

A RECORD OF PRESS CONFERENCE  
STATEMENTS

MADE BY

SENATOR EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

AND

REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD

FOR

THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP  
OF THE CONGRESS



PRESENTED BY MR. DIRKSEN

OCTOBER 10 (legislative day, OCTOBER 9), 1968.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1968

## THE REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP OF THE CONGRESS

### FOR THE SENATE

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Leader  
THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Whip  
BOURKE S. HICKENLOOPER, Chairman of  
the Policy Committee  
MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Chairman of the  
Conference  
GEORGE MURPHY, Chairman of the Repub-  
lican Senatorial Committee  
MILTON R. YOUNG, Secretary of the Conference  
HUGH SCOTT, Vice Chairman, Republican  
Senatorial Committee

### FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

GERALD R. FORD, Leader  
LESLIE C. ARENS, Whip  
MELVIN R. LAIRD, Chairman of the Conference  
JOHN J. RHODES, Chairman of the Policy Com-  
mittee  
H. ALLEN SMITH, Ranking Member, Rules  
Committee  
BOB WILSON, Chairman, Republican Congres-  
sional Committee  
CHARLES E. GOODELL, Chairman, Committee  
on Planning and Research  
RICHARD H. POFF, Secretary of the Conference  
WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Vice Chairman of the  
Conference

### PRESIDING OFFICER

RAY C. BLISS, Republican National Chairman

(11)

## FOREWORD

The Republican Leadership of the Congress—its membership listed on the preceding page—meets regularly throughout each Congressional session and periodically issues statements of position and opinion on matters of interest and concern to the public and the party.

In addition, the Leadership meets quarterly with the Republican Coordinating Committee, the organization representative of national Party leadership and action which it created in 1965, to compose and publish "task force reports" of similar but more detailed nature.

The following pages contain the texts of the statements of the Republican Leadership of the Congress as presented in nationally reported press conferences during 1968 and printed here as a Senate document.

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Credibility (February 29).....	1
Defense (July 18).....	2
The Farm Problem (March 14).....	4
Federal Spending and Taxation (February 21).....	5
Foreign Policy (July 18).....	7
Law and Order (June 13, September 12).....	8
The Middle East (May 3).....	11
The Republican Party (September 12).....	12

## CREDIBILITY

February 29, 1968

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

For 4 long, costly years the American people have been plagued by growing, gnawing doubts—

Doubt that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration understands the nature and the enormity of our multiple domestic problems—

Doubt that this Administration comprehends the scope and viciousness of individual and organized crime in the United States—

Doubt that this Administration is at all aware of the housewife's dreadful dilemma as living costs continue to rise every day—

Doubt that this Administration is doing anything whatever—in practical, visible, meaningful ways—to solve the frightening problems of our cities—

Doubt that this Administration is qualified to control rioting and strife in our streets—

Doubt that this Administration appreciates the impossible economic position into which it has forced the American farmer—

Doubt that this Administration knows the meaning and menace of the mounting Federal deficit and overwhelming national debt—

Doubt that this Administration has any awareness whatever of the degree to which the dollar has been weakened, both at home and abroad—

Doubt that this Administration understands the meaning of the word "inflation" and how it has been brought about by its own wasteful, needless spending on every front—

Doubt that this Administration realizes that we cannot *spend* our way *out* of poverty or *into* prosperity—

Doubt that this Administration sees the effect of its suffocation of State and local leadership and personal self-reliance—

Doubt that this Administration cares at all about clean elections, the only means available for insuring good and responsible government—

Doubt that this Administration knows the vital need for telling our people the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth—

Doubt that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration realizes the rapid rate at which we are hurtling into fearful danger at home and abroad.

Therefore, Mr. President, our Question-of-the-Week:

TODAY DOUBT—  
TOMORROW DISASTER?

February 29, 1968

By Senator Dirksen:

This growing, gnawing doubt that has so plagued our people for so long extends to problems and perils far beyond our borders.

Doubt that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration realizes the dangers we face in spreading our forces and our resources so widely, so thinly, around the world—

Doubt that this Administration has foreseen, or now sees, the extent of the disintegration of NATO—

Doubt that this Administration appreciates the degree of disaffection on the part of our one-time friends and allies—

Doubt that this Administration knows how to prevent local conflicts from escalating into World War III—

Doubt that this Administration is qualified to solve predictable international crises without war—

Doubt that this Administration understands that the only thing the world respects is moral and military strength—

Doubt that this Administration's insistence upon ever greater foreign aid is wise or practical—

Doubt that this Administration is capable of administering properly the billions we have poured into the Alliance for Progress—

Doubt that this Administration is equipped to prevent the rapid drain of our gold to nations abroad—

Doubt that this Administration is qualified to defend the dollar against the mounting attacks upon it—

Doubt that this Administration's passion for "building bridges" with Red nations bent upon our destruction makes any sense at all—

Doubt that this Administration has any even remote understanding of the extent and degree to which our position and prestige throughout the world have been weakened and demeaned—

Doubt that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration, bankrupt in foreign policy and bogged down in foreign war, can prevent future crises anywhere, or, most importantly, end the conflict in Viet Nam.

Therefore, Mr. President, our Question-of-the-Week:

### TODAY DOUBT— TOMORROW DISASTER?

---

#### DEFENSE

*July 18, 1968*

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

The defense of the Nation is the first duty of any Administration. In this, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is failing the American people. Its shortsighted and wishful defense policies, unless promptly reversed, may expose our country to grave danger in the decade ahead.

General Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has said that "The growth of Soviet nuclear power and the trend of certain defense policies combine to make me anxious about the Nation's future capacity for survival."

When Admiral Rickover, father of our nuclear submarine fleet, was asked by members of the Senate Armed Services Committee whether he would today more confidently command the American or the Soviet submarine force he answered instantly: "The Soviet submarine force."

Many professional military leaders believe our Nation will even-

tually be imperiled by recent and present defense policies. In this era of increasingly sophisticated and complex technology, the leadtime of most weapons systems exceeds the Constitutional limit on Presidential tenure. Thus, ironically, the farsighted defense decisions of the Eisenhower Administration provide our margin of safety today. But where will we stand in the 1970's if we continue the Johnson-Humphrey Administration policies?

President Eisenhower sought peace through a defense posture second to none, the traditional American concept. He was able to bring peace to Korea and his successor was able to avert war in the Cuban missile crisis because the United States still had clear strategic superiority. But the Johnson-Humphrey Administration over the past 5 years has:

1. Curtailed expansion of our long-range strategic missile force.
2. Watched in bewilderment as the Russians have doubled the number of their intercontinental ballistic missiles in 1 year.
3. Ended big bomber production, reduced our existing force, refused to approve an advanced, manned strategic bomber, and wasted time and resources on development of the TFX aircraft, that, as experts predicted, proved totally unsuitable for Navy use.
4. Delayed the improvement of our nuclear Navy, permitted the Soviet Union rapidly to close the gap in nuclear-powered submarines and allowed the Russians to establish and expand their fleets in the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean.
5. Halfheartedly, under heavy pressure from Republicans and concerned Democrats in the Congress, agreed to the deployment of a thin antiballistic missile defense for the protection of our people.
6. Weakened our ability to respond to emergency situations such as the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* by concentrating attention on Viet Nam and spreading other available forces, at high risk, too thinly around the world. (This is the 178th day since the *Pueblo*'s seizure.)
7. Allowed the American merchant marine to shrink into virtual insignificance and avoided adoption of a comprehensive maritime strategy and program at the very time the Soviets are stepping up theirs.
8. Diluted and dissipated the successful and prudent posture of seeking peace through strength, which had been bipartisan American policy since World War II, to the point where Soviet spokesmen are openly claiming strategic parity as the price of peace.

It is highly significant that Soviet Communist Party Chief Brezhnev recently assailed the Republican Coordinating Committee's endorsement of the doctrine of strategic superiority for the United States. Brezhnev said the Soviet Union would "remain vigilant, increase its military preparedness and 'keep our powder dry'."

The next U.S. Administration must be equally diligent to keep America's powder dry, to insure our long-range survival through adequate defense planning. The Johnson-Humphrey defense policies have demonstrably failed to face up to the realities of peace and security in a perilous world. They have left us with a genuine and growing strategic capability gap that must be closed quickly.

## THE FARM PROBLEM

March 14, 1968

By Senator Dirksen:

Just a year ago this month, we emphasized that the American farmer has again become "the victim of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's double-edged sword: a new record-high in farm operating costs—a near-record low in farm prices—and, we repeat, with no real benefit received by the American consumer." That statement is even more harshly accurate than it was in March of 1967. The American farmer and his family are being crushed between the hammer and anvil of soaring costs and plummeting prices. They can look for no help whatever from this Administration.

No wonder farmers are leaving the farms. Since 1960, some 4 million farmers have left their farms.

By this date a year ago, Republicans in both House and Senate had introduced more than 50 bills designed first to check and then to remedy the damage being done the farmer and the consumer by the Johnson-Humphrey cost-price squeeze and by its open door policy for agricultural imports. Not one of those Republican recommendations has been given even passing consideration. We can only conclude that they have been stamped at the White House "N.I.H."—not invented here—and promptly thrown into the circular file.

But the damage to America's biggest business—agriculture—continues to mount and the distress of America's farm families becomes more acute every day. In alarmed reaction to it, the Administration has recommended to the Congress a 7-point plan to "bring new prosperity to rural America," no single feature of which is new and no one of which offers any real help or hope to our Nation's embattled farmers. For they are indeed embattled in an economic struggle they cannot hope to win without bold, imaginative, commonsense leadership—the kind they have yet to see in the Johnson-Humphrey Administration.

Therefore, Mr. President, our Question-of-the-Week:

Are you REALLY trying to help America's farmers?

March 14, 1968

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

The war in Viet Nam—the soaring cost of living—reckless, wasteful Federal Government spending—Federal fiscal and monetary policies that are blind or willful or both—rocketing interest rates—and the credibility of this Administration on these and every other issue—these are the terrifying problems that face every American family and none with greater menace than to the family on the farm.

The impact of inflation and of ever higher interest rates can be pinpointed at once as the principal causes of the sky-high operating costs our farmers face today, as they have for 4 long years. For instance, in 1967 the net real income for each American farm dropped \$605 below the average for 1966. At the same time, the average net indebtedness of the American farmer increased by \$1,337 per farm. So, on the average, American farmers fell behind by almost \$2,000 last year.

Furthermore, the inept production and marketing policies of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration must take chief blame for the

near-rock-bottom prices the farmer receives. Only as these policies are changed and these policymakers replaced can the American farm regain its rightful, profitable place in the economy.

The corrective and constructive proposals made over many months by the Republicans in Congress have, as Senator Dirksen notes, been wholly ignored. They can no longer be! Not in partisan, political interest but in that of the most productive and essential industry we have—America's agriculture. Nothing yet proposed, or imposed, by this Administration has helped in the least. To the contrary, many of the policies of the Administration have been decidedly harmful. There *must* be a better way! Believe me, there *is*!

Therefore, Mr. President, our Question-of-the-Week:

Are you REALLY trying to help America's farmers?

---

#### FEDERAL SPENDING AND TAXATION

February 21, 1968

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

Let there be no mistake about it! The House of Representatives will not—I repeat, not—consider the tax surcharge proposal that has been made by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration without an equal, or greater, immediate reduction in nonessential Federal expenditures.

The overwhelming deficit with which we are faced, *certain to be far larger than the \$8 billion estimated by the Administration*, makes a sharp and prompt and massive reduction in these nonessential expenditures imperative. The American people will not stand for anything less!

In addition to the proposed tax surcharge, the Administration has now presented its proposed tax on travel. On this, Senator Dirksen will comment. I share his views completely.

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration's philosophy, practices, and policies seem to have a single theme—tax and tax, spend and spend. We think there is a far better solution to these now overwhelming economic problems which have plagued us for so many months.

The President himself repeatedly places emphasis, with great pride, on the *spending* record of his Administration. He claimed, most recently, that in 1960 the Administration spent \$3 billion for Government training programs, that in 1964 this rose to \$4 billion, that this year it will be \$12 billion.

In 1960, he boasts, Federal programs for the poor totaled only \$9 billion, whereas in 1964, his first year as President, it rose to \$12 billion and now totals \$28 billion.

In 1960 he points out that Federal spending for health, education, and welfare totaled \$19 billion, then in 1964 rose to \$23 billion and this year will reach \$47 billion.

If these massive expenditures had produced—or were now producing—real results for our people no one would question them. But, the fact is, they have not and there is no indication whatever that they will.

In each of these areas Republicans have proposed alternatives—with private enterprise directing them—that would produce far better results for far less money.

Tax and tax, spend and spend—with no apparent interest in competent management of these programs, many of which have proved disastrous. Tax and tax, spend and spend—with no evident concern about the enormous squandering of the people's dollars which every day, more and more, are strewn along this Administration's reckless course.

Therefore, Mr. President, our Question-of-the-Week:

Tax and Tax?

Spend and Spend?

February 21, 1968

By Senator Dirksen:

Let there be no mistake about it! The Senate and, I suspect, the House, will *not* approve the travel tax proposal as presented by this Administration.

That proposal, conceived in error and haste, contains so many weaknesses and loopholes as to be both unacceptable and unworkable.

The road to utter confusion, like that to a better known place, is often paved with good intentions. This appears painfully true of this proposal.

In the first place, the alleged statistics on travel and travel expenditures, on which the proposal is based, can be and have been, seriously questioned. The President's own Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel report reveals, in the opinion of expert observers, a shocking degree of error as to what those expenditures really are. Indeed, it concludes that, in several important categories, the actual travel balance results *favorably* for the United States.

Second, this travel tax is quite unlikely to achieve the purposes intended. The well-to-do will not be affected, nor will students quietly subsidized by their parents.

Those seriously affected by this proposal are—as always—the middle-income taxpayers, to whom this travel tax would represent a minimum of 15-percent increase in the cost of travel, a mountain of paperwork, and a severe restriction on personal freedom.

Third, it is very doubtful that this travel taxation will reduce our balance-of-payments deficit in any significant way. If the Administration *really* wants to save millions, if not billions, of dollars now flowing overseas so liberally it can (1) reduce selectively our heavy troop-and-dependent commitments in areas where not needed, (2) cancel all unnecessary Government travel, (3) practice old-fashioned American thrift at home by cutting back by hundreds of millions of dollars the many nonessential Federal expenditures that so plague and weaken us.

Finally, our present and rather pallid program for attracting *foreign* tourists funds *into* this country could well be given a vigorous and imaginative shot in the arm.

Taxing good and honest Americans in yet another painful and pointless way, while restricting their freedom of movement at the very same time, is not—I repeat, not—the way to bring our overseas deficit into proper balance.

Therefore, Mr. President, our Question-of-the-Week:

Tax and Tax?

Spend and Spend?

#### FOREIGN POLICY

*July 18, 1968*

By Senator Dirksen:

The defense of the Nation is not alone a matter of military force. It depends also upon foreign policies realistic in concept and unflinching in spirit.

All around the globe we see our foreign policies in disarray.

In Western Europe there is growing distrust of the United States and dismay as to the future. NATO, freedom's shield on that continent, has been allowed virtually to disintegrate. In the Middle East indecision alienates our friends and heartens our enemies, and Russian diplomatic and military—especially naval—power has moved into the vacuum the Administration has permitted there.

In Latin America, the Administration's fumbling with the alleged "Alliance for Progress" proves it to be neither an alliance of promise nor one capable of progress in present hands.

The dangerously disturbed state of affairs almost everywhere alarms us with good reason, for we fail to see in this Administration's policies, practices, and philosophy any hope of solution for it.

By way of vivid example, we have hoped for months for Administration support of the atomic desalinization plan placed before it long ago by Americans of unquestioned eminence and ability and enthusiastically endorsed by thousands of citizens around the world.

The Middle East is again a powder keg immensely dangerous to world peace. Even so, the Administration continues to maintain that this extraordinary atomic project for peace, which promises to replace ancient hatreds with hope in the Eastern Mediterranean, is "not politically feasible."

This we cannot accept. The proposal is a thoughtful, practical initiative for peace without parallel in recent years. It might well restore stability in that tormented region. We strongly urge the adoption of that Eisenhower-Strauss proposal at the earliest possible moment.

The improved military capability of Arab nations with French and Soviet planes and weapons has created a power imbalance in the Middle East which is dangerous to peace. It can be corrected only if this Nation will make available suitable and necessary weapons and F-4 Phantom jet planes to the Republic of Israel.

The defense of this Nation is tied as surely to statesmanlike economic proposals as it is to military hardware. We serve neither America nor mankind with sanity by ignoring them.

We repeat that the defense of our Nation is the first duty of this Administration. It is clear and alarming that this primary responsibility is not being met.

June 13, 1968

By Senator Dirksen:

In 1776, it will be 200 years that this good land became a new nation. It began with but 3 million people. Today it exceeds 200 million. The basic law under which it was launched as a Republic not only created a structure of government but also recited the purposes for which the Constitution was ordained. Among those purposes was the establishment of justice and the insurance of domestic tranquillity.

Save for the long civil strife more than a century ago, the refinement and expansion of justice has gone forward and domestic tranquillity has been preserved.

During most of those two centuries authority has been respected, the laws have been generally obeyed and enforced, human life has been protected and safeguarded, a feeling of security has prevailed, and the right of private property has been upheld. Ours has been a good history.

But, in our time, something has happened.

Authority is challenged. The burning of draft cards, the seizure of school administration offices, the riotous rupture of peace in the cities—all are challenges to authority.

The law has been flouted. Riots in cities large and small, the ghastly increase in serious crime, all these attest to disobedience to law and the inadequacy of enforcement.

The sanctity of human life is so callously disdained. A young President is shot down. A young Senator is shot down. A nonviolent Christian crusader is shot down. Each year there are thousands of murders and homicides.

Private property rights are ignored by the robber, the looter, and the arsonist.

Too much of the language of today is uncouth and un-American. "Burn, baby, burn!" becomes a slogan; "Get guns!" becomes an arrogant war cry.

A brooding insecurity arouses the fears of the citizenry.

The flag is deliberately desecrated at home and abroad. There is doubt that we really are "One nation, under God, indivisible."

The Nation has paid a terrible price in lives, in peace of mind, in haunting fear and insecurity, in property damage, in prestige and a tarnished image abroad.

Whatever the cause—be it in the homes, the schools, the courts, in public stewardship or some other field—both the problem and the remedy are reasonable clear.

What does it take?

The law must be obeyed and enforced. No disorderly society can long survive. "There is no grievance," said Abraham Lincoln, "that is a fit object of redress by mob law."

A sacred regard for human life must be restored. Fear seems to be the only universal passion. Even the hardened criminal fears swift, certain, speedy punishment. Mandatory sentences written in the law might help to stem the crime tide.

Respect for authority must be restored. Without it, we may find ourselves on the road to disaster.

The hateful language of destruction which comes so readily to the tongue should be discouraged at every turn.

The flag is the embodiment of the principles of this Republic. The very Republic suffers by its desecration.

Finally, the time has come to rethink our history. It should have emphasis in every school, church, and forum in the land. The legacy which is ours came from those who were here before us. Into this land they built their skills and talents, their hopes and dreams, their tears and sacrifices. Today, we are the trustees of America. Upon us is a twofold duty. The one is to those who came before us and gave us this land for our inheritance. The other is to those who shall come after us.

Perhaps three words can state the whole case: dedication, discipline, duty.

*June 13, 1968*

By Representative Gerald R. Ford:

One full week ago, meeting in the shadow of violence and tragedy, the House passed and sent to the President the Law Enforcement Assistance and Criminal Justice Act of 1968.

The House vote was 368 to 17.

The Senate vote was 72 to 4.

These overwhelming majorities reflected the massive demand of an aroused America that crime must be stopped. People must feel safe to walk in their own neighborhoods, sleep in their own homes, work in their own stores. The law must be upheld and lawbreakers must be punished.

But a week has passed and President Johnson has not signed this comprehensive crime bill into law. What is he waiting for?

Immediately, the President clouded this life-and-death legislation by attacking its gun control provisions, incidentally authored by Senate Democrats, and utterly ignoring the nine other urgently needed sections of the omnibus bill, many of which bear a Republican stamp.

The major gun control provisions Congress already has approved still await the President's signature, along with other long-overdue, anticrime provisions.

What is the President waiting for?

Instead of taking prompt and constructive action, he appointed another study commission. Even if he intends to veto the crime bill, he should do so without delay so we can reenact it over his veto.

A whole week has been lost. Projecting the FBI Crime Index statistics over an average week, more than 70,000 major crimes occur in this country; some 246 murders, 530 rapes, 3,400 robberies, and over 5,000 aggravated assaults have ticked off the crime clock since Congress did its duty a week ago today.

What is the President waiting for?

Besides the gun control sections, the Crime Bill on the President's desk contains these important provisions:

1.—Block grants of Federal funds to assist State governments in the war on crime—sponsored by Senator Dirksen in the Senate and Representative Cahill in the House—urged by virtually all State Governors of both parties over the opposition of the President and the Attorney General.

2.—Federal prohibition of all private electronic eavesdropping and wiretapping, along with carefully defined permission for such surveillance by enforcement officers under court authorization and supervision. This was introduced in the House by Representative McCulloch, Representative Poff, and other minority members of the Judiciary Committee and the Republican Task Force on Crime. The President's own Crime Commission made these recommendations. He has opposed them. These are major weapons in the fight against organized crime, espionage, and subversion.

3.—Authorization for a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, first proposed in the January 1967 Republican State of the Union message by Senator Dirksen and me, and incorporated in the bill by Representative McClory.

4.—Amendments authored by Senator Scott, Senator Allott, and Representative Railsback to modify and clarify recent Supreme Court decisions on the admissibility of confessions and other evidence.

5.—Provisions for "community service officers" proposed by Senator Percy and Representative Goodell to improve relations between police and citizens. An overall application of Representative Broyhill's amendment to recent appropriation bills concerning Federal civil servants who are convicted of crimes related to riots. Senator Murphy's amendment requiring future Directors of the FBI to be confirmed by the Senate. An amendment by Senator Hruska to help States fight organized crime.

All these matters are awaiting final approval at the White House. What is the President waiting for!

*September 12, 1968*

The source: The Annual Crime Report of the FBI. The period of time: 1960-67. The cold, harsh fact: crime in America, in that period, rose 89 percent!

Seldom has there been such a scathing indictment of American leadership. Rarely has there been so obvious a need for a change.

The FBI reports that, during 1967 alone, violent crime was committed each minute: murder was committed every 43 minutes; forcible rape was committed every 19 minutes; aggravated assault was committed every 2 minutes; robbery was committed every 2½ minutes; burglary was committed every 20 seconds; larceny was committed every 30 seconds; auto theft was committed every 48 seconds.

Never in our history has our national leadership been so vulnerable to criticism—and replacement—as it is today in the face of such stark statistics.

Frightening as these facts are, we have reason to be equally concerned about another: the apparent collapse of our people's confidence in the orderly and just society our forefathers strove so hard and so long to build. That loss of confidence can be attributed only to America's lack of leadership at the highest level.

The Law Enforcement Code of Ethics published in the FBI Report, in its opening paragraph reads:

As a Law Enforcement Officer, my fundamental duty is to serve mankind; to safeguard lives and property; to protect the innocent against deception, the weak against oppression or intimidation, and the peaceful against violence or disorder; and to respect the Constitutional rights of all men to liberty, equality, and justice.

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has failed to apply this philosophy of law enforcement and now seeks to cover its glaring deficiencies in a torrent of words and statistics. The incredible fact is that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has ordered their Attorney General not to execute new laws enacted upon Republican initiative by the people's representatives in Congress, to wage effective war on the Mafia and other organized crime activities.

Clearly this Nation needs new leadership, in the White House, in the House of Representatives, and certainly in the Department of Justice, to carry out the unequivocal pledge of the Republican Party Platform for protection of the public peace and safety and elimination of criminal activity and social injustice in every form.

Therefore, our Question-of-the-Week:

Mr. President, When Can We Expect Order With Justice Under Law?

### THE MIDDLE EAST

May 3, 1968

By the Republican leadership:

Today marks the first day of the 21st year of independence of the State of Israel. We congratulate the men, women, and children of Israel upon their extraordinary success to date.

Now the Middle East is becoming a tinderbox of fearful dimensions.

And the Johnson-Humphrey Administration still has no firm policy there.

It is a cold, harsh fact that *unless* a firm, clear, credible policy for the Middle East is soon declared and implemented, the Eastern Mediterranean potential for World War III will take frightening root.

And the Johnson-Humphrey Administration still has no firm policy there.

Nearly a year ago—and most recently this month—the Republican Party, represented by the unanimous vote of its Republican Coordinating Committee, made the following specific recommendations:

1. *The United States should assume active and imaginative leadership in the international community and in the United Nations to secure a political settlement in the Middle East based on the following principles:*

a. *An end to the state of belligerency between the Arabs and Israel and recognition by all states in the area of Israel's right to live and prosper as an independent nation.*

b. *As an essential part of a permanent settlement in the Middle East, the United States should insist on, and aid in, the rehabilitation and resettlement of the more than 1 million Palestine Arab refugees who have been displaced over the past 20 years.*

c. *The United States should join with other nations in pressing for international supervision of the holy places within the City of Jerusalem.*

d. *The United States should continue to strive for international guarantees of innocent passage through international waterways, including the Straits of Tiran and the Suez Canal.*

2. *The United States should propose a broad-scale development plan for all Middle Eastern States which agree to live peacefully with their neighbors.* This should include the bold imaginative Eisenhower-Strass Plan to bring water, work, and food to the Middle East by construction of nuclear desalinization plants.

3. *The United States must fully recognize the implications of increasing Soviet activities in the Middle East and North Africa, and be alert, firm, and resourceful in countering them.*

4. *The United States, in furtherance of peace in the Middle East, should strive with other nations for agreed limitations on international arms shipments to the area; but failing such an agreement the United States should be prepared to supply arms to friendly nations sufficient to maintain the balance of power and to serve as a deterrent to renewed open warfare.*

5. *Finally, the United States should make a determined effort to expose and isolate the militant troublemakers in the Middle East. We should support and encourage only nonaggressive, non-Communist leaders.*

The Republican Leadership of the Congress now reaffirms and again endorses each of these recommendations in its entirety.

Let no American be unaware of the fact that Russia has moved into the Middle East and the Mediterranean with tremendous and increasing naval and diplomatic strength in the biggest Soviet power-grab since the end of World War II.

And the Johnson-Humphrey Administration still has no firm policy there.

Spearhead of the Russian Middle East policy is the modern and constantly growing Russian Navy. Today, for the first time, the Kremlin has a fleet on permanent duty in the Mediterranean. It has missile cruisers, missile submarines, a helicopter carrier, and amphibious landing forces with the most modern of equipment. These give the Kremlin the means of intervening in troubled countries entirely around the Mediterranean rim.

It is an ominous fact that Russia is dramatically gaining in strength at sea in the strategic, vital Mediterranean area.

And the Johnson-Humphrey Administration still has no firm policy there.

The American people, so sorely troubled here at home, can no longer tolerate such blindness to the danger of World War III present today in the Middle East. We urge—no, we demand—of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration that it move now—with courage, clarity and firmness—to assure the State of Israel and the American people that peace and progress in the Middle East can and will be won.

---

#### THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

September 12, 1968

By Senator Dirksen:

The Republican Party, in its Platform of 1968, solemnly pledges to every American that "we shall think anew and act anew." And indeed we shall!

That platform, specifically, pledges us:

To dedicate our efforts toward restoration of peace both at home and abroad—

To bring about a national commitment to rebuild our urban and rural slum areas—

To enable family farm enterprise to participate fully in the Nation's prosperity—

To bring about quality education for all—

To assure every individual an opportunity for satisfying and rewarding employment—

To attack the root causes of poverty and eradicate racism, hatred, and violence—

To give all citizens the opportunity to influence and shape the events of our time—

To give increasing attention to the views of the young and recognize their key role in our present as well as the future—

To mobilize the resources, talents, and energy of public and private sectors to reach these goals, utilizing the unique strength and initiative of State and local governments—

To reestablish fiscal responsibility and put an end to increases in the cost of living.

The Republican Leadership of the Congress reaffirms and endorses to the full each and all of these platform purposes and pledges.

We pledge our strong support of the Nixon-Agnew ticket as the new leadership this Nation *must* have. With this new leadership we will face squarely and resolve successfully the grievous problems the American people face today.

