way of food, and we have concocted all sorts of plans for getting rid of it around the world for nothing or for little or for something. Our great competitor in the world, or, as many of you like to call it, the other super power, has more acreage and more potential than we do and its problem in all of my political lifetime has been trying to find enough to feed its people. Now, certainly, Ladies and Gentlemen, that ought to be some kind of a commentary upon the two systems, and all you have to do to find the proof of what I am saying is to look around in any of your own cities—this one, Brussels, Paris, London, Rome, Amsterdam—you name it. When I first saw them before the war and when I first saw them after the war you could cross any street in any city in Europe with your eyes closed and have no fear of a traffic accident or of becoming a statistic. I only cite the automobile as one sign of the tremendous economic recovery Europe has made. I think it is fair to say that before the war the great mass of people in Europe aspired to some day riding in an automobile; today the masses aspire to owning an automobile and most of them do. This has been our system in competition with the Soviet system.

When I first visited Moscow you could walk down the street blindfold and cross it and not be hit by a car, and when I went there two months ago traffic was still no problem and for the first time in many months, for the duration of my stay there, I was not bothered by traffic jams. So I think it is fair to compare our system with theirs and it is fair to say that we ought to do what we can to preserve and protect ours so that it is not overwhelmed by theirs. Thank you. [Applause.]

**Speech by U.S. Senator Joseph M. Montoya, Democrat, of New Mexico, to Students of Inter-American Defense College, November 9, 1967**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. E. S. JOHNNY WALKER**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 29, 1967*

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on November 9, the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico, the Honorable JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, addressed this year's class of the Inter-American Defense College. As the Members of this body are no doubt aware, each year the Latin American countries are invited to send their brightest young military minds to this college headquartered at Fort McNair. This year's class includes outstanding young men from 15 of our Latin American neighbors, and I know of no person better qualified to address such an audience than Senator MONTOYA. His ability to give this speech in both English and Spanish was prima facie proof to those in attendance that we here in America share much more with them than simply being members of the Western Hemisphere.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to call his remarks to the attention of my colleagues because I think the course he has mapped for these future leaders is one which must be followed by them and supported by the American people if

our hemisphere is to continue its joint progress and understanding.

I include Senator MONTOYA's remarks at this point in the RECORD:

**WHAT THE FUTURE WILL DEMAND OF YOU**

(Speech by U.S. Senator JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, Democrat, of New Mexico, to students of Inter-American Defense College, Washington, D.C., November 9, 1967)

General Henry, General Garcia, General Molina, my friends, a revered American and sincere friend of Latin America once said: "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

Thomas Jefferson was no lover of war or believer in everlasting conflict. He was aware of the realities of international life. He knew human progress is never fast enough for some, and there were those who would destroy freedom and injure liberty in order to attain their idea of a better world.

He knew these men often masqueraded behind slogans of liberty in order to impose upon others a rule of tyranny. So he warned us against such men.

He spoke of a need for vigilance if we are to protect and retain for all men the precious rights so many have struggled for. In our western hemisphere, we have learned painfully how precious our rights are.

Every nation in this hemisphere has had to fight, often bloodily, to be free. Each nation, once free, has had to defend its nationhood against aggressors from without who have sought to enslave them.

We have been successful up to now in repelling these challenges from abroad.

We have been eternally vigilant in defense of our respective nationhoods.

Each nation of our hemisphere has also been successful in repelling threats confronting them from within. There are always elements within society that seek power for themselves rather than orderly progress for all.

Our era has seen a new ideology confront us from without and challenge us from within. It seeks to take advantage of every geographical feature or political mistake on our part.

It cleverly seeks to exploit internal turmoil and dissatisfaction among our populations.

While national governments devote increasing efforts and resources to peaceful internal progress, these disrupters seek to defeat progress, even if it means hurting the prospects of those most in need.

They are willing to see the underprivileged suffer even more, rather than allow democratic regimes time to bring about reforms.

Seekers and fomentors of violent revolution, bloodshed and destruction, they thrive on hate and arousing of passions. They are not interested in building, as democratic regimes are. They have no vocabulary that includes roads, schools, hygiene, trade and honest international dealing.

They pay lip service to these ideals and goals, speaking of them to disadvantaged people. But they have in mind only power, war and aggrandisement. It is up to us to defeat their purposes, and to frustrate their schemes and ambitions. It devolves upon us to bare our breasts to their challenge. We dare not fail. Slavery for generations to follow is the cost if we do not succeed.

Free men and progressive regimes must, therefore, prepare themselves for any challenge. A call to struggle may come at any time, as recent events have shown.

It is regrettable that we must speak of force and be ready to meet might with might. But it is essential to the future of our hemisphere.

Fidel Castro has drawn us a graphic picture of what awaits those who fall prey to such men. See how free Cuba is! Note how fat the Cuban people grow on one egg a month! Watch how much they enjoy the Russian military presence among them! Mark

how free their press is! Observe the liberty they enjoy under Fidel!

Freedom-loving men never take up a sword gladly. But every time a tyrant or potential tyrant has seized the sword of enslavement and sought to bend others to his will, another has taken up the shield of liberty and interposed it between him and his victim. That is your duty, responsibility and permanent task.

Intelligent, politically knowledgeable and progressive military men are what nations of our hemisphere must have. A blind obeyer of orders is not enough. A political professional lacking military knowledge who is not master of his craft is inadequate.

Modern military professionals in our hemisphere must be tacticians and skillful leaders. But they must also be students of the history of their countries and our hemisphere. They must possess understanding of new currents moving in Latin America. They must exercise compassion for and understanding of yearnings and needs of their countrymen. Yours is therefore a double task.

Provide security, but possess understanding. Be able to defend, but be ever ready to instruct. Stand firm, yet be versatile. Set examples but never lose sight of your prime task.

Be nation-builders as well as nation-defenders.

The Fidel Castros are waiting and hoping for you to fail. Like so many vultures they await an opportunity.

As I look at this group, I have a feeling they will wait in vain. You impress me as a new, progressive breed.

Everywhere change is on the march. It need not be change that levels cities and decimates populations. Latin America's people are aware of these rising expectations. They ask to share in them.

Your continent bursts with vitality, resources and eager hands. Nations are emerging one after the other into a new age.

They require talents, ideas and leadership men like you can and must provide. We look to you with hope and a desire to help. No reasonable request by progressive men would be rejected unthinkingly.

We take pride in your progress and suffer if you sustain temporary setbacks. We share your aspirations for a better life for all under the umbrella of democratic institutions.

We have created a new world together. We have suffered together and glared at one another across our borders. Now we must stand united in the front ranks of freedom, determined to make our new world the best of all possible worlds. This we shall do without the lash of enslavement or the sword of dictatorship.

Your behavior and accomplishments will be a foundation to build and live on. It is my hope, as I know it is yours, that our names will be praised rather than cursed. Let us get to work, secure in the knowledge that we are free men in free countries, struggling towards attainable goals.

**Capt. David L. Wiseman Receives Navy Medal**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. CLARENCE D. LONG**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, November 29, 1967*

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Capt. David L. Wiseman, son of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth L. Wiseman, of Baltimore,

Md., was recently presented the Navy Commendation Medal for meritorious service in South Vietnam. Captain Wiseman previously won three Purple Hearts while serving with the 1st Marine Division in Vietnam.

I wish to commend Captain Wiseman for his service to our country and to congratulate his parents on their fine son.

### The Edge of Dissent

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1967

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker—

Men are qualified for civil liberties in exact proportion to their disposition to put moral chains on their appetites—

Wrote Edmund Burke two centuries ago.

Society cannot exist—

He continued—

unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the internal constitution of things that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters.

We are confronted today, in the United States, with a situation which inevitably calls our attention to these eminently practical words of counsel. I mean, specifically, that we are faced today with a crisis testing the durability, the very capacity to survive, of our democratic process—a crisis identified by the name Vietnam. I do not mean that the conflict itself is a threat to our security; it never has been. I mean, rather, that by a curious paradox, our system of democracy, which guarantees as a sacred right the voice of dissent, is threatened as it seldom, if ever, has been in our history—threatened by the appetites of intemperate minds, which know the meaning of neither restraint nor commonsense, and who are using the democratic system to force their own private opinions upon a freely-elected and duly-invested government. Those who do this defy constituted authority in order to usurp the right to dictate public policy in the name of private morality, thereby ignoring the voice of the corporate social ethic. What we have, in effect, is the destruction of dissent by the triumph of demagoguery, the yielding of argument to brutish force, the inundation of reason by primitive emotion.

We are forced every day, by means of the news media, to witness the "dissent" of those who claim to be concerned and responsible citizens—"dissent" which is conceived at best in ignorance and at worst in malevolence. In a democracy such as ours, to be sure, dissent of the proper sort is not only tolerated, but encouraged by the very nature of the system. The concept of democracy is one which inherently demands of its citi-

zenry responsible interest in political issues and the expression of that interest through rational discussion. It follows that dissent is an inevitable concomitant of the democratic process which implements the will of the people through constitutional government—if we mean by dissent its dictionary definition: "difference in sentiment or opinion, especially from the majority; disagreement; withholding of assent." Too many people, however, apparently do not apprehend the proper meaning of dissent, as it applies in the context of democratic government. I do not think that what has recently been passing as "dissent" is conformable to the accepted definition of the word. Nor do I think that much heed is being paid in certain quarters to the meaning of discussion and the place it should occupy in a free society. Discussion, if I may remind you, is defined as "consideration or examination by argument, comment, debate." And discussion, if it is to serve the purpose of human accomplishment, must be characterized by reason—a uniquely human quality, and one which was valued highly by the inventors of democracy—the ancient Greeks. Reason is "the power of intelligent and dispassionate thought, or of conduct influenced by such thought." And it is upon the efficacy of rational discussion that the process of constitutional government depends for success. Without reason, there is no order, and in the words of Othello, "chaos is come again." The alternative to reason is anarchy.

We have come to the point where we are faced with at least the possibility of that alternative. We have come to that point because a highly vocal, though proportionately small, segment of the population is, for whatever reasons, wittingly or unwittingly, devoted to the destruction of our system—a system which assumes that reasonable discussion is the most effective means by which to achieve justice through law.

There are those, of course, who disagree with the President's Vietnam policy, who dissent through the process of rational discussion. This is as it should be. Then, there are those who dissent through the process of civil disobedience—those who, it would seem, are misinformed as to the nature of the constitutional democracy and the way in which it functions. I quote from a recent article in *Look* magazine by Robert McAfee Brown, a professor of religion at Stanford University, to illustrate my point:

I will "counsel, aid, and abet" . . . students to find whatever level of moral protest is consonant with their consciences, and when for them this means refusing service in the armed forces, I will support them in that stand. In so doing, I am committing a Federal offense, for the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 specifically states that anyone who "knowingly counsels, aids and abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces" opens himself to the same penalties as are visited upon the one he so counsels, aids and abets, namely up to five years in jail or up to \$10,000 in fines, or both.

Professor Brown states that he is so moved to act because, in the final analysis, "the vacuum within the two

major parties leaves voters opposed to our Vietnam policy with rather bleak alternatives." What he means by that is that none of the major contenders for the office of the Presidency—including not only the President but also his most serious challengers—that none of the major contenders for the Office of the Presidency is in agreement with his—Professor Brown's—point of view.

It seems to me that Professor Brown, and others like him, are forgetting that the alternative open to them is to dissent through rational discussion, and then to vote as they see fit, in support of their point of view. If no candidate is available who expresses their views, they are at liberty to put one up who does, and if enough people agree with what they believe, they will triumph at the polls. It is as simple as that. What Professor Brown and others like him really mean, is that the majority does not agree with them, and since this is the case, the minority must disobey the laws in order to force their opinion upon the majority. This attitude is hardly consonant with the ideals of our democratic heritage. This attitude can serve only to erode and destroy the system by which the majority at any given time is entrusted with making policy but which at the same time must vindicate the rightness of that policy or face defeat at the polls.

The Nazi regime of Adolph Hitler forfeited its claim upon the allegiance of the German people not only because it violated every known tenet of the code of human morality but also because its totalitarian nature precluded discussion and free choice. The tragedy of Germany was that so many Germans did not realize this. Our tragedy is that so many Americans today seem to feel that their country has likewise forfeited its claim upon their allegiance. When men defy the constituted authority of our Government—which unlike the Hitler regime, has gone out of its way to protect the rights of dissenters and to assure the equity of its laws—when men defy the constituted authority of our Government through illegal action, they imply that Jefferson was wrong when he predicted:

I have much confidence that we shall proceed successfully for ages to come, and that . . . it will be seen that the larger the extent of the country, the more firm its republican structure, if founded . . . in the principles of compact and equality.

I do not believe that Jefferson's hope has been vitiated. Nor do I believe that refusal to cooperate with Government policy is anything but inimical to the national interest—which is, after all, a collective expression of all the individual interests which comprise that national interest.

More serious, however, than the threat posed by these illegal critics who assume a posture of moral superiority, is the threat of those who willfully and maliciously violate the boundary between dissent and demagoguery—the threat of those who earnestly desire and consciously attempt to destroy the social order which allows them the very freedom which they utilize for their destructive purposes. I have in mind, in particular, demonstrators like those who recently

invaded Washington and the Pentagon, in a concerted and obviously organized attempt to disrupt the machinery of Government processes. In regard to their actions I quote from a recent newspaper editorial which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and which puts the issue clearly:

If the cause of dissent is the obscenity and violence of war, one does not make a good case against it by committing obscenities and violence.

It holds further, as Senate majority leader MANSFIELD recently pointed out on the floor of Congress, that "the right of dissent guaranteed under the Constitution should always be allowed, but that right does not entail license, anarchy, or a breaking of the law. . . . Insofar as the Office of the Presidency is concerned," continued Senator MANSFIELD, "it should be treated with respect and courtesy, and that applies to the individual who happens to hold it at a given time. In other words, all Presidents, who only hold the office temporarily, should be entitled to the respect which the permanent Office of the Presidency calls for and is entitled to."

It would be naive to assume that the intention of some of these violent demonstrators is anything less than the destruction of the United States itself. It is tragic that although this is not the intention of many other of these anarchy-minded people, they are nevertheless contributing to that very cause. For it is patently clear that with each new demonstration, and each new lawless protest, the enemy receives aid and comfort and is strengthened in its resolve to continue the conflict in the hope that American resistance will weaken and finally collapse. It need not be reiterated that the longer the conflict endures, the greater the number of American soldiers who will lose their lives. In this connection, Speaker McCORMACK recently noted that a high-ranking North Vietnamese official calls opposition to the war in the United States a "valuable mark of sympathy" to the Communist cause. A recent article in the New York Times serves to vindicate the accuracy of Speaker McCORMACK's perception. This article in the New York Times reports that the official newspaper of the North Vietnamese Government considers the "campaign in the United States for an end to Johnson's aggressive war in Vietnam" to have "entered a stage of active resistance"—and that "an important aspect of the Washington rallies was that they marked the end of protest and the start of a 'fierce struggle' against the war." Thus, because of evidence within the United States itself, observes the British Daily Telegraph:

Ho Chi Minh [cannot be] blamed for insisting on American withdrawal or for making it a point of honour not to reciprocate in any way for the cessation of bombing.

As the Telegraph concludes, however:

The sooner Ho realizes that he cannot win on American campuses and boulevards the war he is losing in Viet Nam, the sooner will he come to the conference table.

I therefore submit that in the interest of preserving both our democratic system and the American lives which pro-

tect it; in defense of both reason and the national security—the American people must address themselves to adopting a position in support of the President of the United States and the policy which he, as the duly elected head of state, has implemented toward what he considers a necessary course of action. So long as other countries are able to condemn us on the basis of what our own citizens say and do—in violation of the principles on which our system of government is predicated—so long as force and unlawful action are allowed to replace reason and legal dissent—so long will the credibility of our own faith in our country and all that it has ever stood for be counterfeited in the eyes of the world. Worse still, when we shall allow democracy to be trampled under foot by the rampant mob, our civilization shall have run its course. Let us hold fast to the judgment of law and civilized dialog. Benjamin N. Cardozo said:

For law is restraint, and the absence of restraint is anarchy.

### U.S. Flights Over China Are a Danger to Us All

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1967

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, on November 15, I alluded in both the permanent and the daily RECORD, to an editorial in the Saturday Review, based on a statement by a spokesman for the State Department—and I quote the editorial:

There is nothing new about flights by United States planes over Chinese territory. United States planes have been flying authorized missions over Communist China for years.

Since then, Mr. Speaker, the Saturday Review has published, in its November 28 issue, word of a disclaimer from the U.S. Department of State, which reads as follows:

The U.S. Department of State has informed SR that it was in error in quoting a State Department spokesman ["The Tragic Trap," SR, Oct. 21] as saying that U.S. military planes had been authorized to fly over Communist China for several years. The State Department says it was referring to accidental flights over China by planes authorized to carry out missions in North Vietnam within specified distances of the Chinese border. The editors are pleased to put this correction on the records.

In order to further elucidate the position of the Department of State on this grave matter of U.S. military flights over Chinese territory, I submit the complete text of a letter to me dated November 21, from Assistant Secretary of State William P. Bundy. The letter follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington, November 21, 1967.

Hon. JOHN G. DOW,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOW: I have noted your remarks of November 15th in the House

(H 15285), concerning statements in a recent editorial in the Saturday Review.

I read that editorial with some shock, because it completely mis-stated what I (the spokesman for the Department) had said to the editor. As my contemporary record of the conversation reads, with the support of a witness in my office, I said nothing of the sort attributed to me in the editorial. What I did say was that none of our bombing missions had been directed over China at any time, which was the clear implication of the earlier Saturday Review editorial of September 9th. I went on to note that there had been accidental overflights of China in connection with our North Vietnamese operations, but that these had taken place over a long period and were not in any sense "recent"—the term employed in the original Saturday Review editorial of September 9th.

I went on to discuss Chinese Communist reaction, but in much more sophisticated terms than this second Saturday Review editorial quoted me. What I said was that the Chinese have from time to time reported overflights and that, when verified by us, we have confirmed the facts and the reasons—faulty navigation, pilots under fire, etc. I went on to say the Chinese Communists had protested these actions but the sum total of their reaction did not suggest that they regarded them as deliberate intrusions or a threat to China itself. I said that of course the question of Chinese Communist reaction was one that we kept always in mind in framing operations, and would continue to do so. Finally, I said that it was our present judgment—which I believe to be shared by a consensus of China watchers, as reported by the New York Times shortly after the first raids nearer the Chinese border, for example—that the likelihood of Chinese Communist major reaction did not appear substantial at the present time, and that it remained our basic view that the Communist Chinese would certainly react if they believed their territory deliberately threatened or if they believed that we were out to destroy the regime in North Vietnam. I said that I did not think they now held either of these beliefs, and that these were certainly not our objectives, as we had tried to make clear both by word and deed.

In view of the substantial degree of misunderstanding and inaccuracy in the Saturday Review editorial, I discussed the matter with Mr. Norman Cousins, its editor. As a result of these discussions the Saturday Review has printed a correcting box in the issue of November 25, which I enclose.

The record of our bombing operations in North Vietnam, the occasional accidental overflights, and our judgment of Communist Chinese reaction is not a new one. We have repeatedly discussed the subject with the relevant committees of the Congress and will continue to do so. I can assure you that we take it most seriously.

I leave it to you whether you may wish to insert the Saturday Review's correction in the Congressional Record. But I wished you have it for your own information in any event.

Since Senator Hartke inserted the whole of the second Saturday Review editorial in the Congressional Record, I am taking the liberty of sending him a copy of this letter.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. BUNDY.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the State Department's clearly sincere effort to clarify a most difficult issue.

Yet, I cannot understand why our Government will for one instant make it possible for military flights over sovereign Chinese territory to occur or permit flights that could come even remotely close to the Chinese border. Knowing, as we do, that all of the bombing of North

Vietnam is of questionable efficacy, then bombing of areas near China must be of slight value. I submit that such bombing is indeed of slight value when compared to the danger it poses of worldwide nuclear war. The judgment in Assistant Secretary Bundy's letter that "the likelihood of Chinese Communist major reaction did not appear substantial at the present time" is all very well, yet scarcely convincing. However competent this State Department judgment may be it is still too slender a thread for us to hang the destiny of the world upon.

Mr. Speaker, I question this judgment. The fate of the world should rest not on speculation, but only upon the most solemn counsel and constitutional checks that are within the power of our democracy to provide.

### Ukrainian Anniversaries

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

#### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1967

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, this year the Ukrainian Community of Greater Buffalo, N.Y., under the auspices of the Buffalo chapter of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, observed a double anniversary—the 50th of the Ukrainian liberation struggle, and the 25th of the creation of the UPA—Ukrainian Freedom Army.

The objective of this observance by the Ukrainian communities is threefold:

First, to give manifest expression of their strong ties with their kin in the Ukraine who are oppressed by the Russian occupants, and with their national aspirations for freedom and independence.

Second, to publicly take a stand supporting stability, strength, and security of the United States and our Government in all just endeavors to guarantee the right for freedom, justice, and national independence for all people and nations in the world.

Third, this is meant as a Ukrainian-American manifestation against the 50th anniversary of the Russian Communist imperial system.

The week-long double anniversary observance began with a Freedom Festival on Saturday, November 25, at Buffalo's Kleinhans Music Hall. Mrs. Iryna Lawriwska was the toastmaster, and Dr. Nestor Procyk, chairman of the observance committee, greeted the enthusiastic gathering at the festival.

With permission, I wish to include Dr. Procyk's introductory remarks and a copy of the Freedom Festival program at this point in the RECORD:

#### REMARKS BY DR. PROCYK

I am honored and privileged to welcome you, on behalf of our "Freedom for Ukraine" Week Observance Committee to this opening program of the week-long observance in tribute to the Ukrainian people on the 50th Anniversary of Ukraine's struggle for liber-

ation and 25th Anniversary of the Ukrainian Freedom Army—U.P.A.

Shakespeare once said: "While you live, tell truth and shame the devil". The truth of Ukraine has been told again and again and must be repeated till the chains will fall and Ukraine will join the family of free nations. For the past fifty years, the struggle to attain sovereign nationhood was marked by suffering, martyrdom and sacrifices. Fifty years of dedication in the service of the Ukrainian nation has claimed millions of nameless victims. Not only the great in spirit were willing to pay the utmost sacrifice, but also the humble nameless masses willingly gave their lives in their effort to achieve the ultimate of a people—a sovereign and independent life.

A half a century of dire oppression from the heavy hands of the Russian Communist rulers has taken its toll—the infamous symbol of their "progress".

The tide, however, is slowly but surely turning. The surge toward independent national life could not be stemmed by modern and no matter how efficient suppression. Yet, neither jails, deprivation, hunger or Siberian exile could permanently extinguish the steady Ukrainian flame for freedom. It is to this magnificent spirit that we are dedicating the evening of Ukrainian music, songs and dance tonight. This musical tribute to the undying spirit of the Ukrainian Nation is a token of our support in their rightful quest for liberation. Tonight we pay homage to a sturdy people who created a valiant Freedom Army—UPA, a people who refuse to bend to the Russian despot and steadfastly adhere to their own image of a deeply Christian people.

God and Country is the rallying call and in the name of this everlasting truth—we shall prevail!

FREEDOM FESTIVAL, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 25,  
1967—6:30 P.M., KLEINHANS MUSIC HALL

#### I

1. Introductory Remarks: Dr. Nestor Procyk, Chairman, Observance Committee.

2. American and Ukrainian National Anthems—Choir "Dnipro" from Cleveland, Ohio.

3. "Counting Days and Nights in Confinement"—Music by D. Sichynsky—Choir "Dnipro".

4. Opening Remarks: Hon. Thaddeus J. Dulski, United States Congressman.

5. Piano Solo by Claudia Hoca: a. "Baida," O. 26 Ukrainian Fantasy, by A. Karalis; b. Prelude in F-Sharp, by W. Barvinsky; c. Intermezzo in D-Minor, by N. Nyzhankivsky; d. Prelude in B-Minor, O. 7, No. 2, by L. Revutsky.

6. Women's Choir "Dnipro" from Cleveland, Ohio: a. "Evening Song," Music by Stetsenko; b. "O, Don't Wink Girls," Music by E. Kozak; c. "Kiev, O, Mine," Music by I. Shamo.

7. "Hutsulka"—Ukrainian Folk Dance, Performed by "Verkowyna", Ukrainian Youth Association Dancers from Toronto.

8. Male Choir "Burlaky" from Buffalo, New York: a. "Let's Sing Together, Brothers," Music by S. Worobkewycz; b. "The Carpathians," Music by I. Shamo, arranged by M. Hrynyschyn; c. "I Will Never Dance Again," Music by O. Nyzhankivsky.

Intermission—10 minutes

#### II

9. Male Choir "Dnipro": a. "Hetmans, Hetmans," excerpt from "Haydamaky," by T. Schevchenko, Music by M. Lysenko, arranged by E. Sadowsky; b. Medley of Ukrainian Freedom Army Songs, arranged by E. Sadowsky; c. "My Ukraine," Music by E. Sadowsky.

10. "Hopak"—Ukrainian Folk Dance, performed by "Verkowyna".

11. Mixed Choir, "Dnipro": a. "On the Dnipro River" Music by M. Dremluha; b. "O, Sheep, My Sheep," Music by M. Hrynyschyn;

c. "Evening Mist," from the Opera, "Utoplena," by M. Lysenko.

Program Announcer: I. Lawriwsky; Stage Decorations: M. Boraczok; "Dnipro": Director of Choir—E. O. Sadowsky; "Burlaky": Director of Choir—Y. Lawriwsky; Soloists "Dnipro": Y. Oryschkewycz, R. Kassaraba, N. Jakymcwo, O. Kondratenko; Soloists, "Burlaky": T. Pryschiak, R. Ciolko, M. Stasiuk, I. Matwijiszyn; Director of Dancing Ensemble "Verchowyna": Y. Klun.

It was my privilege to participate in this opening observance, and my remarks follow:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE T. J. DULSKI

Mr. Chairman, members of the Buffalo Chapter of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, distinguished guests, and friends.

To say I am glad to be here this evening at the opening of your double anniversary observance would be a gross understatement. It is always a distinct pleasure to be with a group such as this, but it is even more so today because of the occasion for this observance—the 50th anniversary of the Ukrainian Liberation struggle, and the 25th anniversary of the creation of the UFA (the Ukrainian Freedom Army).

I commend you for arranging this week-long observance in our community to focus attention on the plight of the oppressed peoples of the Ukraine. It also serves to emphasize our country's awareness of the continued national aspirations of these peoples for freedom and independence. We need to let the world know that we will not waver one bit in our endeavors to guarantee the right for freedom, justice, and national independence, for all peoples and all nations of the world.

During the ninth observance of Captive Nations Week last July, our City of Buffalo fittingly commemorated the subjugation of the countries of Eastern Europe and elsewhere in the world.

The expansion and increased fervor of these observances is indeed encouraging, but we must nonetheless be concerned that the plight of the captive nations of the world is always before us and that we must look for solutions to their problems. It should be indelibly clear that we are not just concerned during Captive Nations Week, but that we are continually dedicated to assisting them in regaining their freedom.

And this is what you are doing here this week.

The 50th anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution is not the only "50th". Free Ukrainians, and many other non-Russians will be observing 50th anniversaries of independence and freedom, which Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism snuffed out.

Their free voices will be raised in behalf of captive Ukrainians and the other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.—yes, equally, and also in behalf of the freedom and open opportunities of the long enslaved Russian nation itself.

In every sense, this oncoming period is a real occasion for us to make a special effort to obtain authority to establish a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. Early in this session of Congress I again sponsored a resolution to establish such a Committee.

I feel strongly that this would be a constructive first step in bringing freedom to these unfortunate people. Such a Committee would symbolize our free answer to the basic fraudulence of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution and the real tragedy of this 50th anniversary of that deceptive revolution. It would also pay shining tribute to the non-Russian "50ths", for the non-Russian revolutions in the years of 1917-23 were of the same essence and nature as our own American Revolution nearly 200 years ago.

Let me give you renewed assurance that I will continue to press our leadership in the House, for positive action on legislation to create this special House committee. Several of my colleagues in the House are joining me in this effort.

I am grateful for the support of the Ukrainian Congress Committee. It is heartwarming to see the efforts being made by your Chapter here as well as elsewhere in our country.

Yours is a continuing concern for the oppressed in your homeland. It is also a reflection of the support of the American people for every endeavor aimed at guaranteeing the right of freedom and national independence for all people.

I also include below a copy of the schedule of activities for the remainder of the week of this double anniversary observance, along with a copy of the proclamation issued by the mayor of the city of Buffalo, the Honorable Frank A. Sedita:

**OPENING OF EXHIBITION—LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF UKRAINE**

NOVEMBER 26, 1967, 3:00 P.M., UKRAINIAN HOME "DNIPRO"

Address: Hon. Henry P. Smith, III, Congressman of the 40th District; The Exhibition Open Daily During the Week; Arrangements: Mr. Marian Borachok, Artist.

NOVEMBER 29, 1967

Meet With The Ukrainian Students of the Norton Conference Theatre, SUNYAB; Contemporary Ukrainian Literary Trends Under Soviet Russia, Resumes—Poetry—Translations.

DECEMBER 2, 1967

Buffalo Athletic Club, 69 Delaware Ave.; Dinner Banquet; Speakers: Hon. Yaroslav Stetzko, former Prime Minister of Ukraine, President, Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations; Hon. Dr. Edward M. O'Connor, Former High Commissioner for Displaced Persons.

Featuring Female Quartet: Verkhovyna, Toronto, Canada; Recitation: Miss Renata Wolyne; Master of Ceremonies: Mr. Andrew Diakun, Atty.

DECEMBER 3, 1967

Ukrainian Home Dnipro: Festive Program Concluding Observance Week in Tribute to Ukraine and Her People.

Speakers: Wasyl Potishko, Member of the Ukrainian Central Rada; Lev Futala, Commander of Ukrainian Freedom Army—UPA; Presentation of Ukrainian War Veterans; Ukrainian Youth participating in the artistic part of the program.

**PROCLAMATION**

Whereas, the year 1967 marks fifty years of continuous struggle of the Ukrainian people for their national independence and against Communist Russian occupation and oppression of their land; and

Whereas, this half-century-long fight against the fraudulent Russian Communist Revolution brought millions of victims to the cause of freedom; and

Whereas, during World War II, while in the throes of two giants, Nazi-Germany and Communist Russia, the Ukrainian people arose again and created the Ukrainian Freedom Army—UPA with the ultimate aim to regain long sought freedom from the two adversaries; and

Whereas, these two anniversaries—the 50th Ukrainian struggle for national independence and the 25th of the creation of the UPA Army constitute milestones in the history of mankind's eternal quest for freedom and human dignity,

Now, therefore, I, Frank A. Sedita, Mayor of the City of Buffalo, do hereby proclaim this week of November 26 to December 3, 1967 as "Freedom for Ukraine Week", and urge all

people of greater Buffalo Metropolitan Area to pause and participate in the activities planned to pay tribute to the Ukrainian nation's struggle for freedom and national sovereignty.

FRANK A. SEDITA,  
Mayor of Buffalo.

**Attorney General Clark Reports on Campaign Against Organized Crime**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

**HON. EMANUEL CELLER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1967

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government, under President Johnson's leadership, is waging its most effective campaign in history against organized crime.

The campaign has resulted in an increase from 19 in 1960 to 1,197 in 1966 of indictments returned in cases handled by the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Justice Department.

Of the 182 Federal indictments or convictions of known Cosa Nostra members during the past 12 years, 66—more than one-third—have come within the last year.

The Federal campaign, already the most intensive and effective yet undertaken, is being bolstered through development of new strategy. The "strike force" concept, involving special intra-agency teams of Government prosecutors and investigators, is a promising new technique.

Attorney General Ramsey Clark reported on the campaign in an address in New York City this month. The address, delivered before the National Emergency Committee of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency in New York on November 14, 1967, also contains a thoughtful analysis of the problem of organized crime. I respectfully include the address to be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

Crime in America has many faces. Each exists because we are what we are. Our national character and condition create these capabilities for crime, cause us to suffer them, inhibit commitment to their control.

The motives of most are economic. Ninety percent of all serious crimes are against property. Many of the crimes against persons—muggings, kidnappings, assaults and murders—are incidental to property crimes.

White collar crime—embezzlement, fraud, swindling, price-fixing, tax evasion—often the acts of respected and successful people, wrecks millions annually from the public. The consequences to its victims are often as dire and direct as those that follow the thief, the burglar and the robber; frequently more so, because white collar crime can dig deeper than the purse in the bureau drawer or the wallet in the pocket to wipe out the savings of a family or a firm and its stockholders. Few crimes so corrode moral standards.

Crime in the streets, as it has come to be called, the widespread occurrence of general crimes, plague the nation. A steady rise in reported crime is a source of deep concern to our people. Over three million serious crimes were reported last year with perhaps as many

unreported. Here is our most pervasive and dangerous crime. It strikes capriciously, frequently; anywhere, anytime, anyone. But mostly it strikes the poor and the defenseless. It enlists our youth by the tens of thousands and sets them against society. It creates an atmosphere of fear that can destroy the self-confidence of a nation and the freedom of its people. It is by far the greatest challenge crime presents America today. It will be by far the most difficult to control.

An emerging defiance of law to demonstrate dissent or to disrupt is often a cause more of inconvenience than of injury. It has rarely elevated human dignity or the worth of the individual. Perhaps more significantly it lends to an atmosphere of contempt for social stability.

Extremist groups of the right and left—the Ku Klux Klan, the Minutemen, the Revolutionary Action Movement, Deacons for Defense and Justice—present another face of lawlessness. Capable of violence and intimidation, they are a concern to law enforcement and a threat to the public.

Rioting with vast property destruction, looting and sniping, injury to thousands and death to scores has visited the nation over four consecutive summers now. It threatens our quest for equal justice, our ability to build great cities where every American child will have his chance for fulfillment. Wild and irrational, riots destroy property, people, opportunities and dreams alike.

Today we examine organized crime. Here is planned, systematic continuous criminal activity: organizations, large and small, loose and tight, that live at the expense of society through the violation of its laws by force and stealth.

As with the other faces of crime, it must be viewed in context. All are interrelated as social phenomena, as criminal activity and as crime control problems. Each must be approached with perspective and balance.

Many find it difficult to believe there is organized crime. But of course there is, as history, experience and reason all prove. The Mafia made its presence known in the United States in the last decades of the 19th Century. Each decade of this century has known various conspiracies of professional criminals. In a society in which nearly every form of human activity is organized, is it realistic to believe criminal activity will not be? Crime has proven to be far too profitable in our society to expect an absence of organization in its execution.

No simple definition or description of organized crime is possible. Our society is too complex for that. There is no single massive organization that manages all or even most planned criminal activity throughout the country. There are cohesive groups exhibiting similar patterns of criminal conduct, with deference for the interests and areas of each other, that reach major parts of the nation. There are many small groups active in particular geographic areas that are independent of outside control. Together, these professionals constitute a major problem for law enforcement and an important challenge to society.

President Johnson's Crime Commission surveyed 71 cities in its study of organized crime. Nineteen acknowledged the existence of organized crime in their city. Nine failed to respond. Of these, six are known to have some organized crime. Four of the five cities with more than one million citizens indicated the presence of organized crime. Of the cities surveyed, only one in five with populations between 250,000 and 1,000,000 acknowledged any organized crime. More than half of the handful of smaller cities surveyed between 100,000 and 250,000 thought they had organized crime. Federal intelligence indicated the presence of organized crime in some cities where local reports denied it.

Of the 19 cities reporting the presence of organized crime, only 12 had specialized po-

lice units to deal with it and only six had prosecutors specifically assigned to it.

The activities of organized crime are wide ranging, but gambling is by far its greatest source of income. Gambling lends itself to criminal conduct.

Loan sharking, often called shylocking or juice, is generally believed to be the second most significant source of income. Here, as with gambling, organized crime must deal with large numbers of people. To protect its interest and accomplish its purpose, as in collections, pressure and violence are used as necessary. The end justifies any means.

Extortion, blackmail, and shakedowns are frequent practices. Importation and wholesaling of narcotics engage many groups in organized crime though in recent years the retail trade is often left to the small time pusher. Prostitution, bootlegging and related alcoholic beverage violations are common enterprises.

Increased sophistication and affluence have led organized crime into many legitimate businesses, labor activities and government services and contracts, licensing and zoning. Here they bring all the strong-armed tactics, violence and unprincipled conduct they practice in illegal areas. Firms have been bilked of assets, fraudulent stocks issued, planned bankruptcies executed, trust funds and loan accounts manipulated, and competitors driven out by unfair trade practices and criminal acts.

Generally organized crime as distinguished from ordinary crime supplies goods or services wanted by a large number of people: the chance to gamble, the loan of money, narcotics, prostitutes. An aroused community leadership can do much to limit its sales.

Because it is an on-going business, with payrolls to meet, dealing with hundreds or thousands of people, organized crime cannot flourish without protection. At the very least local law enforcement must be neutralized because major organized crime activities cannot be effectively concealed. Significant continuing gambling, shylocking, narcotics traffic, prostitution, extortion and other widespread organized criminal acts cannot long escape the notice of law enforcement.

Perhaps the greatest harm to come from organized crime is the corruption of officials. This affects a community in ways well beyond the reach of the criminal activity itself. Where some police are corrupt, law enforcement generally is likely to be bad. Where government officials are bribed, the moral climate of the whole community is likely to be affected; public confidence is undermined, cynicism takes hold.

Organized crime is a major concern of federal law enforcement. For seven years the federal government has waged an intensive campaign against a tenacious and deeply rooted enemy.

The current drive is the most comprehensive and successful yet undertaken. The Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Department of Justice which, directly and through U.S. Attorneys' offices, handles

organized crime cases, has the largest legal staff of its history now working exclusively in organized crime.

Indictments returned as a result of its efforts have risen from 19 in 1960 to 1,197 in 1966. Convictions over the same period have risen from 45 to 477. Between fiscal years 1964 and 1967, convictions or organized crime and gambling figures resulting from FBI investigations have risen 300 percent, from 64 to 197. Of 182 federal indictments and convictions of known members of the Cosa Nostra in the last 12 years, 66, more than one-third, have come in the last 12 months. Included are some of the highest ranking members of this major crime syndicate ever caught.

Criminal intelligence supplied to local law enforcement by federal agencies has had an even greater impact on organized crime. In fiscal 1967, the FBI disseminated over 250,000 items of intelligence regarding organized crime resulting in 3,600 arrests for violation of state law. Criminal intelligence supplied by the FBI has resulted in 174 raids of organized crime operations and 674 arrests in the past four months.

A new and highly effective technique already tested in a major northeastern city involves the "Strike Force" concept. A special team, the "Strike Force," staffed by Organized Crime and Racketeering Section attorneys and selected federal investigators from several key agencies, carefully coordinate with state and local law enforcement. An intensive correlation of intelligence guides special investigation, raids, grand jury investigation and action followed by prosecution. Superimposed on regular law enforcement and with no other assignment than to find and prosecute organized criminal conduct, the "Strike Force" can deliver major blows to organized crime and leave local law enforcement in control. A series of strike forces are being planned for centers of organized crime.

For better than a year now, the Department of Justice has conducted meetings in major cities across the country to alert local law enforcement and to intensify and better coordinate local, state and federal action directed at organized crime.

The Department will continue its efforts against organized crime in the months ahead. This is an area where the federal government must play a major role. The interstate nature of much of the more extreme organized crime activity and its ability to neutralize local law enforcement make this imperative.

But we must not look to the federal government to eliminate organized crime any more than we can look to it to control crime in the streets, or riots. Excellence in local law enforcement is the *sine qua non* of any effort to eliminate organized crime. Without this, little can be permanently accomplished. It is local police that patrol the streets and alleys and see and know the activities of the people. It is local police that are present in adequate numbers to deal with organized gambling, shylocking or prostitution. It is

state and local laws that are violated by most organized crime activity. It is the duty of local police to enforce those laws.

Crime in the streets can only be controlled and reduced. Organized crime can be eliminated. There are whole nations and societies relatively free of its scourge. A key will be the professionalization of local law enforcement: raising standards, training officers to meet the varieties of criminal conduct committed, paying salaries that will attract the best among us, providing adequate force, research and development, organization and leadership to bring excellence to local law enforcement throughout the nation. It is a happy fact, though no coincidence, that fulfillment of this same great need will aid in the arrest and reversal of the trends toward lawlessness in the other faces of American crime.

### Executive Briefing on United States-Russia Fisheries Agreement

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 29, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in October of last year the Congress passed a law which would prohibit foreign vessels from fishing within 12 miles of our coastal waters, except as expressly provided by an international agreement to which the United States is a party.

On Saturday of last week, the United States and Russia entered into a fisheries agreement concerning our Atlantic coast fisheries. Similar agreements concerning our Pacific coast fisheries were entered into between the United States and Russia and the United States and Japan, respectively, in February and May of this year.

On Monday, December 4, 1967, at 10 a.m., in room 1334, Longworth House Office Building, before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, there will be an executive briefing by representatives of the State Department and the Department of the Interior on the above-mentioned agreements. There will also be a discussion on fishery negotiations between the United States and certain South American countries and the United States and Mexico.

Because of the importance of this meeting to our U.S. fishing industry, I would like to invite all Members of the Congress to attend this classified briefing.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1967

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

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Dear Father, we are grateful for the inner call of service to God and man. Be with these who have been called by the people of this Nation to lead. May they

feel the call of the God of history as they make history today.

We are grateful for the solution to the conflict on the island of Cyprus. For those who were messengers of peace, we give Thee thanks. Give to this small nation the blessing of inner peace.

Give us guidance, O God, to new avenues of finding peace in the continuing conflict we face in Vietnam. May these worthy statesmen feel the strength of faith, hope, and love in this perplexing hour of history. We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, November 29, 1967, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the