

A RECORD OF
PRESS CONFERENCE STATEMENTS

MADE BY

SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

AND

REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES A. HALLECK

FOR

THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN
LEADERSHIP



PRESENTED BY MR. DIRKSEN

OCTOBER 2, 1964.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1964

THE JOINT SENATE-HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP

FOR THE SENATE

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Leader
THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Whip
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Chairman of
the Policy Committee
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Chairman of the
Conference
THRUSTON B. MORTON, Chairman of the
Republican Senatorial Committee

FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CHARLES A. HALLECK, Leader
LESLIE C. ARENDS, Whip
JOHN W. BYRNES, Chairman of the Policy
Committee
GERALD R. FORD, Jr., Chairman of the
Conference
CLARENCE J. BROWN, Ranking Member, Rules
Committee
BOB WILSON, Chairman of the Republican
Congressional Committee

PRESIDING OFFICER

DEAN BURCH, the Republican National Chairman

FOREWORD

In politics, party policy is reenunciated every 4 years when the national convention is held and a party platform is adopted. 1964 was such a year.

To Republicans this practice of policy reinvigoration every 4 years was especially interesting this year because President Eisenhower when he left office in January 1961 had established the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership to serve as a continuing policy body. Would there be any noticeable lines of departure in the Republican Party Platform from positions taken by the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership?

Of course, every policy statement issued by the Leadership between March 23, 1961, and July 2, 1964, was available to the Platform Committee and its staff, yet it is remarkable and a source of satisfaction to the Leadership that there was no conflict between its policy statements and the Party Platform. This coherence is a tribute to Republican devotion to basic policy.

It was also with pride that the Joint Leadership saw its Presiding Officer, William E. Miller, Republican National Chairman, named by the Republican National Convention as its candidate for Vice President. And a few days later we were privileged to welcome a new Presiding Officer for the Leadership sessions, Dean Burch, the new Republican National Chairman.

As in previous years, the Leadership statements for 1964 are being published as a Senate document. They appear on the following pages and are indexed as to issues covered.

CONTENTS

	Page
Communist bloc trade.....	1
Cuba.....	4
Democrats' domestic record.....	5
Economy, the.....	6
Farm program.....	6
Foreign Affairs, conduct of.....	8
Inflation, threat of.....	13
Nuclear control.....	14
Nuclear test ban.....	15
Poverty.....	16
Presidential campaign.....	17
Reapportionment and the Supreme Court.....	19
Spending.....	21
Vietnam.....	22

A RECORD OF PRESS CONFERENCE STATEMENTS

COMMUNIST BLOC TRADE

February 20, 1964

By Senator Dirksen

The wheat deal with the Soviet Union, initiated last October and currently being feverishly pursued by the Johnson administration, is doing far greater damage to American foreign policy than it is good to the American economy.

The chain of events which has followed this reversal of our economic policy toward Russia shows how costly the decision has been. It has all but destroyed our economic blockade of Cuba, a result forecast by Representative Halleck on October 2 last year when he said: "If the Kennedy administration puts its stamp of approval on sale of wheat to the Soviets, how can our Government expect to persuade other nations not to trade with Cuba in the future?"

The truth is now upon us. We can no longer persuade them.

Our ally, France, is reportedly negotiating a \$10 million truck deal with Cuba. Our ally, Spain, is negotiating for the sale of 100 fishing vessels and 2 freighters to Cuba. Our ally, Great Britain, has sold 400 buses to Cuba over our protest, and another 600 are on order. Four British airliners are being reconditioned for Cuba. Now negotiations are underway for British delivery of \$1.4 million in heavy roadbuilding machinery to Castro.

Worse yet, France has recognized Red China. Equally bad, our NATO agreement limiting credit to 5 years to the Communist nations is on the verge of collapse. While France, Italy, and West Germany watch, Britain is now negotiating a 15-year credit with the Soviets for \$448 million in fertilizer and chemical plants. Japan is considering credits and trade with Red China.

These nations use the wheat deal as an excuse. Britain's Prime Minister Home stood on the White House steps last week and made it clear the British intend to trade with the Communist nations. Former Prime Minister Ishibashi, a leading Japanese advocate of trade with Red China, has hailed the wheat deal as the "big turning point" in making trade with Communist nations possible.

In short, the wheat deal is turning into a diplomatic nightmare. Nothing has so undermined our leadership of the free world in a score of years. We have set a precedent that can be used against us from now on by the Communist nations to persuade our allies to trade with them on extended credit. We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership, strongly urge the Johnson administration to revalue further extension of the wheat deal before the diplomatic damage it is doing is beyond repair.

February 20, 1964

By Representative Halleck

The wheat deal with the Soviet Union is not only playing havoc with our world leadership but it is also disrupting our economy at home.

Our maritime unions are directing a boycott against loading wheat in American ports for shipment to the Soviet Union and they have adopted a strongly worded resolution this week denouncing the wheat deal as a "grotesque blunder."

Our shipowners are up in arms because the White House pledge that 50 percent of the wheat deliveries would be in American ships has not been kept, with nearly 75 percent of the wheat tonnage having been shipped so far on foreign vessels.

The American taxpayers are awakening to the fact that they are paying as much as 84 cents a bushel in special subsidies so that the wheat can be sold to the Soviet Union at the far lower world price instead of at the price an American would pay if he bought it.

Our farmers find themselves in a dilemma because the White House, not they, initiated a deal supposedly for their benefit which is giving the Soviet Union a big financial break at the expense of the U.S. Treasury. And the subsidies for the Russians' benefit keep climbing. The present estimate is that the American taxpayers will contribute more than \$40 million in subsidies for the benefit of the Soviet Union.

And finally, the Members of Congress—kept in session day after day, night after night until last Christmas Eve because President Johnson insisted on authority to give extended Export-Import Bank credits to the Soviet Union—now know that the original congressional prohibition against sales of Government-subsidized agricultural commodities to Communist nations was right.

This wheat deal has turned into a sorry mess. The only winner has been the Soviet Union, which is exactly what many of us predicted. The American taxpayers, our maritime unions, and our shippers are the losers. It is time a halt was called on these transactions with the Soviet Union. We believe the overwhelming majority of the American people, including American farmers, would support such a move.

March 12, 1964

By Senator Dirksen

From Moscow last week came a proposal by First Deputy Premier Kosygin for the negotiation of a long-term trade agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union. On Saturday President Johnson said: "We would be very happy to explore that possibility with them."

Mr. Johnson may be happy on this score, but we are not.

We simply cannot understand how the United States one week can protest the extension of trade and credits by our allies to the Communist bloc and the next week welcome the possibility of a long-term trade agreement with the Soviet Union.

We simply cannot understand how the United States last week could invite the Soviet Union to buy more American wheat—as did Under Secretary of Commerce Martin in Moscow on Friday—and this week tell the British they shouldn't trade with Cuba—as did Walt W. Rostow, a State Department official, in London on Tuesday.

We know that the White House and the State Department have for months been trying to justify the wheat deal on the grounds that a "fat Communist" is less dangerous than a "lean" one. Twenty-five years ago there were those who thought a "fat Nazi" in Germany was less dangerous than a hungry one, but history proved them wrong.

We know also that since the wheat deal, France has recognized Red China, our allies have stepped up trade with Cuba, and the NATO agreement against long-term credits to the Communists has been undermined. Even Japan is wavering. I hold in my hand a recent edition of the Japan Times. There are six separate articles in it exploring possible Japanese trade with Red China.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, think it is high time for the Johnson administration to decide whether a "togetherness" program with the Soviet Union is more important than our free world alliances. We can't have both.

April 30, 1964

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

For more than a decade it has been the policy of the United States and its allies to limit trade and credit to the Soviet bloc nations and to ban all commerce in strategic items. The United States itself has gone further, barring all trade with Red China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba and, in the latter case, asking our allies to join in a program of "economic denial."

Today the free world policy structure on trade with the Communists is disintegrating. The reason is not remote. The leadership once provided by the United States is disintegrating.

This Nation's wheat negotiations with the Soviet Union touched off the rush last October. Britain promptly breached the "economic denial" policy with shipments to Cuba and began negotiations with the Soviet Union for long-term credits which would breach the NATO agreement limiting credits to 5 years. France recognized Red China. West Germany stepped up its trade negotiations with the Eastern European Communist bloc, and Japan did likewise with Communist China.

In Washington, President Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk, Secretary of Treasury Dillon, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, and Secretary of Commerce Hodges all repeatedly welcomed expanded trade with the Communist nations while dispatching emissaries to the capitals of our allies asking them not to trade with Cuba or extend long-term credit to the Communist bloc.

Last month the State Department came forth with a policy statement to explain it all. Trade with Communist nations is a matter of "selectivity." It is determined on a day-to-day, week-to-week basis, depending on how each Communist nation is behaving. The American public was told this was not a new policy although nobody, including our allies, had ever heard of it before.

Like ever-changing weather, this so-called policy presents some very grave questions:

How can a trade policy, officially described as "flexibly adapted and flexibly applied" to each Communist nation, be deciphered by our allies?

What is to prevent any ally from "flexibly" applying its own policy to Cuba or Red China as, in fact, some of our allies are already doing?

How long is the NATO list of restricted strategic items going to last when Secretary of Commerce Hodges, as he did on March 10, says "we are moving in the direction" of easing the ban on sales of such vital products to the Communists?

What cooperation from our allies can we expect on the "economic denial" program for Cuba when the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright, tells the world the Cuban "boycott policy has failed because the United States is not omnipotent and cannot be"?

Times change and so must policy. But we suggest that a policy which endangers our alliances and threatens our leadership position can never be justified.

CUBA

May 14, 1964

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

In the recent efforts of high officials of our Government to explain this Nation's policy toward Cuba it has become increasingly evident that the Johnson administration has adopted a "double standard" toward the Soviet Union and its puppet state 90 miles from our shores.

In a speech on Cuba policy, billed in advance by the State Department as "definitive," Under Secretary of State George W. Ball outlined the administration's program of "economic denial" and said "it will be continued so long as [Cuba] persists in its efforts to subvert and undermine the free societies of Latin America."

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges in congressional testimony declared "we will not retreat from our present policy as long as the Castro regime continues to threaten the security and stability of other nations in this hemisphere."

Even Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman William Fulbright, who regards the economic denial policy as a failure, said in London last week that he is "not in favor of trade with Cuba as long as they are exporting their revolution."

Since these statements, the House Foreign Affairs Committee has released testimony given on April 14 by Gen. Andrew P. O'Meara, the U.S. Army's expert on Latin American military requirements, who declared the Communist guerrillas active in Latin American nations have not only been trained in Cuba but the Soviet Union as well.

"Organized guerrilla training camps are known to exist," General O'Meara said. " * * * there is an active program today. The training that these people acquire in Cuba and Russia and to a lesser extent in China is being put to use today."

The contradiction is plain.

On one hand we attempt to bolster the policy of economic denial toward Cuba by trying to persuade our allies not to sell vital locomotives, buses, and planes to Castro because his regime is promoting revolution in Latin America.

On the other hand the Johnson administration is openly advocating increased American trade with the Soviet Union under a "double standard" policy which ignores the fact that the Russians are also engaged in promoting revolution in Latin America.

As things now stand the only policy the administration has in effect on Cuba is the policy of economic denial and it cannot possibly succeed without the cooperation of our allies. As we have previously pointed out, some of our principal allies, notably Britain and France, are not cooperating.

Only this week at The Hague, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in a speech to the prime ministers of the NATO governments, again pleaded for support of our economic denial policy on Cuba, but the reaction from our allies was not encouraging.

These disturbing facts can only lend emphasis to the necessity for the United States, as a leadership nation, to lead, not to go off in two directions at once. Otherwise, our allies will continue to insist that if we can trade with Russia, they can trade with Cuba. It is time for American policy to be put back on the track.

DEMOCRATS' DOMESTIC RECORD

January 28, 1964

By Representative Halleck

When the 3-year domestic record of the Democrat administration is examined in the light of promise versus performance, no amount of window dressing in Presidential messages can alter the fact that little has actually been achieved. And when the increased cost of government for those 3 years is considered, it has been an expensive experience for the American taxpayer, to say the least.

President Johnson boasts that in 3 years the gross national product has increased \$100 billion, or 16 percent. He overlooks the fact that the GNP increased 44 percent in the Eisenhower years, when the cost of government averaged 22 percent less than today. Likewise, Mr. Johnson tiptoes around the fact that, by his own budget calculation, the Democrats will have added \$31 billion to the national debt since they took office. That's a huge amount of red ink in times supposed to be so prosperous.

Despite the sunshine terms used to disguise the fiscal mess in Washington, two groups of Americans—our workers and our farmers—know how little Federal deficit spending accomplishes. Unemployment stays grimly above the 4 million mark, while the parity ratio between the prices of what a farmer buys and what he sells has dropped to 78 percent, the lowest figure since the depression of the 1930's.

Then there are all the 1960 campaign promises that still await fulfillment—massive aid to education, medical care under social security, youth camps, lower interest rates, etc., etc. And civil rights, promised as the first order of business for January 3 years ago, but not even sponsored in Congress by the administration until 6 months ago when bloodshed and violence forced the hand of the executive department.

Now we are told we are going to get all these things bigger and better at less cost. Well, if anybody believes this, and few do, all they need to do is examine the record. The last Democrat President who ever cut the cost of anything was Grover Cleveland and he went out of office in 1897.

THE ECONOMY

April 21, 1964

By Senator Dirksen

In two press conferences this month, President Johnson has issued statements painting a rosy picture of economic conditions in this country. At one point he put the economic outlook in these words:

"I think," said the President, "this will be a good year for the people from an economic standpoint, and I think it will be a good year for the Democrats from a political standpoint."

It is not clear which the President puts first—the economic welfare of the American people or the political welfare of the Democratic Party. If politics comes first, we think the Johnson administration is engaged in a dangerous game.

His array of statistics doesn't change the fact that Federal budgets affecting election year 1964 have been deliberately designed to pump huge sums of borrowed Federal money into the economy at the same time a major tax cut has already given it a shot in the arm.

It doesn't change the fact that many top economists in this country now fear inflation. Already the tides of inflation are running in Europe. At home, financial experts are watching the increase in raw material prices. The stock market is now reflecting increased purchase of common stocks by persons wanting to hedge against the inflation threat.

Yet it is now evident that the President is feverishly bent on using "blowtorch" tactics to beat up the economy to full-fledged boom by election day. It raises the question: What next—a bust? This may be good shortsighted tactics for the Democratic Party but it could be disastrous to the pocketbooks of the American people.

We would remind the President that the country was booming in 1952, but the guns were booming in Korea and a Republican was elected President. We doubt that a souped-up economy is going to take the eyes of the American people off the fact that our position is deteriorating badly abroad and that American servicemen are again dying in Asia.

FARM PROGRAM

May 7, 1964

By Representative Halleck

It has become the recent fashion in Presidential press conferences to cite numerous statistics and economic indicators to show how prosperous America has become. But the Johnson administration seldom mentions one important segment of our economy, agriculture. Small wonder. What the White House is trying to sweep under the rug is the fact that our farm economy has slipped badly.

The barometer the farmer watches closest is the parity ratio which compares his production costs with the prices he receives. During the Eisenhower years this ratio averaged 84.5 percent. Last month, according to official Agriculture Department figures, it dropped to 75 percent, the lowest monthly figure in 24 years.

In fact this index of farm prosperity has been dropping every year since the Democrats took office. On April 15, 1961, the farm parity ratio was 80; in 1962 it fell to 79; in 1963 to 78; and this year to 75, the lowest monthly figure since August 1939.

Not only have commodity prices dropped, but the cost of what the farmer buys has risen an average of \$750 per farm unit since the Democrats took over the White House. Their record must look strange indeed to farmers because the Democratic platform flatly pledged an increase in price supports to 90 percent of parity. Although Secretary of Agriculture Freeman need only sign an administrative order to carry out the pledge, not a single price support has been increased to the promised 90 percent during the Johnson-Kennedy years.

For example, the Democrats pledged to support wheat prices at \$2.28 a bushel. Wheat is selling at only \$1.94 and is dropping. They promised to support corn prices at \$1.40 a bushel. Corn is selling at only \$1.14. This week prime cattle brought the lowest price in Chicago in 18 years and the import policies of the Johnson administration threaten to drive them even farther down.

At the rate the farm parity ratio has been dropping under President Johnson, farmers would be justified in calling it the poverty ratio.

May 7, 1964

By Senator Dirksen

While it must be clear indeed that the American farmer is the forgotten man in President Johnson's prosperity statistics, the American taxpayer has also become a victim of the administration's unwise agricultural policies. As the farmer's economic position has worsened each year under the Democrats, the cost of the administration's farm program has soared to new heights.

Department of Agriculture spending has jumped from \$5.4 billion in 1960, President Eisenhower's last year, to \$7.7 billion for 1963. This represents an increase of 43 percent in Federal outlays for agriculture since 1961 while the farmer's cost-price ratio has dropped nearly 10 percent.

Another fact that can only distress the taxpayer and the farmer alike has been the jump in Department of Agriculture payroll since the Democrats assumed control. The farm population has dropped from 15,600,000 in 1960 to 13,800,000 in 1963. Yet the Democrats have boosted the Agriculture Department payroll from 98,600 employees under Eisenhower to 116,800, an increase of 18 percent at the Federal level to administer a farm program for 12 percent fewer farmers at the rural level.

If the farmer's financial plight had improved during these Democratic years, the taxpayer and the farmer might be a bit more tolerant of the Federal extravagances. But it hasn't. While the Democrats were spending an extra \$4 billion on agriculture since 1961, the farmer's mortgage debt skyrocketed from \$12 billion under Eisenhower to \$16 billion under the Democrats, an increase of 33 percent.

The truth is that the agricultural program of the Johnson administration is a mess—a mess that has hurt the farmer economically and cost the taxpayer nearly twice as much. It is misleading to talk about prosperity when the producers of our food and fiber are in a financial squeeze and it is equally misleading to talk about economy in government when the Agriculture Department spends more money only to make things worse.

CONDUCT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

January 28, 1964

By Senator Dirksen

This Nation has now had 3 years of foreign policy shaped by Democratic Presidents and it is time a frank accounting of the world picture was rendered. Here are the facts:

In southeast Asia, American fighting men are losing their lives in South Vietnam; Cambodia, a former friend, has severed economic and military relations and is making friendly gestures to Red China; Indonesia's determined friendship with Peiping was rewarded by American acquiescence in that nation's annexation of Dutch Guinea; Burma, Laos, and Thailand all suffer from Communist infiltration and buildups and internal anti-American campaigns. Even Pakistan has signed trade and airline agreements with Red China.

In Africa, Ghana and Zanzibar have gone Communist, while Algeria and Morocco carry on more than friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

In Europe, the NATO structure has deteriorated; the Berlin wall has been built and France has recognized Red China. The insistence of the administration for authority to sell wheat to the Soviet Union on our taxpayers' credit amounted to an open invitation to Britain to sell buses and airliners to Cuba. Spain is also negotiating the sale of fishing vessels in a further rupture in the slowly disappearing economic blockade around Cuba.

In Latin America, Cuba has gone Communist and become the first Soviet base in this hemisphere; Panama has completely severed diplomatic relations in a threat to the Panama Canal; Communists promote increasing strife in Venezuela, British Guinea, Brazil, and Bolivia; military coups have occurred in the last 2 years in Argentina, Peru, Ecuador, the Dominican Republic, and Honduras.

There is the 3-year record. It is a losing record, a grim record. It has reduced American prestige. It certainly does not justify any American embrace of Moscow-sponsored "coexistence" or White House talk of "peace offensives." It is high time our Government recognized that Communist aggression never stops and never will until we formulate policies to meet the realities presented by a cold, relentless, and inhuman enemy.

February 27, 1964

By Senator Dirksen

One of the responsibilities of the party out of power in the United States is to lend its support to bipartisan foreign policy wherever mutual accord makes this possible. We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, have repeatedly subscribed to this doctrine since the Democratic administration took office January 20, 1961.

However, on several occasions during the last 3 years we have been compelled to assert our mystification as to what policy we were being asked to support, indeed whether there was any policy at all. Since Mr. Johnson assumed the Presidency in November, the mystery has

deepened. In those 3 months, the United States has suffered one setback after another around the world without any coherent policy emerging to right them. We have been drifting on the high seas of uncertainty and confusion.

Is President Johnson continuing the late Mr. Kennedy's highly questionable policy of "coexistence" with the Communist world? If so, how can the United States persuade other free world nations not to trade with Cuba or to extend long-term credits to the Communist bloc countries, a pair of bleak problems which now confront us?

If the policy of "coexistence" is still in force, where is the evidence of "coexistence" on the part of the Communist nations when they promote subversion, violence, and anti-American campaigns in Latin America, Africa, and southeast Asia? Have the Kennedy-Johnson administrations paved only a one-way street with good intentions?

And what is happening to American prestige when one little nation after another—with smaller populations than most of our larger cities—kicks us in the shins and gets away with it? If our foreign policy cannot cope with problems of these dimensions, what happens when greater issues must be met?

We think the time is here for a reassessment of American foreign policy. Surely we Republicans cannot be expected to support an enigma. We respectfully suggest to President Johnson that Radio Moscow was right on June 12, 1963, when it applauded our Government's shift to a policy of "coexistence" as a "renunciation of the policy of strength" that marked the Eisenhower years. We stand ready to support a "policy of strength" and the sooner this Nation returns to it the better.

February 27, 1964

By Representative Halleck

Perplexity over American foreign policy is not limited to members of the joint Senate-House Republican leadership, but it also exists among the governments of our allies. The examples that contribute to the confusion are numerous.

One month the administration says that the war in South Vietnam—crucial to all southeast Asia—can be successfully concluded by the end of 1965. A couple of months later Secretary of Defense McNamara tells us we are withdrawing from South Vietnam by the end of 1965 regardless of the outcome.

One day President Johnson says that if there is a proposal to neutralize both North and South Vietnam the United States will consider it sympathetically. A few days later our Ambassador to South Vietnam, Henry Cabot Lodge, says neutralization would be regarded as turning South Vietnam over to the Communists.

One month, the White House is promoting the sale of surplus American wheat to the Soviet Union. A couple of months later it is protesting the sale of British-made buses to Communist Cuba, to which the British manufacturer replies: "If America has a surplus of wheat, we have a surplus of buses."

One day, Secretary of State Rusk is saying over the Voice of America radio that American consumers may boycott goods produced by nations trading with Cuba; a couple of days later the State Department officially announces the U.S. Government does not favor such boycotts.

One day, American newspapers picture the White House as resolute in its determination not to renegotiate our Canal Zone rights in Panama; a few days later the same newspapers report the White House is seriously considering admission of the renegotiation question.

We Republicans do not recite these examples of vacillation in American foreign policy with any satisfaction. We recite them with dismay. We think corrective steps are urgent and our goal is to encourage them. President Johnson says we are "beloved" around the world. We certainly hope so, but it is equally important to be respected. In the coldblooded arena of foreign affairs, love is not enough.

March 20, 1964.

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

In the last 14 years Communist bloc aircraft and antiaircraft guns have attacked U.S. military planes on peaceful missions on 30 occasions, shooting down 17 of them with casualties to 95 Americans, 53 of whom are missing, 35 are dead, and 7 injured.

Two of these attacks have occurred in the last 2 months during the so-called period of relaxed tensions. In January in East Germany the Soviets shot down an Air Force trainer plane, killing three American airmen. Last week another trainer plane which also strayed over East Germany was shot down by a Soviet fighter plane, with the crew of three Americans, one injured, still being held prisoner by the Soviets.

Lest anyone think only American planes stray, a Bonn official says in the last 3 years there have been 95 incursions of West Germany by Communist military planes compared to 77 NATO craft drifting into East Germany. NATO forces politely escort stray Communist planes back to their borders; the Communists in the reverse situation have several times started shooting.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, think the exchange of stern diplomatic notes with the Soviet Union over these two incidents is not enough. We suggest that the United States call off current negotiations on a Soviet proposal for the establishment of an equally shared New York-Moscow commercial air route. If the Soviets cannot accord stray U.S. military craft peaceful treatment, how safe will our commercial airliners be on the new route?

These negotiations have already raised other questions. The aviation industry is agreed that the New York-Moscow route offers far more gain for the Soviets than the United States. There are many who argue it would give the Soviets a secure line of communications with their espionage network in this country.

Even more important, it offers a pitfall that must not be ignored. With the Soviets anxious to step up their infiltration of Latin America, what arguments will we have left if, after we agree to a commercial route, the Soviets propose similar routes to our friends in South America? The gate for infiltration and espionage will have swung wide open.

June 11, 1964

By Senator Dirksen

On June 1, the United States and the Soviet Union signed a consular convention, the first bilateral treaty ever negotiated between the two nations. Subject to ratification by the U.S. Senate, the convention would authorize negotiations for the Soviet Union to open consular offices in such cities as New York, Chicago, and San Francisco in exchange for similar American offices in the Soviet Union.

The agreement contains an unprecedented concession to the Soviet Union. Although a consular office is concerned principally with trade and its officials and employees do not enjoy diplomatic immunity, the Soviet Union demanded that a provision be included for immunity from prosecution for crimes, including espionage.

Only 4 months earlier, J. Edgar Hoover, Chief of the FBI, testified before the House Appropriations Committee (January 29) as follows:

It is well established that a topheavy percentage of Soviet bloc official personnel assigned to this country actually have intelligence assignments. * * * The number of these representatives has steadily increased over the years and the Soviet bloc works diligently to send more and more such representatives to this country.

Attorney General Robert Kennedy has stated that "Communist espionage in this country is much more active than it has ever been" (Parade magazine, Jan. 7, 1962), yet the Senate is now going to be asked to ratify an agreement that will increase Soviet espionage and cloak it with immunity from prosecution to boot.

The State Department tells us the unprecedented immunity concession was necessary to obtain a Soviet agreement to notify our authorities of the apprehension of American nationals within 3 days and to accord access to them within 4. We think the Senate should take an exhaustive look at this strange deal before any vote on ratification.

If the Russians are "mellowing" as the State Department contends, then the United States has paid an exorbitant price simply to get the Soviet Union to accord American citizens the same treatment that other civilized societies do.

July 2, 1964

By Senator Dirksen

For a year now, the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership has been issuing statements raising serious questions about American policy not only on Vietnam but toward the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc nations as well.

When the late President Kennedy embraced Moscow-sponsored "coexistence" in his American University speech a year ago, we were the first to point out that a major shift in foreign policy was underway. When it was followed up by an expanded trade policy toward the Communist nations, we raised the issue of its adverse effect on the NATO agreement limiting credits to the Communist bloc, and on our policy of "economic denial" for Cuba.

We have protested the pending treaty for establishment of consulates in the United States and the Soviet Union, and a negotiated proposal for a Moscow-New York commercial air service, both of which appear to offer the Soviet Union far more benefits than they do the United States. We have pointed out the inconsistency of asking Great Britain not to trade with Cuba because it is a "government that is actively promoting Communist subversion in this hemisphere," while we step up trade with the Soviet Union when the Pentagon was telling Congress the Soviet Union is also training guerrillas for the subversion of Latin America.

Serious questions about our foreign policy have also been raised by a House Republican task force headed by Representative Gerald Ford, of Michigan, and by a Republican Citizens' Critical Issues Council headed by Dr. Milton Eisenhower. But we Republicans are not alone. The maritime trade unions have attacked the expanded trade policy with the Communist bloc as a "grotesque blunder," while the AFL-CIO Executive Council only last month declared it "rejects as a monstrous myth the notion that our country * * * can promote world peace * * * by helping the Communist dictatorships overcome the severe hardships * * * their policies * * * have brought about."

When we weigh Communist promotion of subversion, violence, and anti-American campaigns in Latin America, Africa, and southeast Asia against the administration's capitulation to a "coexistence" policy toward the Soviet Union, we must assert a grave issue has been raised. Much as we would prefer to avoid the subject, we must declare that not only the Vietnam question but the Johnson administration's broader policy of "coexistence" must be fully exposed in the 1964 presidential campaign.

September 23, 1964

By Senator Dirksen

If the 100 top historians in the world today were asked to name the greatest issue now facing mankind, they unquestionably would reply: communism.

If the same 100 top historians were asked what communism endangers most, they undoubtedly would reply: freedom.

Yet in this election year of 1964, the American people must face the fact that the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, in accepting the nomination of the Democratic National Convention at Atlantic City for a full term, never mentioned communism once in his entire speech.

Likewise, the American people must face the fact that Mr. Johnson, in his opening campaign speech in Detroit, described the goals of his administration and his party as "prosperity," "justice," and "peace." The most vital ingredient of the American way of life, "freedom," was omitted.

We are astounded at the omission by the President of the greatest issue the world has known since the Dark Ages—the issue of communism versus freedom.

Communist governments now rule a third of the people on this globe and the appalling fact is that the Communists have achieved

80 percent of their conquest since 1946, a span of only 18 years. The threat of further conquests in Asia, Africa, and Latin America is a clear and present danger.

What hope does the President of the United States offer to the embattled peoples of the world when he talks of the three goals of his administration and freedom is not one of them? What solace is there for the American people when the greatest issue of our times is ignored in speeches that are more concerned with telling us how much money we have in our pockets, how much food in our bellies, and how much gasoline in our automobiles?

The worldwide threat of communism cannot be swept under the rug nor the issue of freedom be ignored for a very simple reason—we Republicans won't let it happen here.

THREAT OF INFLATION

March 25, 1964

By Representative Halleck

President Johnson this week asked both auto management and auto unions to avoid a new contract that might cause a "revival of the price-wage spiral." He said the "public interest today, more than ever, requires that the stability of our costs and our prices be protected."

We agree completely with the President on the need to combat inflation. However, we suggest that not only should industry and labor practice restraint, but so should the Federal Government. And the place to commence is on Federal spending.

From the first day that talk began about a reduction in taxes, we Republicans took the position that you shouldn't cut taxes without cutting spending to avoid the danger of inflation. Because we favored a tax cut we set up a task force in the House of Representatives to recommend a reduction in Federal spending. The record shows the Congress reduced appropriations by \$6.3 billion in hard cash below Presidential requests last year.

What has been the President's reaction to this effort by Congress to combat inflation? Here are the facts:

President Johnson is currently spending \$2 million more a day than the late President Kennedy and \$50 million more a day than former President Eisenhower. In addition, Mr. Johnson is seeking at least \$2.5 billion more in supplemental appropriations than are currently needed to keep up the increased spending rate.

Some economists believe that the tax cut now in effect is going to give the economy a tremendous thrust. Their concern however is the threat of inflation, the damage it could do by further reducing the purchasing power of the American dollar at home, and by increasing the drain on our gold reserves from abroad. They realize inflation could wipe out every benefit provided by the cut in taxes.

Mr. Johnson in his speech this week acknowledged these dangers but we invite him to support the efforts of our new budget-cutting task force in further reductions in appropriations this year. Such a course would show the Nation that the Federal Government is willing to do as much as it is asking labor and management.

NUCLEAR CONTROL

September 25, 1964

By the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership

There is one issue in this campaign on which clear proof is available that either Senator Goldwater or President Johnson is right. That issue is the subject of nuclear control.

Senator Goldwater has said:

I suggest that the Supreme Commander of NATO—who is an American officer and probably always will be—have direct command over a NATO nuclear force * * *.

President Johnson has said:

The responsibility for the control of U.S. nuclear weapons rests solely with the President, who exercises the control of their use in all foreseeable circumstances.

The most recent issue of Time magazine had this to say on the subject:

There is nothing whatever in the law to prevent him (the President) from delegating to, say, a NATO commander, authority to use nuclear weapons under certain circumstances.

Goldwater insists that the President should delegate such authority. Johnson lets on that he can't and won't. The fact is that he already does, as did Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy before him.

U.S. News & World Report, also in this week's issue, stated:

Even now, the understanding is widespread among NATO allies that U.S. commanders in Europe already have orders, issued in advance, to use nuclear weapons in certain emergencies with no further instructions from Washington.

These two statements, coming from two such highly reputable American magazines, are in direct conflict with statements of President Johnson and practically every major spokesman of his administration on this subject.

There can be no question that the American people are now thoroughly confused about this issue. If Time magazine and U.S. News & World Report are right, then Senator Goldwater has been the object of one of the biggest political misrepresentations in the history of presidential campaigns.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, call upon President Johnson immediately to make clear to the American people the truth in this matter—whether or not the U.S. Supreme Commander in Europe has or has not been given authority to use tactical nuclear weapons in time of dire emergency, and also whether or not this authority was given under the two previous Presidents. To that end, we call upon him to deny, if that is possible, the very serious statements that are contained in these two magazines.

The national security of this country is too important a matter to leave such an issue unresolved in the minds of our people, our NATO allies, and the Communist enemy.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN

March 25, 1964

By Senator Dirksen

Late last summer when the controversial nuclear test ban treaty was being considered for ratification by the Senate, many of us felt, because of Soviet violations of a previous moratorium on testing, the Congress should have assurances from the executive branch that every precaution would be taken to meet the emergency of any future violation. Accordingly, after discussions with the late President Kennedy, he sent a letter on September 10 to the Congress which I read on the Senate floor.

The letter made the following commitments on a state of readiness for our nuclear weapons program:

Underground nuclear testing, which is permitted under the treaty, will be vigorously and diligently carried forward, and the equipment, facilities, personnel, and funds necessary for that purpose will be provided * * *

The United States will maintain a posture of readiness to resume testing in the environments prohibited by the present treaty * * * in the event there should be an abrogation or violation of any treaty provision * * *

Our facilities for the detection of possible violations of this treaty will be expanded and improved * * * against clandestine violations by others * * *

This Government will maintain strong weapons laboratories in a vigorous program of weapons development in order to insure * * * a strength fully adequate for an effective national defense * * *

There were four other commitments involving freedom to use nuclear weapons for defense, the development of nuclear explosives for peaceful purposes, and guarantees that the treaty could not be used by Cuba or East Germany to enhance their status.

We have no doubt that as the Vice President, Lyndon B. Johnson subscribed to these commitments. With the change of administrations however, we feel that President Johnson could perform a useful service if he would—

(1) Address a communication to the Congress restating the essential commitments, and,

(2) Provide Members of the Congress with a 6-month report on the steps being taken to assure our state of complete readiness, with respect to the current development of weapons, underground tests, and resumption of banned tests if a violation occurs.

Some Members of Congress have questioned whether or not a sufficient portion of the overall defense budget is being expended in this field. It would be reassuring both to the Nation and the world to know the facts.

POVERTY

September 3, 1964

By Representative Halleck

The 1964 Democrat Convention has come and gone and with it the American people now find themselves presented with a political hoax that will go down in history as the year of "plenty amid poverty" and "poverty amid plenty."

Few will forget the maze of oratory, all the way from the President down to the declaimers on the Democrat platform, who in one breath told us we had never had it so good and in the next told us we were surrounded by misery.

It is about time the American people woke up. For 32 years Democrat candidates for President have traded on human misery each election year for political purposes and in the final analysis they have evidently solved nothing in this respect. In 1935 Democrat President Roosevelt told us that with a population of 128 million, one-third, or 43 million, lived in poverty. In 1964, Democrat President Johnson tells us that one-fifth of a 191-million population is living in poverty, a figure not far from 43 million.

In those 32 years the Democrats have controlled Congress 28 of the years and have controlled the White House 24 of the 32 years. Mr. Roosevelt talked about WPA and PWA but the poverty and unemployment continued without abatement until World War II. Mr. Truman talked about "full employment," but poverty and unemployment resumed after World War II until the Korean war. Now Mr. Johnson talks about the "war on poverty" while, according to his own statements, poverty, and unemployment continue.

This is political chicanery at its worst. Billions upon billions of dollars are spent each election year by the Democrats in the name of poverty. But nothing is solved. We only pass more debt onto our children and their children. Is war the Democrats' only solution?

The Democrat National Convention, staged managed from beginning to end, has come and gone, and we and the world are told poverty and unemployment are still with us. We ask a simple question: Why should the Democrats in 1964 get by with 32 years of failure?

September 3, 1964

By Senator Dirksen

For three decades the Democrats every 4 years have issued the "election year tranquilizers"—things are really better, but they are also bad, so elect us and they'll get better. This year we have a whole new array of election year tranquilizer pills—Job Corps, work training programs, work study programs, community action programs, special programs to combat poverty in rural areas, employment and investment incentives, family unity through jobs, Volunteers for America.

My friends, you name it and the Democrats have got it in 1964 if it sounds like it might get a vote—all for a cheap billion dollars of your money. It's called the war on poverty package. And there is not one permanent durable job in the whole phony bundle.

The Democrats can't even get their statistics straight. On April 7, 1960, Democratic Presidential Candidate Kennedy said 17 million

Americans went to bed hungry every night. In January this year, the National Policy Committee on Pockets of Poverty reported 20 million Americans lived in poverty. On January 20, President Johnson put the figure at 35 million—an increase of more than 100 percent in 4 years during all of which a Democratic President occupied the White House and Democrats controlled Congress.

Now Mr. Johnson tells us we are going to eliminate poverty by spending \$1 billion this year. Well, the Federal Government is already spending \$31 billion a year in relieving hardship and the States are spending \$13 billion more—a total of \$44 billion. By adding just \$1 billion more, Mr. Johnson says, we will solve the problem of poverty. Does anyone really believe this?

Of course hardship is a concern of all of us and has been throughout the history of this Nation. That's why we have manpower training, expanded vocational education and scores of other programs to combat distress. It is a cynical business when we are told in an election year that a 1-percent increase in expenditures and a political slogan are going to end poverty.

January 28, 1964

PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

By Representative William E. Miller

In America one of the roles of the opposition party is to keep the political spectrum in balance—

By pointing out truths that otherwise might go unmentioned by the party in power;

By bringing submerged facts into sharper focus that the people may better grasp them.

The Congress has just received President Johnson's State of the Union message, his economic report, and his budget. This is an election year and it is perfectly evident from the tone of these messages that the White House knows it. That is why, as presiding officer of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership and as Republican national chairman, I am participating in this press conference today—to provide some general political observations while Senator Dirksen and Representative Halleck provide the specifics.

To put it in a nutshell, the wheeling and dealing has started, with the most accomplished wheeler-dealer Washington has ever seen, Lyndon B. Johnson, running the show. The New Dealers and Fair Dealers are only memories. Now we have the wheeler dealers.

The big come-on was in these three Presidential messages:

The world is rosy; it just needs more and better coexistence,

The economy is booming if you'll just overlook 4 million unemployed, and

The budget is pretty as a picture, give or take a few billion in juggled figures and a hard-to-cover-up increase in the national debt to \$317 billion or more.

The plain truth is that not a single new idea was presented; most of them are 3 to 30 years old. Only the sales pitch was new. We, as Republicans, have had to put truth squads into the field in the last 3 presidential campaigns so fact could catch up with fast talk. And it is plain that this year we will have to do it again, from now until election day. So let's start today.

July 29, 1964

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership, met today with our colleagues, the Republican presidential candidate, Senator Barry Goldwater, and the Republican vice presidential candidate, Representative William E. Miller. We also welcomed the new Republican national chairman, Dean Burch, who, for the first time, assumed his cofunction of presiding officer of the joint leadership. Certain conclusions were reached which are here recorded:

1. The cooling-off period which always follows a hotly contested national political convention has set in. Republicans are already at work resolving their differences. A united Republican effort in all the 50 States and the District of Columbia will be achieved.

2. The Republican Party starts this campaign cast as the underdog. So be it. However elections are not settled in July, but in November. President Johnson has had the traditional period of grace that good Americans always grant every new Chief Executive. But the period of grace is over. Now he must stand on his own feet, on his own actions, and on his own record. Clever and determined politician though he is, we frankly don't think he can do this and win. We are convinced this Nation is yearning for leadership with strong and deep convictions and a moral fiber that can solve our pressing problems of human relations at home and the ever-spreading cancer of communism abroad.

3. We Republicans are determined to carry the vital issues of our times to the American people in this election year. It will be a positive and forceful campaign. The United States cannot long continue dribbling away its human and material resources and its prestige, without a day of reckoning. We believe the American people know this. The people aren't talking; they are thinking. They will think it through and vote Republican.

Already the political tide is turning in this country. By November it will be running full stream. Federal money, handouts, and double-talk from Washington may temporarily numb the American conscience but they will never extinguish it. A moral reawakening of America is at hand. Let all of us arise to join in it.

September 23, 1964

By Representative Halleck

It must be dawning on the American people that they have a politician in the White House, that political gain is now the way of life in Washington, and that the entire executive branch of the Federal Government is now engaged in trying to get Lyndon B. Johnson elected President. Certainly Washington has never seen anything like it.

The Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, unlike his predecessors, is now in the thick of the campaign battling the Republican nominee almost daily.

The Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, unlike his predecessors, tilts constantly in the campaign arena and the Department of Defense has set up a political press desk just to issue political statements promptly.

The Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, unlike his predecessors, is injecting his own special brand of sarcasm into the

presidential race without regard for what the other delegates to the United Nations may think.

Mr. William C. Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, appears before the Democrat platform committee, and Mr. Sargent Shriver, who runs the Peace Corps, finds ample time to make political speeches attacking the Republican nominee for President.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay discovers his speeches on the need for new weapons censored by the Pentagon, but Adm. Harold Page Smith is free to talk about nuclear weapons because he is attacking Barry Goldwater.

Through it all the Democrat vice-presidential nominee, Hubert Humphrey, sheds large tears about the collapse of bipartisan foreign policy and, of course, blames the Republicans. All we can say is when the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the Disarmament Agency, the Peace Corps, and the U.N. Ambassador become adjuncts of the Democrat National Committee, where is there any room for bipartisan foreign policy?

Yes, folks, we have a politician in the White House.

REAPPORTIONMENT AND THE SUPREME COURT

June 26, 1964

By Senator Dirksen

It has been 175 years since the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, a document never equaled in history in its profound concern for the protection of all the people's rights and interests, whether they are the majority or minority, the great or small, the rich or poor.

The Constitution achieved its near millenium in government by establishing a Federal system of States under a tripartite National Government of carefully limited powers, with all other authority residing in the States. One of its wondrous features was modeled on a constitutional practice of certain States themselves—a legislative body divided into two branches, one, the Senate, based on geographic representation, the other, the House of Representatives, based on population. It represents one of the delicate balances which brought about the union of the States.

Last week, the Supreme Court handed down a 6-to-3 decision declaring that "the equal protection clause requires that the seats in both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned on a population basis." In a dissenting opinion Justice Stewart said the decision "finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of Our Federal Union." The majority opinion embraces the so-called one person, one vote doctrine.

What's next under this Court's logic?

Will it be the U.S. Senate, where today 26 States having only 16 percent of the population could exercise a 52-to-48 majority if they chose?

Will it be the electoral college system, under which one New York City precinct casting less than a thousand votes could nullify the electoral vote of 12 States for President of the United States.

What happens to our Federal system now that, as Justice Harlan said, "the amending power," reserved to the Congress and the States, has been usurped by the Supreme Court? Of course, abuses of geographic representation exist in some State legislatures and should be remedied, but is this the way to do it? We say emphatically "No."

Clearly it is up to Congress to examine this whole question. We Republicans intend to take the lead.

June 26, 1964

By Representative Halleck

For the past week since the Supreme Court's decision on apportionment of State legislatures, Republicans have been working on a proposed constitutional amendment to nullify the edict. We have done so in the conviction that sober examination of the facts points directly to the existence of a constitutional crisis.

The issue can be stated simply. If the Supreme Court, with neither clear constitutional language nor precedents to guide it, can upset 175 years of legislative tradition in unmistakable violation of rights specifically vested in the States, then what is the future of the historic Federal-State relationship in these United States?

Some 44 of the 50 States must revise their legislative apportionment to comply with this decision based on a sentence in the 14th amendment which Justice Harlan, in a dissenting opinion, showed by exhaustive historical citation, was never intended to be applied in such fashion.

The Founding Fathers, by their determination that the membership of the U.S. Senate be geographic, evidently thought highly of the system that has been upset by the Court's decision.

As Justice Stewart said:

What the Court has done is to convey a particular political philosophy into a constitutional rule, binding upon each of the 50 States * * * without regard and without respect for the many individualized and differentiated characteristics of each State * * * stemming from distinct history, distinct geography, distinct distribution of population and distinct political heritage.

Does not the majority decision potentially challenge the very foundation of municipal and county government? It is a question that confronts us.

We Republicans believe the historic geographic population legislative balance which has protected minority rights and interests for 175 years should be maintained. We intend to support a constitutional amendment if necessary to rectify the Supreme Court's decision.

SPENDING

March 12, 1964

By Representative Halleck

As everyone knows, 1964 is a presidential election year. Lights are supposedly being turned off in the White House, budget figures are being juggled to make a bad fiscal picture look rosy, and "paper" reductions are being made in the Federal payroll.

In his last press conference, President Johnson announced that he has cut Federal civilian employment "6,526 below the budget estimate for the current fiscal year and 7,265 below the estimate for the fiscal year starting July 1."

We think this statement should be put in proper perspective.

The fact is, according to President Johnson's own revised budget figures, the Federal payroll by next July 1 will have increased by 15,000 employees compared to the same date a year ago. This is like the little woman greeting you at the door with the announcement she has just "saved" you \$7 by buying a \$15 hat instead of a \$22 one—you are still out \$15.

But this is not the whole picture by any means. It is a further fact that much of the so-called reduction is only a trick in Government bookkeeping. It simply increases the number of people hired on "contract" by the Government which means they are not counted as Federal employees although they are hired, directed, and paid by the Government. The Air Force, to cite one example, is increasing its contract employees by 2,628 for the next fiscal year.

Finally, we think the American taxpayer is entitled to a base of comparison. Even assuming that everything has been cut as stated, the cold fact is that the Federal payroll by the end of the current fiscal year will have been increased by 133,000 employees by the Kennedy-Johnson administrations since President Eisenhower left office. A Republican President and a Republican Congress would show the country some real economy by making real cuts—not in pennies but in billions of dollars.

May 26, 1964

By Representative Halleck

Probably the greatest hoax perpetrated on the American people since Franklin D. Roosevelt promised in 1932 to cut the Federal budget 25 percent is the current "snow job" picturing President Johnson as a disciple of "economy" in Government. Here are a few facts:

For the first 3 months he was in office, President Johnson spent more money than any President in history—\$24.3 billion. This is \$2 billion greater than the late President Kennedy's peak quarter—\$22.3 billion (December-February 1962-63).

President Johnson is currently spending \$2 million a day more than President Kennedy and \$50 million more a day than former President Eisenhower.

President Johnson is actually spending \$99.9 billion this current fiscal year but is hiding \$1.6 billion of the spending by selling federally held mortgages and other assets to private investors so the spending

won't show in the budget. For the next fiscal year President Johnson will actually spend the alltime record amount, in peace or war, of \$100 billion but hopes to hide \$2.3 billion of it by a similar disposal of Government assets.

President Johnson has requested from Congress appropriations for the next fiscal year starting July 1 greater than President Kennedy or any other President ever demanded or received from the legislative branch in its history.

Despite all the publicity about turning off lights in the White House and reducing the Federal payroll, Mr. Johnson's so-called reductions have been unmasked by Senator Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, who wrote the President last week that he noted the Federal payroll had been reduced by 14,848 employees on temporary public works projects but only by 845 elsewhere.

Finally, Mr. Johnson has boasted to the press that Congress is "finding that our budget requests did not contain any padding," despite the fact that the House of Representatives—thanks to a Republican task force—has already cut more than \$3 billion out of his requests and we are not through yet.

If any further proof of the "snow job" is needed, let it come from Secretary of Treasury Dillon who only yesterday asked Congress to increase the Federal debt limit from 8309 billion as of June 30 to \$324 billion for the coming year, an increase of \$15 billion to take care of Mr. Johnson's "red ink" spending. As P. T. Barnum said, "There's a sucker born every minute."

VIETNAM

April 21, 1964

By Representative Halleck

The American-supported war in South Vietnam against the Communist guerrillas from North Vietnam now involves 15,000 American military personnel and \$1.5 million a day additional in direct military aid.

Although the American public is repeatedly assured that our servicemen are there only as instructors, there is mounting evidence that many of them are engaged in actual offensive warfare. The growing American casualty lists are part of the evidence:

In 1963, Americans killed, wounded, or missing in Vietnam totaled 503, or an average of 42 a month.

In the first 103 days of this year (January 1 to April 12), 31 Americans have been killed, 276 wounded, and 2 are missing. This is an average of 91 a month, or twice the American casualty rate of last year.

Last month a 27-year-old graduate of the University of Notre Dame and the father of four children, U.S. Air Force Capt. Edwin G. Shank, Jr., of Winamac, Ind., was killed in Vietnam. Following his death, his widow made public his letters to her.

"I'll bet you," he wrote her on January 20:

that anyone you talk to does not know that American pilots fight this war. * * * The Vietnamese "students" we have on board are airmen basics [recruits] * * *

The only reason they are on board is, in case we crash, there is one American "adviser" and one Vietnamese "student." They are * * * sacrificial lambs * * * and they are a menace to have on board.

In a buried paragraph in an April 14 dispatch from Saigon, the New York Times reported that "the majority of [casualties] * * * occur among American airmen who fly most of the combat planes of the Vietnamese Air Force and among pilots and crewmen of U.S. helicopters that fly Vietnamese troops into battle or serve as airborne gun and rocket platforms."

In 1961, when the late President Kennedy called congressional leaders to the White House to tell us American military personnel were being sent to Vietnam, I said to him that it looked as if some American boys were going to get killed and if they were, the administration had better get the country ready for it.

If American servicemen are actually engaged in warfare in Vietnam, why shouldn't the American people know it? Certainly the Communist guerrillas know what the facts are.

The American people have always shouldered the burdens of warfare, but they have done it best when they have known the truth. We believe the facts should be put on the table face up.

The following excerpts from the letters of the late Air Force Capt. Edwin G. (Jerry) Shank, Jr. of Winamac, Ind., to his wife and family were issued with Representative Haleck's statement of April 21, 1964.

December 14, 1963

The war is quiet because the Viet Cong are quiet but they'll pop up again soon. The funny thing is—I know, we know—everybody knows where some Viet Cong concentrations are but they won't let us hit until the Viet Cong start something. What a war—I just don't understand it. We're fighting a defensive war—and one of the oldest laws of war is that the best defense is a strong offense.

December 16, 1963

The Viet Cong sure give them a rough time. The Viet Cong are kind of a Mafia. They terrorize and then they sell "insurance" so that the people will not be harmed again. They strike especially villages where Americans have been seen. They terrorize these villages then blame it on Americans by saying: "If Americans hadn't come to your village we would not have plundered and killed, so if you don't want it to happen again pay us money and don't let Americans into your village."

January 7, 1964

Morale is at a big low over here, especially among the combat crews * * * [we] lost two guys today. One was a pretty good friend of mine * * * the only guess is the airplane just came apart.

January 8, 1964

I don't know what the United States is doing. They tell you people we're just in a training situation and they try to run us as a training base. But we're at war, we are doing the flying and fighting. We are losing. Morale is very bad.

We ask if we couldn't fly an American flag over here. The answer was "No." They say the Viet Cong will get pictures of it and make bad propaganda. Let them. Let them know America is in it. If they'd only give us good American airplanes with the U.S. insignia on them and really tackle this war we could possibly win. If we keep up like we are going we will definitely lose. I'm not being pessimistic. It's so obvious I'm surprised they can keep the lie going in the United States. How our Government can lie to its own people—it's something you wouldn't think a democratic government could do.

January 18, 1964

The Vietnamese T-28 pilots used to come down here to Soc Trang and fly missions. Lately, since we've been getting shot so much, they moved up north. I kid you not. [A friend] worked with them for a while. Here is what they told him. First they didn't want to come to Soc Trang 'cause their families couldn't come; second, because they didn't get enough per diem; third, 'cause they didn't want to get shot at. There were a couple more reasons but I can't remember them. These are the people we're supposed to be helping.

January 20, 1964

I'll bet you that anyone you talk to does not know that American pilots fight this war * * * The Vietnamese "students" we have on board are airmen basics (recruits) * * * The only reason they are on board is, in case we crash, there is one American "adviser" and one Vietnamese "student." They are * * * sacrificial lambs * * * and they are a menace to have on board.

February 21, 1964

[We lost] two airplanes in 2 days * * * Not only that, the B-26's have been grounded since Monday 'cause the wings came off one again at Hurlburt (Air Force base in Florida). So after the last crash the whole U.S. Air Force fighter force is down to six airplanes * * * Rumor now is that B-26's will fly again only with greater restrictions. If I lose another friend because of that old airplane I'm going to start writing letters to Charlie Halleck * * * [the] poor B-26 jocks are really shook. That airplane is a killer.

March 13, 1964

McNamara (Secretary of Defense) was here * * * with his screwed-up bunch of people—we call them McNamara's Band * * * He did send a representative over here. This man is somewhere in the Kennedy clan and had a Ph. D. All he did was thoroughly [upset] the troops. One of our complaints was that we can't understand the [Vietnamese] air controllers. So he suggested we learn Vietnamese—we said we didn't have that much time so he suggested we stay here for 2 years. A brilliant man—he is lucky to be alive. Some of the guys honestly had to be held back from beating the idiot up.

Captain Shank wrote his last letter home on March 22. He mentioned that he had more than 80 missions, but mainly he wrote of how much he hoped he would get home in June to see his new daughter for the first time. He was killed the next day.

May 25, 1964

By Senator Dirksen

It is clear that the military situation in Vietnam is deteriorating which, coupled with Communist moves in Laos and Cambodia, constitutes a grave threat to all southeast Asia. It is also clear that while the Johnson administration falters in indecision, the United States is a party to another treadmill conflict that parallels the experience of the Korean war of a dozen years ago.

An examination of the record of American policy statements on Vietnam over the past 2 years offers an insight to the continuous setbacks we have suffered in southeast Asia.

On April 30, 1962, Under Secretary of State Ball said we faced a "long, slow arduous" war in Vietnam. Three hundred and fifty-eight days later (April 22, 1963) Secretary of State Rusk repeated the warning declaring no "quick" victory could be expected. Nevertheless, as if to counteract news reports that the war was going badly, the White House publicly announced 163 days later (October 2, 1963) that the United States would withdraw 1,000 American troops in the next 3 months, and a "major" portion by the end of 1965.

Seventy-nine days later (December 20, 1963) the troop withdrawal policy was abandoned when Secretary of Defense McNamara assured Saigon that American military personnel would "stay as long as needed," a position reemphasized by President Johnson in a subsequent statement (January 1, 1964).

Notwithstanding these policy declarations, Secretary McNamara was telling Congress 28 days later (January 29, 1964) that he still hoped for the troop withdrawal by the end of 1965. Two weeks ago the tune had changed again with Mr. McNamara declaring the Vietnam war "will be long, hard and very difficult" and "we should not delude ourselves into thinking it won't." Now Secretary of State Rusk this past weekend has warned the Communists that if they continue their aggressions the United States may "expand the war."

If, as is evident, it is difficult for Americans to understand this vacillating American policy, how demoralizing it must be for the Vietnamese. We only know that indecision in Washington is dribbling away both American lives and American prestige in southeast Asia. We think the time has come for President Johnson to announce a firm policy and pursue it with vigor.

June 11, 1964

By Representative Halleck

We are seriously disturbed by repeated reports in responsible newspapers that the Johnson administration is postponing a decision on the war in Vietnam until after election day next November.

This has twice been reported by the New York Times whose highly

respected columnist Arthur Krock wrote in the May 24 issue that President Johnson fears the election campaign could "require him to make the fateful decision he hopes to postpone until after election day." In the same issue a Washington story on Vietnam described the administration as "moving with the usual caution of an election year though many here doubt that the critical choices in southeast Asia can be put off until November."

The Washington Post on June 1 reported from Saigon that the Vietnamese think there will be increased action this year "but say it will stop short of a direct challenge that might force the United States to take some face-saving action it would prefer to avoid during an election year." The story also reported that a Vietnamese paper, the Saigon Post, in a front-page editorial had "noted that the Communist Viet Cong rebels are not hampered by any election campaign and concluded that 'what is worse, they damned well know we have our hands tied until November.'"

The Washington Star has reported (May 15) that no decision will be made until "December or later," while the New York Times (June 2) covering the Honolulu conference on Vietnam said "officials hope now to stretch over a longer period of time a program of less dramatic political and military moves" in South Vietnam.

Two weeks ago the Joint Senate-House Republican Leadership declared "indecision in Washington is dribbling away both American lives and American prestige in southeast Asia." If this indecision is based on the politics of an election year, as the press is indicating, the Johnson administration must be prepared to answer for it. We think all Americans will support a firm policy in Vietnam, but they will never tolerate an election year gamble that could endanger the American position in the entire Far East.

July 2, 1964

By Representative Halleck

The history of this country shows that when the administration in power pursues a strong foreign policy then there is strong bipartisan support for that policy. Recent examples include the Truman Greek-Turkish policy which the Republican 80th Congress supported without stint and the Eisenhower policy in the Formosan, the Suez, and the Lebanon crises which had the backing of Democratic Congresses.

The question has now arisen: Will the Johnson administration's conduct of affairs in Vietnam be an issue in the 1964 presidential campaign?

For a year now the military situation in Vietnam has deteriorated steadily, despite the presence of more than 15,000 American military personnel on the scene in "advisory" or "training" roles. The United States to date has suffered approximately a thousand casualties with those killed exceeding 240, more than half of whom died in actual combat.

That the deterioration is political, as well as military, is evidenced by the fact there have been three different governments in South Vietnam in 9 months, two of which fell to military coups. The morale of both the Vietnamese and American forces has fallen, a fact made

clear both by reports of American news correspondents and the mail home from our own fighting men.

And what is the administration's policy? President Johnson's utterances have fluctuated all the way from declaring neutralization of North and South Vietnam "would be considered sympathetically" to stating the United States would "risk war" to achieve our goals in South Vietnam. Secretary of Defense McNamara has twice reversed himself on statements that the United States would pull out its forces by the end of 1965. Contradictions, confusion, and vacillation abound.

In the responsible American and Vietnamese press there has been open speculation that the Johnson administration is avoiding a decision until after the presidential election here in November while we go on dribbling away both American lives and American prestige in a "no win" war in southeast Asia.

Thus the answer to the question is plain: The lack of policy in Vietnam will be a campaign issue this year because President Johnson's indecision has made it one. So the people will make it one.

August 20, 1964

By Senator Dirksen

American retaliation in the Bay of Tonkin affair apparently now is history; the Congress—with unanimous Republican approval—has passed a resolution of support for "all necessary measures" to protect southeast Asia against Communist aggression, but the war in Vietnam continues to go from bad to worse.

More and more the Vietnam conflict is beginning to resemble the incredible "no win" war fought in Korea more than a decade ago. One by one the tragic mistakes of Korea are being repeated in South Vietnam.

As in Korea, a treadmill policy emanates from Washington. As in Korea, the Communists wage warfare from a "privileged sanctuary." As in Korea, when the "no win" policy encouraged the Red Chinese to enter the conflict, today North Vietnam has twice attacked American naval vessels in international waters, and, since June, North Vietnam troops have been entering the conflict. As in Korea, American lives, resources, and prestige are going down the drain without so much as a victory target in Vietnam.

As of August 12, the official Washington figures on American casualties since January 1961 total more than 1,300—of whom 263 have been killed, 179 in combat. Billions of dollars have been spent and the cost is mounting daily. Yet despite all that has been staked in American blood and resources, the Communists continue to win victories in South Vietnam.

The time has come to ask a blunt question: Why?

Certainly the confusion and contradictions in policy in Washington are a major part of the answer. For example:

Secretary of State Rusk has talked about "an expanded war." President Johnson has stated that the United States would risk war to save South Vietnam. But when the South Vietnamese Government proclaimed a "march to the north" policy, President Johnson promptly disavowed it.

Plainly, if this administration doesn't want an expanded war, then it should quit talking about one. In fact, it is about time the administration decided what it does want to do in southeast Asia and then do it. The American people will support—as they did the Bay of Tonkin action—any necessary effort to thwart Communist aggression if a clear-cut objective is set and then vigorously pursued.

August 20, 1964

By Representative Halleck

We believe that part of the confusion over American policy on Vietnam can be attributed to a basic defect in the Johnson administration—it has one eye on the presidential election in November, instead of both eyes on the affairs of this Nation.

For example, there can be little doubt that the treadmill policy in South Vietnam is due to the administration's desire to postpone a decision on southeast Asia until after the election. Responsible American newspapers have said so; Vietnamese newspapers have said so. No one has disputed it.

But to make things look better in an election year, it has been announced that 5,000 more American military personnel are being sent to Vietnam. More lives and resources risked, but the treadmill policy hasn't changed.

However, the election year sleight of hand doesn't stop there.

When the Republican presidential candidate, Senator Barry Goldwater, last month pointed out that not a single new weapons system had been developed since President Eisenhower left office, President Johnson promptly announced on July 24 "the successful development of a major new strategic manned aircraft system"—the SR-71. Evidently Mr. Johnson had forgotten that last February he announced an earlier version of the plane, only at that time he correctly attributed the aircraft's origin to the Eisenhower administration in 1959.

In addition, there still has been no satisfactory explanation why President Johnson announced on TV at 11:36 p.m., August 4, our Bay of Tonkin counterattack an hour and a half before our planes were over target. This provided a probable alert to North Vietnamese antiaircraft guncrews before our planes arrived, two of which were shot down with one pilot dead, the other missing. Of course, had the President waited, network stations in the eastern time zone would have been off the air and his audience greatly reduced. But it is noteworthy that only a few hours earlier congressional leaders, including Senator Dirksen and me, were sworn to secrecy and told by President Johnson there would be no announcement of the airstrike until our pilots were over the target.

Perhaps this Nation's national defense is fair game for election year liberties. It certainly was in 1960 when we heard so much about a nonexistent "missile gap." But we suggest that the American people want less politics and more truth, and, believe me, we intend to give them the truth.

○